



SPEECH ACT THEORY A HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Ali Abdulhamzah

Email: ali.abdulzahrah10@e-uvv.ro

University of Timisoara, Romania

Abstract: Speech act theory, from the perspective of pragmatics, is a concept that is continually developing within the realm of linguistics. While Austin and Searle's models provided the conceptual frameworks that contribute to ongoing scholarship, contemporary research also identifies a need for further adapting established models as analysts examine issues impacting subjects, organizations, and nations in the 21st century. In this context, the primary objective of this article is to offer an overview of the historical evolution of Speech Act Theory and to illustrate how these theoretical evaluations enhance the dissertation's examination of speech acts as processes that impact distinct populations in diverse manners.

Introduction

Contemporary theories in linguistics conceptualize speech acts from varying perspectives. These assessments analyze the phenomenon in the context of their unique linguistic structures and their ability to achieve perlocutionary effects on target audiences (Harris, Fogal and Moss 2018). Discussions of a speech act's pragmatic dimensions examine the degree to which certain utterances achieve real-world outcomes (Abdulabbas 2022). These assessments, in turn, reference the concepts of cultural framing and power as elements that inform the construction of speech acts and that influence the scope and nature of their pragmatic effects (Ardèvol-Abreu 2015; Drid 2018). These collective findings indicate that even simply constructed speech acts can be examined in terms of their social, cultural, political, and pragmatic significance.

While contemporary discussions of speech acts rely on a range of theories to inform their analysis, two primary theorists inform many of these assessments. First, J.L. Austin (1962) represents a foundational linguist who borrowed concepts from Ludwig Wittgenstein and refined them into an established framework. Austin's initial theory described and differentiated two primary speech acts while his later framework would elaborate on these principles (Mabaquiao 2018). The theorist's later expansion of his initial theory partially derived from John Searle's influence. In the latter author's original work on speech acts, Searle (1969) contended that the analysis of an utterance required assessments that extended beyond Austin's original distinction between constatives and performatives. This argument prompted Austin to elaborate on his initial model and simultaneously contributed to Searle's development of an extensive taxonomic framework. (Oishi 2006). Third, Bach & Harnish (1979) provide a detailed category that distinguishes various types of illocutionary acts based on the expressed attitude and, in some cases, content constraints. They use the terms 'constative' and 'commissive' from Austin as well as 'directive' from Searle. Furthermore, they prefer the term 'acknowledgment' over 'behabitive' or 'expressive' for expressions such as 'apologies', 'greetings', 'thanks', 'congratulations', and 'condolences'. These expressions convey an attitude to the hearer in response to an event, often meeting a social expectation.

This article explores these wider themes by analyzing works that assess the theoretical importance of Austin and Searle and their multifaceted impact from five key viewpoints. These

discussions will provide a brief history of speech act theory; examine the relationship between the theorists and their respective frameworks; and discuss the constituent elements that define their models. A final section analyzes the implications deriving from Austin, Searle and Bach and Harnish's theory of speech acts.

The literature review presented in this article examines the speech act theories developed by J.L. Austin, John Searle and Bach and Harnish. The works analyzed for the study define the theorists as significant figures who influenced later generations of scholars in important and paradoxical ways. The following literature review examined the speech act theories developed by Austin, Searle and Bach and Harnish perspectives. The analysis briefly described the history of the concept; discussed the relationship between the theorists; described the constituent elements that defined the frameworks; surveyed the work of contemporary authors; and discussed the implications deriving from varying speech act theoretical models. These themes are derived from a separate analysis of Austin, Searle and Bach and Harnish's primary works, the research provided by contemporary scholars, and a comparative analysis of the primary and secondary sources.

This initial process enabled the researcher to locate the secondary works that contributed to the discussions. The secondary approach involved the author's in-depth analysis of the primary texts selected for the analysis. The critical sources in this context included Austin's foundational study and his later works (Austin 1962, 1976 and 1990).

Contemporary applications of speech act theory commonly define the concept as a structured yet open-ended framework that can be used to analyze various dimensions of speech and individual utterances. These assessments describe the phenomenon's characteristic linguistic elements; its dependency on specific sociocultural and organizational settings; and its relative ability to create real-world outcomes (Dolan, Huang and Gordon 2021; Edmonson 2014). Critical accounts also examine the theory's history and its ongoing patterns of development. While applied concepts date back to the work of 19th and early 20th-century philosophers, they also align with contemporary variants of poststructuralist theory (Mabaquiao 2018; Neufeld 2021). These broader-level observations indicate that the history of speech act theory needs to be examined from the perspective of its past and its continued influence on contemporary research.

Scholarly discussions of the speech act's theory tend to present two primary views. First, these analyses attribute the concept's development to specific thinkers including Austin and Searle (Oishi 2006). Secondly, scholars refer to the model's complex patterns of development. This view posits that while specific linguists helped cultivate specific models that can be distinguished from one another, their work can also be framed within a broader continuum (Tashakori and Gobanchi 2022). As the article's discussions indicate, this latter perspective contributes to an analysis of the relationship between Austin, Searle and Bach and Harnish. While the latter authors produced separate models, they additionally created the theoretical foundation that enabled future scholars to reconceptualize and apply the speech acts concept to their work (Weisser 2020).

