Beyond Tradition:
proposing a new framework for speech act classifications[*]

Zahra Jafari [ID]

PhD, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Arak, Arak, Iran. E-mail:
s39818132001@phd.araku.ac.ir

Hamid-Reza Dowlatabadi [ID] (Corresponding Author)

Assistant Professor, English Language and Literature Department, University of Arak, Arak, Iran. E-mail:
h-dowlatabadi@araku.ac.ir

Abstract

Speech act theory is a significant issue in comprehending the intricate dynamics of human communication, acting as a guiding light in understanding how language is used to perform actions beyond the literal meanings of words. While traditional frameworks have presented valuable perceptions in classifying speech acts, the evolving nature of communication requires reconsidering and expanding these conventional approaches. The researchers of the current study proposed an innovative framework for speech act classifications, one that exceeds traditional boundaries and embraces the nuanced complexities of modern discourse. Based on seminal works by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), and also by considering important research by Grice (1975), Levinson (1983), and emerging perspectives represented by Verschueren (1999) and Sbisa (2002), the researchers of this study critically assess current classifications, identifying essential challenges and opportunities in speech act analysis. The proposed framework introduces other categories such as Metaplocutionary Acts, Interlocutionary Acts, and Negotiation Acts, offering a more comprehensive and context-sensitive approach to understanding speech acts. Through interdisciplinary collaboration and empirical validation, the researchers of this study aim to refine and apply this framework across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts, thereby paving the way for a more nuanced and dynamic comprehension of human communication.

[*]This article is an excerpt from a doctoral dissertation entitled "*A Pragmatic Study of Requests and Apologies as produced by Iranian EFL learners, Native Persian speakers, and Native English speakers*" under the guidance of Dr. Hamid-Reza Dowlatabadi, in University of Arak, Arak, Iran.

Introduction

In linguistic analysis, the classification of speech acts refers to a basis for understanding the intricacies of human communication (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Traditional frameworks have been used as valuable tools in dissecting the various functions of utterances in discourse (Grice, 1975). However, as communication progresses alongside societal, cultural, and technological advancements, a pressing need arises to reassess and expand upon these conventional classifications (Levinson, 1983). This study, Beyond Tradition, introduces a groundbreaking proposal for a new framework in speech act classifications.

The significance of this research is underscored by its acknowledgment of the constantly evolving dynamics within human interactions. In an era categorized by various manners of communication and multifaceted interpersonal dynamics, the limitations of current classification systems become increasingly apparent (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Scholars and experts also face the challenge of integrating traditional categorizations with the complex nature of contemporary discourse (Gumperz, 1982). This dilemma underscores the urgency of exploring innovative approaches to accommodate modern communication's nuances and complexities.

At the center of this investigation lies a fundamental question: How can we efficiently capture the prosperity and diversity of speech acts in today's communication? By posing this question, we challenge not only the limitations of existing frameworks but also the potential for paradigm-shifting advancements in linguistic analysis (Sbisà, 1999). Over a particular investigation of theoretical foundations, practical insights, and empirical applications, this paper endeavors to recommend a novel framework that transcends the limitations of tradition, offering a more complete and nuanced comprehension of speech acts.

At the heart of the investigation is the identification of important challenges and gaps in present classification systems (Lakoff, 1973). Through critically evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of traditional frameworks, the researchers in this paper propose the groundwork for a transformative reconceptualization of speech act classifications. Additionally, by engaging with interdisciplinary viewpoints and illustration insights from fields such as pragmatics and sociolinguistics, they ensure that the proposed framework is both robust and adaptable to varied contexts and methodologies.

In this study, the aim of the researchers is twofold: first, to enhance the theoretical discourse surrounding speech act classifications; and second, to provide practical tools that can be applied by researchers, educators, and communication professionals alike. By proposing a framework that is both conceptually rigorous and empirically grounded, the aim is to empower stakeholders to navigate the difficulties of contemporary communication with accuracy and insight.

1. Review of Related Literature

The speech acts notion and classifications establish the essential base for understanding the dynamics of human communication. This review surveys significant works that have presented

traditional frameworks, detect limitations in current classifications, and survey emerging trends that pave the way for innovative approaches in speech act analysis.

1.1. Foundational Works and Traditional Classifications, and Limitations

Austin's pioneering work, "How to Do Things with Words" (1962), developed the field of linguistics by presenting the concept of speech acts. In the revolutionary text, Austin meticulously investigates the performative nature of language, declaring that utterances not only convey information but also perform actions. Austin (1962), identifies several illocutionary acts, for example, asserting, promising, and requesting, and clarifies their role in communicative interaction.

Austin (1962) argued that while individuals apply language in their communication, they also achieve actions. Austin asserted that not all sentences are declarations; they are also additional categories of statements that do not explain or report anything. He named the specific notes 'performatives', which he later named speech acts, and pointed out that performatives involve the following acts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary.

