

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Speech Act Theory in Economic Discourse

Tursunmuradova Aziza Saidvaliyevna

English teacher at academic lyceum under Tashkent State University of law, Uzbekistan

Received: 15 May 2025 **Accepted:** 11 June 2025 **Published:** 13 July 2025

ABSTRACT

This article will discuss the origin of speech act theory and its categorization according to several researchers' views. The application of speech act theory in economical discourse will be analyzed and illustrated with the table of authentic samples. The article will try to emphasize the role of speech act theory to study pragmatic features of economic discourse.

Keywords: Illocutionary act, locutionary act, perlocutionary act, economic discourse, persuasive force, illocutionary force.

INTRODUCTION

One hypothesis in the philosophy of language that makes a serious effort to methodically describe how language functions is the speech act theory. Since it is currently one of the main theories being carefully explored in the fields of linguistics and communication, its broad effect has extended beyond the boundaries of philosophy. In short, a branch of pragmatics called speech act theory examines how words are used to perform activities as well as convey information.

In this article we will discuss how this speech act theory will function in economic discourse. Since the speech act theory has a power to influence listeners' and make communication meaningful beyond simple row of words, it is essential to analyze the application of three main speech acts in the context of economic field.

METHODS

In this article we will apply comparative analysis of different speech acts and their evolution, pragmatic analysis to illustrate pragmatic implication. The framework of the article will be based on the foundational works of pioneers, J. Austin and J. Searle. The discussion will be continued by the further development of speech act theory and some critiques in pragmatics.

RESULTS

The theory of speech acts are divided into three main categories which are popular in modern linguistics and subgroups of illocutionary act can illustrate how non-verbal factors play an important role in communication and clarity of information transformation.

DISCUSSION

The theory's two primary pioneers were John Searle and J. L. Austin. Austin started the work and established its framework, and his most famous pupil, John Searle, further organised it and strengthened its pillars. American philosopher John Searle expanded on the speech act theory, which Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin first presented in "How to Do Things With Words". It takes into account how much a speech is considered to do locutionary, illocutionary, or perlocutionary acts. What has now been referred to as the speech act hypothesis was first proposed by Austin. He focused on categories of utterances rather than categories of words or expressions.

In addition to the laws of language discussed by Carnap and others, Grice argued that there are further "rules of communication," which he dubbed conversational

maxims. According to these norms, one typically speaks things that are not only true but also pertinent, supported, etc. (And like the laws of logic, Grice claims that these rules are an inherent feature of human rationality.)

Some contemporary theorists depart from Grice in that they focus more on pragmatic than on semantic aspects of communication, continuing the tradition of addressing language by focusing on the analysis of speech and communication.

The notion that language has significance beyond the meanings of the words employed is known as speech act theory. Language, often known as speech acts, is a tool used to accomplish a variety of tasks. According to speech act theory, the context in which we use our words, their structure, and the sort of speech we are giving all affect their meaning. It also describes how speech can produce a result or an action. The study of pragmatics, or how language is utilised in social contexts, includes this notion.

Speech act theory is studied by several linguists and philosophers, like Andreas Kemmerling, in order to get a deeper understanding of human communication. "Part of the joy of doing speech act theory, from my strictly first-person point of view," stated Kemmerling, "is becoming

more and more remindful of how many surprisingly different things we do when we talk to each other" .

The locutionary act is "roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference," the illocutionary act is "such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, &c., i.e. utterances which have a certain (conventional) force," and the perlocutionary act is "what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading" . All three types of acts can be superimposed in an act of utterance, according to Austin.

According to Searle, speakers can only make five illocutionary points about propositions in an utterance, which are as follows:

The assertive;

The commissive;

The instruction;

The statement;

The expressive

Illocutionary act types	Definition	Samples	Context
Assertive	A remark that expresses a belief or factual facts about the world.	"The GDP contracted by 2.5% in the last quarter, indicating a slowing economy."	Economic analyst reporting in a market review.
Commissive	A promise made by the speaker to take action in the future.	"Our firm will invest \$10 million in renewable energy over the next five years."	Company pledge made during an investor meeting.
Instruction	A speaker's attempt to persuade the audience to take action.	"Ensure the revised budget is submitted before the audit deadline."	CFO directing a finance department team member.

Expressive	A manifestation of the speaker's emotional or mental condition.	"We regret any inconvenience caused by the recent system outage."	Official apology in customer or investor communication.
Declarative	A statement that implements a shift in social or institutional standing.	"The committee hereby approves the new tax policy effective July 1st."	Official declaration from a government economic body.

Some contend that Austin and Searle only focused on statements that were taken out of their potential context, basing their work primarily on their intuitions. The fact that the illocutionary force of a concrete speech act cannot assume the shape of a sentence as Searle thought of it is, in this view, one of the primary inconsistencies to his proposed typology.