Discussions of the theory's historical patterns of development often identify J.L. Austin as the principal theorist who codified the term speech acts and who developed an initial taxonomy designed to explain and contextualize the framework (Gasparatou 2018). A review of the concept's history, however, also indicates that Austin's contributions can be viewed as being part of a broader theoretical paradigm. According to Mabaquiao (2018), Austin's emerging concept emerged from his review of previous thinkers, all of whom cultivated a unique approach to the problem of analyzing the relationship between language and external reality. The author identified the philosophers John Stuart Mill, Bertrand Russell, and Ludwig Wittgenstein as the primary influences on Austin's conceptual development of the



speech act concept. The same author noted that Austin would ultimately differentiate his model from those described by the preceding philosophers. Whereas Russell focused on the principle of logic as the basis for his analysis of the language/reality division, Austin would cultivate a more nuanced understanding. Wittgenstein, however, exerted a greater influence on the latter theorist. Harris and Unnsteinsson (2018) noted that Austin and Wittgenstein shared a mutual interest in analyzing language's utility within specific contexts. Their approach to the language/reality divide thus challenged Russell's assumption that a spoken or written statement's value derives from its logical coherence alone.

In his foundational work, Austin developed a simplified framework that addressed the question of a speech act's utility (Austin 1962). The binary dichotomy of constatives and performative acts enabled the theorist to divide language into different functions. This primary approach helped him address the broader questions that informed his and Wittgenstein's analysis of language's use and practical functions. The simplified nature of Austin's divisions enabled him to integrate a set of implicit concepts into his model. He analyzed the value and success of constatives and performative-oriented speech acts through the application of true and false statements and pragmatic outcomes, respectively (Hadiati 2019). Austin's model implied that the successful outcomes associated with both types of statements would depend on the relationship between the speaker, his/her relative dimensions of power as a means for generating illocutionary force, and the same speaker's ability to achieve perlocutionary outcomes in real-world settings (Stevani et al. 2023).

Bach and Harnish (1979) proposed an intention-inference-based approach to speech acts, suggesting that interactional talk involves an inferential process. They asserted that illocutionary actions are based on mutual contextual beliefs between speakers and listeners, introducing the concept of "Speech Act Schemata" as an essential part of the inferential process in communication. According to this schema, a listener's understanding of a speaker's utterance relies not only on the speaker's words but also on the shared contextual knowledge. Therefore, understanding a speaker's message requires comprehending both the literal and non-literal meanings of the language used. This is also why the Speech Act Theory by Bach and Harnish (1979) offers a more detailed categorization compared to other theories.

The historical contributions deriving from Austin's initial theory can be analyzed from the perspective of its later influence. Despite its initial limitations, the framework enabled linguists to understand, contextualize, and examine the relationship between specific speech acts and their variable influence on audiences and real-world developments (Sarfi et al. 2018). Searle's later critique of Austin's speech act model focused on the later author's perceptions of the framework's limitations (Mabaquiao 2018). These perceived gaps prompted Searle to cultivate a comprehensive set of factors that influence the relationship between the speakers, his/her influence on listeners, and the individual's ability to achieve the direct and implied perlocutionary effects that the speech utterance references (Hosseinpour 2018). Finally, according to Bach and Harnish (1992), Searle's argument is based on an incorrect distinction between having a communicative intention and being required to have one, along with a misinterpretation of the difference between performativity and communicative success.

Speech act theory constituent elements

A detailed examination of Austin and Searle's theory identifies three primary themes related to the elements that constitute each model. First, the variables can be interpreted in terms of their difference. While both theorists sought to describe and contextualize the relationship between speech acts and their intended and actual effects, Austin and Searle developed different frameworks that achieved these outcomes. Secondly, a review of each theory's elements identifies their areas of overlap and similarity. A critical issue in this context refers to the idea of pragmatics as the concept describes



how speech acts impact specific audiences and attempt to achieve a diverse set of real-world outcomes (Sbisa 2013). Finally, these analyses describe how the combined theories contribute to developing speech act theories.

Austin and Searle's competing theories can be first analyzed in terms of their differences. While both theorists sought to define and conceptualize speech acts as complex linguistic entities, they developed distinct frameworks. In his earlier work, Austin applied Wittgenstein's philosophical discussions of language to his emerging theory (Hosseinpour 2021). This approach resulted in his definition of constatives and performatives as distinct speech act variants. According to the theorist, a constative directly or indirectly proposes a truth statement that can be empirically validated or refuted (Austin 1962). Sakai (2019) noted that constatives can be evaluated based on their truth or falsehood as the speaker makes a contention. One of the limitations that Searle identified in Austin's theory referred to the potential ambiguities that can develop as analysts attempt to distinguish between constatives and performatives (Mabaquiao 2018). A phrase that describes a speaker's opinion might potentially represent a constative speech act as it delivers information that could be empirically evaluated. At the same time, the speaker's intention might also blur the boundaries between a fact-based statement and an utterance intended to generate an action on the part of an audience (Searle 1983).

The second term that Austin presented in his theory referred to the concept of performative-based speech acts (Austin 1962). The theorist defined these variants as the utterances that persuade others to perform specific actions and that often contribute to real-world developments. Austin's later research would further classify performative speech acts by describing the conditions and factors that contribute to their success and desired aim (Austin 1976, 2020). Performative statements typically derive from specific settings and contexts and contain specific verbs that direct target audiences toward a set of desired goals (Gasparatou 2018). The speaker needs to word the discourse in the present tense and address a subject while using first-person grammatical construction (Austin 1976). While constatives typically distinguish between speech and physical acts, performatives frequently conflate these divisions (Drid 2018). A speaker who exercises power and authority within an organizational setting can, for example, deliver performative messages that succeed at the linguistic level and accomplish desired illocutionary and perlocutionary goals (Dolan et al. 2021).

Searle's speech act theory diverges from Austin's in important ways. Whereas Austin's framework divides speech acts into two primary divisions, Searle's emerging model created a more detailed and encompassing taxonomy (Searle 1969). After identifying the limitations associated with the preceding theory, Searle developed a five-part framework that classified and described the performative verbs that accompany non-constative speech acts (Smith 2003). The emerging theory's first iteration referenced verdictives as a performative category that enabled speakers in specific settings to investigate issues and cases and to render authoritative judgments. Exercitives consist of acts that individuals with specific rights can create by voting in the context of a specific office or warning others while serving in these capacities. Commissives connect the speaker to a specific group or party involved in a dispute (Devi and Degaf 2021). Behabitives enable individuals to perform necessary social actions, such as apologizing to others; expositives concisely interject a speaker's intentions or perspective into a phrase, such as a statement can include the phrase "I contend". Several research studies have concentrated on speech acts, especially those encompassing a performative classification that empowered speakers in specific contexts to examine matters and make authoritative assessments. Tarish (2019) conducted an in-depth pragmatic evaluation of all the speeches given by U.S. Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump. In his research, he applied the fundamental illocutionary act categories outlined by Searle (1976) in this particular section. For example,

"My fellow citizens, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision". "Illocutionary act is representative, President Bush was asserting as fact that Iraq had been given sufficient time to acquiesce to the demands of the United States and now he must decide how to proceed. The Projected of Perlocutionary act is anticipation of the President's decision" (Tarish 2019).

Masykur (2022) in his study, he categorizes and explains the types of illocutionary functions found in imperative statements within the novel "Uncle Tom's Cabin" using a pragmatic approach. The research employed a descriptive qualitative methodology and integrated a case study within it.

"Can I talk to you a moment, Ruth?"

"This utterance can be a part of illocutionary which has function to request. It shows from request question from the dialogue "Can I talk to you a moment, Ruth?". This question is polite utterance to request someone to do something. This dialogue is done by the people having same social condition" (Masykur 2022).

"Topsy, bring them here. They're beautiful"

"There is a conversation between Miss Evageline (Eva) and her best friend namely Topsy. Miss Eva asked Topsy to bring the bunch of flowers to her. So, there is a statement to request to the best friend. From the speech, it has the context of the situation that the master had the power to order his slave. Therefore, the utterance "bring them here" here has the meaning of showing friendship. It can be concluded that it uses an illocutionary speech act that functions to request" (Masykur 2022).

The first iteration of Searle's model enabled him to identify the variable elements that accompany a performative speech act and that often predict an utterance's potential for success or failure (Searle 1969). The author's revised framework introduced an additional set of terms (Searle 1976). These latter terms introduced new concepts and reevaluated the relationship between the speaker, the illocutionary power of a performative utterance, and the conditions that are often necessary for the statement to achieve perlocutionary outcomes (Hadiati 2019). In the revised taxonomy, Searle defined a representative as an act that enables a speaker to present an assertion related to an argument or truth claim (Searle 1976). Directives seek to motivate others to act and to perform specific actions either directly or indirectly (Meibauer 2019). The term commissives reflects a speaker's intention and describes the outcomes that he/she will achieve in the indefinite future (Prihodko 2018). Expressives signify a speaker's subjective emotional state and evoke utterances that convey their socially-oriented intentions by apologizing, offering condolences, congratulating others, or performing related acts. Declarations establish a unique type of equilibrium between speech acts and real-world conditions. These latter statements conflate a speaker's political, religious, or social authority with key pronouncements that affect reality (Harris et al. 2018). A priest confirming the baptism of an infant or marrying a couple represents specific examples. Declarations align with Austin's broader definition of speech acts as both concepts describe scenarios in which a speaker's utterance can succeed at the linguistic and perlocutionary levels (Sarfi et al. 2018).

While Austin and Searle's respective speech act models differ in terms of their approach to analysis and the critical terms that the frameworks apply and evaluate, they rely on many of the same implicit theoretical concepts. In both taxonomies, the theorists conceive of a speech act's quality and effect as being contextually related to the idea of linguistic pragmatics (Mabaquiao 2018). This latter concept describes the relationship between a speaker, the relative force of power of his/her statements, and the utterance's relative influence on real-world conditions (Ariel 2010). In current research, analysts

frequently describe how specific settings and contexts influence pragmatic arrangements and indirectly affect a speaker's rhetorical strategies (John, Brooks & Schriever, 2019).

Austin and Searle's respective theories implicitly define speakers as variable individuals and parties who communicate across a range of settings and contexts. Austin's idea of constatives refers to generalized statements that may not require a speaker to possess a high level of power or authority (Austin, 1962). Diverse individuals can formulate provisional truth statements even as others might critique the accuracy or truth/falsehood based on their respective positions within a social or organizational setting. The illocutionary power associated with a constative speech act would thus likely remain low even as the statement generates limited perlocutionary effects. A performative statement, could generate immediate-term locutionary processes and result in longer-term perlocutionary goals (Issac, Gwunireama and Ogan 2020).

Searle's initial and revised frameworks provided detailed taxonomies that addressed the potentially ambiguous nature of Austin's theoretical model. The ten conditions that Searle defined as facilitating factors can be used to analyze several key issues as they relate to the broader issue of linguistic pragmatics (Franco 2019). While the terms define and distinguish variable speech act types, the concepts implicitly define the situations that potentially influence a speaker's rhetorical approach (Ekoru and Gunn 2021). The frameworks identify the social, political, or institutional situations that may require the individual to rely on specific ceremonial performative acts. Directives, accompanied by the speaker's variable dimensions of power or social authority, can initiate direct forms of illocutionary processes (John et al. 2019). The individual's power dimensions can also influence perlocutionary outcomes in cases where speakers formulate directive commands (Dada 2004). In specialized cases, a speaker's position and his/her use of declarations can achieve the types of blurred effects that Austin attributed to performative speech acts.