Instead, scholars propose that a speech act has a communicative purpose distinct from that of a sentence, which is a grammatical unit inside the formal structure of language.

The hearer is viewed as having a passive function in speech act theory. A given utterance's illocutionary force is assessed based on its linguistic form as well as an introspective assessment of whether the requisite felicity conditions—not least with regard to the speaker's beliefs and feelings—are met. As a result, interactional elements are overlooked.

However, speech acts are connected to other speech acts with a broader discourse context, so conversation is more than just a series of separate illocutionary forces. Speech act theory is inadequate in explaining what truly occurs in conversation because it ignores the role that utterances play in advancing discussion.

There are three types of speech acts: perlocutionary, illocutionary, and locutionary acts. The effectiveness of the acts in delivering the speaker's message to the target audience is measured by whether they are direct or indirect.

The simplest way to describe locutionary acts is as "the mere act of producing some linguistic sounds or marks with a certain meaning and reference," according to Susana

Nuccetelli and Gary Seay's "Philosophy of Language: The Central Topics." However, this is only an umbrella term for the other two acts, which can occur simultaneously.

According to Austin, a locutionary speech act is roughly comparable to making a specific utterance with a specific sense and reference, which is also roughly equivalent to meaning in the conventional sense. Accordingly, locutionary refers to what is uttered. Additionally put forth by Yule, who defines a locutionary act as the production of meaningful utterances.

The example of the locutionary speech act can be seen in the following sentences:

1. It's so dark in this room.
2. The box is heavy.

The true situation is reflected in the two statements above. The room's illumination is discussed in the first sentence, and the box's weight is discussed in the second.

The communicative power of an utterance, such as making a promise, expressing regret, or making a gift, is used to carry out the illocutionary act. Another name for this action is the act of stating or doing anything. The illocutionary act is the most important degree of action in a speech act since it is determined by the force that the speakers have sought.

Illocutionary act can be the real description of interaction condition.

For example: 1. It's so dark in this room. 2. The box is heavy.

According to the aforementioned instances, the first

statement requests that the light be turned on, and the second sentence requests that the box be lifted up.

According to Hufford and Heasley, a perlocutionary act is an action taken by a speaker when their speech has a specific impact on the listener and other people. Offering someone is another example of a perlocutionary act. The term "perlocutionary act" describes how one speech affects another person's thinking or behaviour. A perlocutionary act is unique to the circumstances surrounding its issuance and is therefore not typically accomplished simply by making that precise utterance. It encompasses all intentional or unexpected, frequently unpredictable repercussions that a certain utterance in a specific scenario causes. For instance:

Thus, speech acts can be further classified as either illocutionary or perlocutionary. The former provides instructions for the listener, such as making a promise, giving an order, expressing regret, or expressing gratitude. Contrarily, perlocutionary behaviours provide audiences consequences, such as "I will not be your friend." In this case, frightening the buddy into obedience is a perlocutionary act, whereas the threat of friendship loss is an illocutionary act.

The interaction between the speaker and the listener is crucial to comprehend in the context of perlocutionary and illocutionary acts of speech since they rely on the audience's response to a particular speech.

CONCLUSION

Possessing the ability to decipher an utterance's underlying meaning is crucial. If we are not careful, some words or utterances could be misinterpreted as nasty. We can gain a better comprehension of the utterances by comprehending pragmatics and speech acts. English is used as a foreign language in Indonesia. The English language contains several idiomatic terms that the Indonesian language does not.

These expressions operate as obstacles that might prevent someone from understanding the words' or utterances' true meaning. Speech acts could be socialised in the classroom in an attempt to increase awareness of such obstacles. The teacher should keep these three objectives in mind when instructing students in specific expressions like advising, complimenting, and congratulating: increasing awareness, enhancing knowledge, and fostering productive

development.

The purpose of teaching speech actions in the classroom should be to increase students' awareness that statements made in English, a foreign language, may be misunderstood. Accurately interpreting the intended meaning through utterance analysis is essential. Students may ascertain the meaning of the utterances and increase their knowledge, which would enable them to execute the speech act, by comprehending the conventions and colloquial idioms of the first and second languages.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 108.
- Austin, J. L. (1964). *Philosophical Papers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words* (2nd ed., edited by J. O. Urmson & M. Sbisà). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge, p. 16.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hurford, J. R., & Heasley, B. (1983). *Semantics: A Coursebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 250.
- Kemmerling, A. (2002). Speech acts, minds, and social reality: Discussions with John R. Searle. *Expressing an intentional state*. *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy*, 79, 83–95. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Nuccetelli, S., & Seay, G. (Eds.). (2007). *Philosophy of Language: The Central Topics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Recanati, F. (2004). *Literal Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1971). Performative-constative. In J. F. Rosenberg & C. Travis (Eds.), *The Philosophy of Language* (pp. 54–71). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 48.

ThoughtCo. (n.d.). *Speech Act Theory*. Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/speech-act-theory-1691986>