The term "context" referred to as a collection of shared contextual beliefs (Bach and Harnish 1979: 5), includes any other factors the listener needs to consider when determining the speaker's intention, partly because it is expected of them to do so. The performative act in the statement determines the intended purpose, such as the imperative form. The effects that result from the statement on the listener include convincing, urging, guiding, directing, or misleading. These three levels of the speech act are all present simultaneously and to varying extents, making the speech act complete. As seen above, Austin (1962, 1976 and 1990) differentiates between declarative and performative sentences, and these performative statements can be either explicit or implicit. The analysis of explicit performative statements should not rely on any unique characteristics of the performative formula, as emphasized in Searle's (1989) detailed analysis. Bach & Harnish (1992) contend that Searle's analysis is founded on a false differentiation between possessing a communicative intention and being obligated to possess one, as well as a misunderstanding of the distinction between performativity and communicative effectiveness.

Despite their differences in terms of terminology, descriptive power, and theoretical orientation, Austin and Searle's combined theories contribute to current research that examines speech acts as a complex and affective linguistic variable. The combined theories enable analysts to develop an increasingly detailed system that analyzes the relationship between speakers, their power dimensions, and their effect on speakers or populations (Abdulabbas 2022). The frameworks' collaboration also helps researchers moderate the limitations associated with the individual theories and demonstrate how additional concepts contribute to these same discussions (Mabaquiao 2018).

Speech acts theories contemporary applications

A survey of contemporary research that applies Austin and Searle's theory to their analysis identified that authors often utilize these concepts in their discussion of four broader-level topics. Analysts utilize variable speech act frameworks in their assessments of expanding theoretical concepts; variable contexts and settings; analyses of selected texts; and the impact of power structures on speaker rhetorical strategies. These collective themes illustrate that Austin and Searle's respective theories continue to inform research related to speech acts even as contemporary authors apply these discussions to 21st-century issues and concerns (Weisser et al. 2020).

The surveyed works that apply Austin and Searle's theories to expanded theoretical discussions perform the following tasks. First, the analyses extend the frameworks to their analyses while critiquing aspects of their assumptions or constituent elements. Gowasa Radiana and Afifah (2019) examined a set of representative speech acts by examining the language presented by Turkish regional university students in their descriptive analysis. Sobirova (2022) relied on a similar methodology in the author's examination of subject discourse in an Indonesian context. The respective authors' studies relied on a direct application of speech act theory, while Borchmann (2020) critiqued aspects of Searle's concept of intentionality. Other authors demonstrated how the speech act framework aligns with other theoretical models. Primary examples included the theories related to framing, corpus linguistics, and post-structuralism (Ardèvol-Abreu 2015; Neufeld 2021; Rühlemann and Clancy 2018). Weisser's (2020) analysis of corpus linguistics from a speech acts perspective contributed to the author's contention that this field may require an emerging conceptual framework that can better analyze digitally-based discourse. Other findings indicate a need for examining speech acts from the perspective of social leadership and group identity (Hogg 2021; Tajfel 1982).

An additional theme deriving from the secondary sources addressed the issue of social, cultural, and organizational contexts as the variables impact a communicator's reliance on specific speech acts. These findings identified educational settings as locations that often require their stakeholders to communicate utilizing a combination of constative and performative speech acts in the scope of their responsibilities (Azhari Priono and Nuriadi 2018; Gasparatou 2018). Other studies described the influence of specific occupational or service-related settings on a speaker's application of the concept (Labinaz and Sbisà 2021). These works demonstrated how a communicator's awareness of his/her occupational conditions, the target audience, and the nature of distinct performative strategies contribute to his/her selection of a given style and methodology (Franco 2019; John et al. 2019; Sameer 2021). An additional theme reflected in these analyses identified cultural considerations as an essential factor that impacts a speaker's performative dimensions across various nations and discourse communities (Ekoro and Gunn; Hadiati 2019; Mukhroji et al. 2019).

A third theme deriving from the reviewed sources applied varying speech act theories to an analysis of a given text. Cheng's (2002) comparative study described how American and Chinese newspaper accounts framed a report describing the same incident. The analyst referenced the conjunction 'if' as a recurrent phrase in the U.S. accounts that signified the federal government's attitudes towards Chinese government accusations. Other studies applied the speech act framework to their critical assessments of various discourses and texts (Bloor and Bloor 2014; Devi and Degaf 2021; Sholihatin 2020). Caroline et al.'s (2021) discussion of Facebook Founder Mark Zuckerberg's speeches on the YouTube platform demonstrated how the figure's selected speech acts aligned with his position, the purpose of his address, and the stated and unstated goals that informed his communication.

An implicit theme deriving from Caroline et al.'s (2021) article related to the enormous levels of social capital and implicit authority that Zuckerberg commands from the standpoint of his position as the founder of Facebook. Other works elaborated on these themes by exploring the relationship

between speech acts as a broader theory, specific utterances, and a communicator's power. Dolan et al. (2021) noted that the structure of corporate power requires companies to formulate heavily coded speech acts that convey a firm's commitment to ethical values. Gasparatou et al.'s (2018) analysis of the educational sector similarly correlated a stakeholder's dimensions of relative institutional authority with the potential success of performative speech acts.

Austin's and Searle's speech acts theories

The relationship between Austin and Searle can be analyzed from varying perspectives. First, the theorists directly influenced one another in important ways. While Searle would critique Austin's original speech act theory, he would apply its terms and concepts to the development of his model (Smith 2003). Secondly, the combined insights derived from both theorists' models would develop the foundation that would support future-term scholarship. This latter trend indicates that while the individual models that the theorists developed featured several potential limitations, their collaborative work contributed to the growth of the speech acts concept (Tashakori and Gobanchi 2022). Finally, the relationship between the linguists can be viewed as being part of the same broader continuum that influenced Austin's development as a theorist (Mabaquiao 2018).

Discussions of Austin and Searle's relationship first focus on how the theorists influenced one another. Mabaquiao (2018) summarized these themes by describing the relationship between the theorists as being complex and defined by varying stages. As a student, Searle learned under Austin and derived many of the concepts that would inform him from his mentor. Austin's framework encouraged Searle to conceive speech acts as being composed of multidimensional elements, including the perlocutionary outcomes that occur as a result of specific official utterances (Sakai 2019). At the same time, Searle recognized the limitations inherent in Austin's framework. Hosseinpour (2021) identified the confused boundaries between specific types of speech acts and the older model's inability to differentiate speech from real-world outcomes as primary examples. The younger theorist's critique would ultimately motivate him to develop his listing of the five categories that define, constrain, and affect varying speech acts (Smith 2003).

While the relationship between the theorists can be viewed as oppositional, their patterns of mutual influence can also be conceptualized as a type of synthesis. Searle's critique of Austin's theory eventually enabled both thinkers to refine and reconceptualize the foundational concepts that informed their perspectives (Zou and Yiye 2022). The gaps and limitations that Searle identified in Austin's initial model would lead both analysts through the lifelong project of developing and refining the descriptive taxonomies that informed their interpretation of speech acts (Hosseinpour 2021). Searle's critique of Austin's use of pragmatics would also contribute to a revision of his initial categories (Searle 1976). These same patterns of ongoing influence enabled Austin to further define his arguments related to the relationship between speech acts formulated in official channels and their corresponding impact in real-world settings (Austin 1990). The differences and contentions formulated by the theorists, in brief, resulted in their models' refinement. These same outcomes would benefit future scholars who continue to examine speech acts as a multidimensional concept (Harris et al. 2018).

A comparative review of Austin, Searle's, and speech act theories indicated that the frameworks were broadly defined by their interpretation of linguistic pragmatics as they inform and frame a speaker's selected utterances (Austin 1962; Searle 1969). The same variables differentiate the models since Searle elaborated on the limitations that he perceived in Austin's foundational model (Searle 1968).

According to the research findings, the differentiated theories influenced one another in complex ways. Searle both learned from and critiqued Austin's initial theory (Mabaquiao 2018). This

development influenced the respective theorists as its informed Searle's emerging theoretical framework and resulted in Austin's reconsideration of his guiding themes and assumptions. A review of the secondary sources included in the literature review indicated that contemporary linguists approach varied speech act theories in the following ways. The analysts apply and critique the concepts presented by Austin and Searle's respective frameworks (Borchmann 2020). They integrate additional theories into their analysis (Ardèvol-Abreu 2015). The findings additionally identified the limitations associated with existing speech act taxonomies and recommended the introduction of expanded frameworks that more effectively analyze unique forms of discourse (Weisser 2020). Other analysts applied the theories in their examination of specific settings and their discussions of selected texts (Devi and Degaf 2021; Ekoru and Gunn 2021). Finally, the reviewed sources identified power-related factors as variables that can influence a speech act's potential for linguistic, illocutionary, and perlocutionary outcomes (Kamarudin 2020). The implications deriving from the literature review's analysis indicate that speech act theory represents an evolving concept that contributes to the analysis of varied cultural, social, organizational, and political settings and contexts.

Finally, a review of the theorist's relationship reaffirms the arguments that identify speech acts theory as an evolving framework. According to Zou and Yiye (2022), the theory's foundational principles first emerged in the work of eighteenth-century philosophers who sought to examine the correlations between language and reality. Harris and Unnsteinsson (2018) identified Wittgenstein as a crucial 20th-century thinker whose analysis of language's utility would directly influence Austin. Searle's complex relationship with his mentor illustrated how emerging speech act models both rely on and critique existing frameworks. The theorists' ongoing engagement with one another throughout their careers further illustrated the concept's ability to be reinterpreted and framed through varying conceptual models (Harris et al. 2018). This aspect of the theory benefited the work of Austin and Searle and continues to provide opportunities for ongoing analysis.

Bach and Harnish's speech acts theories

As shown above, speech act explores how language is used by speakers and listeners to communicate. However, Bach (1995) pointed out that the linguistic aspect of language is not the only focus. The theory of speech acts revolves around three primary components according to Bach (1995). The first element involves the act of speaking, which entails articulating words in coherent sentences that are grammatically sound and convey meaning, encompassing phonetic, structural, and semantic levels (Bach 1995). The range of linguistic expressions for carrying out a specific type of speech act is too broad to be reasonably attributed to a specific convention that designates only those expressions whose utterance qualifies as the execution of that type of action. The fact that they are standardized does not indicate that they are regulated by specific conventions. Instead, it establishes a model that helps to simplify the reasoning needed for their effective performance (Bach 1995).

In 1979, Bach and Harnish developed a Classification of Communicative and Conventional Illocutionary Act. The classifications proposed by Bach and Harnish (1979) are based on different combinations of illocutionary categories that work on "*Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*". They categorized the types of speech acts according to the attitudes they convey. Pedersen (2002) observed that in their classification of speech acts, Bach and Harnish included numerous specific branches under each type of speech act. It is important to emphasize that speech acts are frequently used by people to accomplish specific purposes. The function of these acts is evident in various forms of communication, whether oral or written. However, Bach and Harnish (1979) identified four categories based on Searle's work, which closely align with the categories identified by Pedersen (2002). When

comparing Searle's framework with Bach and Harnish's points, the remaining four categories closely match. In terms of categorization, Searle's categories include "Assertives, Directives, Commissive, Expressives, Declaratives", while Bach and Harnish's categories include "Constatives, Directives, Commissive Acknowledgements". However, Bach and Harnish do not consider "Declaratives" as a distinct category in their framework. Instead of using Austin's "exercitive", they prefer Searle's term "directive" as it encompasses a broader range of actions, including requests, questions, requirements, permissions, prohibitions, and acts of advice.

According to Bach and Harnish (1979), the following are brief explanations of each speech act category and sub-categories: *constatives* generally involve expressing a belief and intending for the listener to form or maintain a similar belief. Simple *Assertives, Predictives, Ascriptives, Descriptives, Informatives, Confermatives, Suggestives* fall into this category (Bach and Harnish 1979: 44). The typical outcome of these acts, perlocutionarily, appears to be that the listener/reader entertains the proposition in question or comes to believe it, perhaps by imagining that the speaker believes it. Constatives represent the speaker's viewpoint and their intention or desire for the listener/reader to adopt or influence a related belief. They suggest that *directives* convey the speaker's attitude towards a potential action by the listener. If this were the only information conveyed, it would simply be a statement with limited content, such as attributing the possible action to the listener. However, the directive function encompasses the speaker's intention, including the sense of guidance and the encouragement to prompt the listener to execute the directed action, such as *Requestives, Requirements, Prohibitives, Permissives, Advisories*. The typical outcome of these acts, perlocutionarily generates specific effects that can be observed through the reactions and responses exhibited by the listener. The effect may manifest as a coercion and prohibition that must be followed. The directive function of the authoritative speaker's statement leads the listener to have no alternative but to comply. However, it also conveys the speaker's intention (wish and desire) for his statement or the attitude he expresses to be communicated and prompt the listener to carry out an action as per his inclination (Bach and Harnish 1979: 46). They claimed that *commissives* involve committing oneself or proposing to commit oneself to carrying out a specified action, with the possibility of specifying conditions for when the action needs to be performed or is not necessary, such as *Promises, Offers* (Bach and Harnish 1979: 50). In their 1979 work, they outlined that *acknowledgments* fall within Austin's diverse group of 'behabitives' that convey, whether earnestly or routinely. The usual result of these acts, perlocutionarily generates specific emotions towards the listener or reader. These emotions and their articulation are suitable for specific types of situations, such as *Apologize, condole, commiserate, greet reject, refuse, spurn* (Bach and Harnish 1979: 51-55). For example, numerous studies have focused on speech acts, particularly those involving directive verbs and the content of Friday sermons. In 2018, Abd Ganing Laengkang conducted a significant study analyzing speech acts in the Friday sermon texts from Selangor State (Laengkang 2018: 1-18). This research aimed to apply Bach and Harnish's (1979) speech act theory to analyze the texts of the Friday sermons from Selangor State. The researcher examined six sermon texts published in 2018 and identified three sections and thirteen branches of speech acts. The study's findings revealed a notable predominance of the use of speech acts, particularly in the category of directive verb usage, specifically the branch of advice.

Conclusion

In conclusion, speech acts are essential in the interaction between communication and their audience, helping senders convey information successfully and motivate readers to engage in intended actions or behaviors. Austin's (1968) 'How to Do Things with Words' offered a fresh perspective, aiming

to develop a comprehensive theory of speech acts that goes beyond a simple understanding of performatives and constatives. However, this article presents an in-depth study of Speech Act Theory and its evolution over time. The literature review in this research investigates these key themes by examining works that focus on the theoretical implications of Austin, Searle, Bach, and Harnish, along with their varying degrees of influence from five primary viewpoints. These discussions provide a brief summary of the historical development of speech act theory, investigate the relationships between the theorists and their frameworks, and analyze the core components that define their models. Essentially, Austin suggested a distinction between speech acts or utterances that were simply statements or "sayings" and those categorized as "doings". As later elaborated by Searle, and acknowledged by Austin towards the end of his work, precise classification in this regard presents inherent challenges.

References

- [1] Abdulabbas, I. A. 2022. "The Pragmatic Aspects of Speech Acts". *Elementary Education Online*, 21(3), pp. 165-165. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2022.03.11>
- [2] Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2015). "Framing theory in communication research in Spain. Origins, development and current situation". *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 70, pp. 423-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2015-1053>
- [3] Ariel, M. 2010. *Defining pragmatics*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Austin, J. L. 1990. *A Plea for Excuses: The Presidential Address*. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series, Vol. 57 (1956 - 1957), pp. 1-30. Oxford University Press.
- [6] Austin, J. L. 2020. *How to Do Things with Words*. Barakaldo Books. <https://www.kobo.com/ww/en/ebook/how-to-do-things-with-words?srsId=AfmBOoru0SVW1rGHEsVvyT3w5Q94iKIH9GsD5JjJ8AxCgoCa-R3o-9j>
- [7] Austin, J.L. 1976. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Azhari, A. S., Priono, P., & Nuriadi, N. 2018. "Speech Acts of Classroom Interaction". *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture (IJLLC)*, 4(2), pp.24-45. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/281208-speech-acts-of-classroom-interaction-a2be163a.pdf>
- [9] Bach, K. 1995. *Standardization vs. Conventionalization*. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 18, 677-686.
- [10] Bach, K. And Harnish, R. M. 1979. *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- [11] Bach, K. and Harnish, R. M. 1992. *How Performatives Really Work: A Reply to Searle*. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, pp.15, 93-110.
- [12] Bednarek, M. 2006a. *Evaluation in Media Discourse: Analysis of a Newspaper Corpus*. London: Continuum, pp. 5-30.
- [13] Bednarek, M. 2006b. *Evaluating Europe – Parameters of Evaluation in the British Press*, In C. Leung And J. Jenkins (Eds.) *Reconfiguring Europe – The Contribution of Applied Linguistics*. London: BAAL/Equinox (British Studies In Applied Linguistics), pp. 137–156.
- [14] Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. 2014. "Critical Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics of Discourse". *Handbook Of Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin. 189. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214406-008>



- [15] Borchmann, S. 2020. "The Intentionality of Questions—A Critique of Searle's Analysis of Speech Acts". *Scandinavian Studies in Language*, 11(1), Pp.20-55. <https://doi.org/10.7146/Sss.V11i1.121360>
- [16] Caroline, R. T., Sitorus, U., Sinurat, B., & Silalahi, D. E. 2021. "An Analysis on the Speech Act of Mark Zuckerberg In English Speeches Youtube Channel". *Zien Journal Of Social Sciences And Humanities*, 1(1), pp.175-181. <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/zjssh/article/view/113>
- [17] Cheng, M. 2002. "The Standoff: What Is Unsaid? A Pragmatic Analysis of the Conditional Marker 'if'". *Discourse & Society*, 13(3), 309-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926502013003050>
- [18] Dada, S. A. 2004. "Introduction to Pragmatics". In T. Bamisaye Ed. *An Integrated Study in Language and Society* Pp.141-166. Lagos: Majab Publishers.
- [19] Devi, M. F., & Degaf, A. 2021. "An Analysis of Commissive Speech Act Used by the Main Character of 'Knives Out'". *PARADIGM: Journal of Language And Literary Studies*, 4(1), Pp. 43-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18860/prdg.v4i1.10932>
- [20] Dolan, C., Huang, J., & Gordon, C. 2021. "The Ambiguity of Mutuality: Discourse and Power in Corporate Value Regimes". *Dialectical Anthropology*, pp.45, 9-27. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10624-019-09569-y>
- [21] Drid, T. 2018. Language as Action: Fundamentals of the Speech Act Theory. *Praxis International Journal of Social Science and Literature*, 1(10), 9.
- [22] Egoro, D. E., & Gunn, M. 2021. "Speech Act Theory And Gricean Pragmatics: A Review". *Lwati: A Journal Of Contemporary Research*, 18(4), pp. 130-143. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>
- [23] Franco, P. L. 2019. "Speech Act Theory and the Multiple Aims of Science". *Philosophy Of Science*, 86(5), pp.1005-1015. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/philosophy-of-science/article/abs/speech-act-theory-and-the-multiple-aims-of-science/A6A3FC56CF9BFD0E963AC35C9806AF7F>
- [24] Gasparatou, R. (2018). "How to Do Things With Words: Speech Acts in Education". *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 50(5), Pp.510-518. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2017.1382353>
- [25] Gowasa, N. S., Radiana, S. P., & Afifah, N. 2019. "A Study on The Use of Speech Acts: A Review of Selected Paper". *ELSYA: Journal of English Language Studies*, 1(2), pp.55-60. <https://doi.org/10.31849/Elsya.V1i2.3528>
- [26] Hadiati, C. 2019. "Felicity Conditions of The Speech Acts In Banyumasan Daily Conversation". *Theory And Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), pp.700-705. I: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/Tpls.0906.13>
- [27] Harris, D. W., & Unnsteinsson, E. 2018. "Wittgenstein's Influence on Austin's Philosophy of Language". *British Journal for The History of Philosophy*, 26(2), pp.371-395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09608788.2017.1396958>
- [28] Harris, D. W., Fogal, D., & Moss, M. 2018. "Speech Acts: The Contemporary Theoretical Landscape". *Oxford University Press*, pp. 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198738831.001.0001>
- [29] Hogg, M. A. 2001. "A Social Identity of Theory Of Leadership". *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0503_1



- [30] Hosseinpour, G. 2021. "A Meditation on Austin and Searle Taxonomies of Illocutionary Acts". *Philosophy*, 19(2), 39-56. <https://doi.org/10.22059/Jop.2021.321807.1006599>
- [31] John, P., Brooks, B., & Schriever, U. 2019. "Speech Acts in Professional Maritime Discourse: A Pragmatic Risk Analysis of Bridge Team Communication Directives and Commissives in Full-Mission Simulation". *Journal of Pragmatics*, pp.140, 12-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.013>
- [32] Kamarudin, K. 2020. "Speech Acts Analysis and Its Application within the Interlocutors' Communication". *Cordova Journal Language and Culture Studies*, 10(1), Pp.67-83. <https://doi.org/10.20414/Cordova.V10i1.2228>
- [33] Kanno-Youngs, Z. and Sullivan, E. 2022. "Is That Legal? How Scores of Migrants Came to Be Shipped North". *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/16/us/politics/migrants-marthas-vineyard-desantis.html>
- [34] Labinaz, P., & Sbisà, M. 2021. "Speech Acts and The Dissemination of Knowledge in Social Networks". *Approaches to Internet Pragmatics: Theory and Practice*, 318, pp.145-172. <https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/5001712#page=154>
- [35] Laengkang, A. G. 2018. "Analisis Lakuan Bahasa Terhadap Khutbah Jumaat Negeri Selangor". *Jurnal Hal Ehwal Islam Dan Warisan Selangor*, pp.1-18.
- [36] Mabaquiao, N. M. 2018. Speech Act Theory: From Austin to Searle. *Augustinian Journal*, 19(1), pp.1-18.
- [37] Masykur, A. D. 2022. The Analysis on Illocution Functions for Imperative Utterances in "Uncle's Tom Cabin" Novel. *International Journal of English Linguistics, Literature, and Education (IJELLE)*. 1 Vol. 4, No., pp. 1-12 ISSN 2686-0120 (print), 2686-5106. <http://journal.univetbantara.ac.id/index.php/ijelle/index>.
- [38] Meibauer, J. 2019. "What is an Indirect Speech act? Reconsidering the Literal Force Hypothesis". *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 26(1), pp.61-84. <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/pc.19009.mei>
- [39] Mukhroji, M., Nurkamto, J., Subroto, H. E., & Tardjana, S. S. 2019. "Pragmatic Forces in the Speech Acts of Efl Speakers At Kampung Inggris", Indonesia. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(1), pp.38-60. <https://jsser.org/index.php/jsser/article/view/400>
- [40] Neufeld, D. 2021. *Reconceiving Texts as Speech Acts: An Analysis of I John* (Vol. 7). Leiden, Holland: Brill.
- [41] Oishi, E. 2006. *Austin's Speech Act Theory and the Speech Situation*. *Esercizi Filosofici*, 1.2006, pp.1-14. <https://sites.units.it/eserfilo/art106/oishi106.pdf>
- [42] Pedersen, H. M. 2002. *Speech Acts And Agents - A Semantic Analysis*. M.A Dissertation. Technical University of Denmark
- [43] Prihodko, G. 2018. "Specific Nature of Evaluative Speech Acts". *Advanced Education*, 9, pp.201-205. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.128232>
- [44] Rühlemann, C., & Clancy, B. 2018. *Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics*. Pragmatics and Its Interfaces, pp.241-266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/pbns.294.11ruh>
- [45] Sakai, T. 2019. "Between Performatives and Constatives: Construal in Speech Acts". *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers*, 41, pp.259-277.
- [46] Sameer, I. H. 2021. "Speech Acts and Politeness in Nixon And Bush's Victory Speech: A Pragmatic Study". *Al-Adab Journal*, 2138, pp.13-32. <https://doi.org/10.31973/Aj.V2i138.1738>



- [47] Sarfi, F., Ghotbi, S., & Davoodi, M. F. 2018. "A Study of Speech Acts in Ghadir Hadith Based on Austin and Searle Theory". *Emamat Pajouhi*, 8-2, pp.105-142. <https://doi.org/10.22034/Jep.2018.91176>
- [48] Sbisa, M. 2013. *Pragmatics of Speech Actions*. in Sbisa, M., & Turner, K. Eds. Handbook of Pragmatics, pp.25-74. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214383>
- [49] Sbisa, M. And Turner, K. Eds. 2013. *Pragmatics of Speech Actions*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- [50] Searle, J. R. 1968. *Austin on Locutionary and Illocutionary Acts*. The Philosophical Review, 77-4, pp.405-424. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2183008>
- [51] Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press: New York.
- [52] Searle, J. R. 1976. *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts*. Language in Society, 5(1), pp.1-23. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166848>
- [53] Searle, J. R. 1983. *Intentionality: An Essay in The Philosophy of Mind*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- [54] Searle, J. R. 1989. *How Performatives Work*. Linguistics and Philosophy, 15, 535-558.
- [55] Sholihatin, E. 2020. "An Analysis of Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Speech Act in Defamation Texts". *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 7-1, 49-56. <https://ejournal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt/article/view/1438>
- [56] Smith, B. 2003. *John Searle: from Speech Acts to Social Reality*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- [57] Sobirova, N. E. 2022. "A Study on The Use of Speech Acts". *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Studies*, pp.18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21070/ijins.v18i.667>
- [58] Stevani, M., Tarigan, K. E., Sawalmeh, M. H., & Ginting, F. Y. A. 2023. "A Case Study of Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary Speech Acts in English Learning Interactions in Junior High School". *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 5-1, pp.47-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2022.5.1.5>
- [59] Tajfel, H. 1982. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- [60] Tarish, A. H. 2019. *US Presidents' Discourse. A Linguistic Approach*. Phd Diss. West University of Timisoara.
- [61] Tashakori, M., & Gobanchi, N. 2022. "Study and Analysis Attar's Mantegh-O-Teyr Speech Acts in Advancing Narration with Emphasis on John R Searle's Theory". *Journal of Poetry Studies*, 14-3, pp.93-120. <https://www.magiran.com/paper/2507032/study-and-analysis-attar-s-mantegh-o-teyr-speech-acts-in-advancing-narration-with-emphasis-on-john-r-searle-s-theory?lang=en>
- [62] Weisser, M. 2020. "Speech Acts in Corpus Pragmatics: Making The Case for An Extended Taxonomy". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 25-4, pp.400-425. <https://doi.org/10.1075/Ijcl.19023.We>
- [63] Zou, L., & Yiye, Z. 2022. "Review of Research on Development of Speech Act Theory and Its Application". *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 5-12, pp.127-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.12.16>