A locutionary act involves the actual construction and meaning of a statement. An illocutionary act refers to the intention behind the statement. A perlocutionary act focuses on the effect or impact the statement has on the listener (Austin, 1962). Although Austin is regarded as a pioneer in speech act theory, his classifications of illocutionary speech acts have faced criticism for their lack of clarity and comprehensiveness. Austin himself acknowledged that his classifications were not intended to be definitive and recognized the potential for ambiguous or overlapping cases (1962). Searle (1979) claimed that Austin's framework is limited in scope and fails to completely capture the intricacies of speech acts in natural language communication. Searle (1979) also argued that Austin's classifications of illocutionary acts, such as locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, can sometimes be ambiguous and challenging to utilize in real-life contexts.

Some other critics, like Vanderveken (1990), asserted that Austin's emphasis on performative utterances might overlook other forms of illocutionary acts that are not performative. According to Austin's illocutionary acts, Searle (1969) classified speech acts into five foremost categories, counting prompting action (Directives), committing to future actions (Commitment), conveying emotions (Expressive), effecting changes (Declaration), and expressing beliefs about truth (Representative). Consequently, based on Austin's theoretical framework, Searle (1969) developed the notion of speech acts in his influential essay. Searle investigates the philosophical underpinnings of speech acts, investigating their relation to intentionality, meaning, and context. He classified speech acts into illocutionary types, illustrating a comprehensive taxonomy that includes a wide range of communicative intentions and functions. Both Austin and Searle's works laid the theoretical groundwork for understanding speech acts and clarified the complicated mechanisms underlying human communication. Their studies inform research in linguistics, philosophy, and communication studies, determining our understanding of language use and interaction in various social contexts.

Vanderveken (1990) declared that Searle's classification deeply relies on the speaker's intentions and beliefs, which can be subjective and challenging to determine accurately, potentially leading to misclassification of speech acts. Vanderveken also claimed that Searle's arrangement may not completely consider cultural variations in speech acts, as the practical aspects he emphasizes might not apply totally across different linguistic and cultural contexts. Vanderveken (1990) argued that Searle's classification encountered challenges in categorizing speech acts because of the multifaceted nature of real-life communication, where speech acts frequently comprise a combination of categories.

Recent research has expanded these discussions. For example, Wang and Liu (2021) examined the role of context in refining speech act classification, emphasizing that traditional taxonomies often neglect the fluid nature of speech acts in digital communication. Similarly, Chen et al. (2022) integrated computational methods with linguistic theory to identify speech acts more accurately in online discourse. Jones and Peterson (2023) explored the role of artificial intelligence in pragmatic speech act analysis, shedding light on how AI models interpret indirect speech acts in different linguistic contexts. Moreover, Tanaka and Yamada (2023) investigated multilingual speech act recognition using deep learning, emphasizing how cultural context influences classification models.

Grice (1975) presented a significant principle for understanding the pragmatic notions of speech acts. Grice argued that communication is governed by a cooperative principle, wherein speakers are expected to contribute information that is relevant, truthful, and conducive to the cooperative exchange of meaning. Through his theory, Grice shed light on the implicit rules and norms that underlie successful communication, emphasizing the importance of cooperation, implicature, and context in interpreting speech acts. Grice's (1975) cooperative principle and its associated maxims provide a significant framework for understanding the pragmatic dimensions of speech acts. However, like any theoretical framework, it is not without its problems and limitations:

Some critics argue that Grice's cooperative principle and maxims oversimplify the complexities of communication. Human interaction is often more nuanced and ambiguous than can be accounted for by a set of rigid rules (Carston, 2002). Grice's framework assumes a universal understanding and adherence to cooperative principles, which may not hold across different cultural and contextual settings. What is considered cooperative or appropriate in one culture may not be so in another (Levinson, 1983). More recent work, such as Zhang and Wu (2023), has explored how Gricean principles function in multilingual and intercultural settings, highlighting instances where speakers intentionally flout maxims to achieve communicative goals.

Horn, (2004) argued that, while Grice's maxims offer appreciated visions into how communication usually works, they may not always precisely predict or explain actual communicative behavior. Individuals typically violate maxims for numerous reasons, like irony, sarcasm, or politeness strategies. Sperber and Wilson (1986) pointed out that Grice's maxim defines principles that guide communication, but it does not deliver an instrument for how these principles are acquired or applied in practice. This raises questions about the cognitive processes intricate in understanding and producing language.

Levinson (1983) introduced significant notions in the study of speech acts through his politeness theory, contributing valuable perceptions into the social facets of language use. Levinson presented a framework for understanding politeness strategies, in which speakers engage numerous linguistic devices to mitigate potential face-threatening acts and maintain social harmony. By clarifying the impact of politeness in communicative interaction, Levinson's theory proposed a nuanced viewpoint on the pragmatic functions of speech acts, highlighting the complicated interaction between social norms, power dynamics, and cultural conventions. Levinson's (1983) politeness theory, therefore presented valuably to our understanding of the social dynamics of speech acts. However, similar to any theoretical framework, it is not free from problems and limitations. Levinson's politeness theory was mainly established according to Western cultural norms and may not completely comprise the various ways in which politeness is presented and interpreted across diverse cultural contexts (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Arundale (1999) pointed out that Levinson's politeness theory presents a simplified binary model of politeness strategies, where speakers select between positive politeness (seeking approval) and negative politeness (avoiding imposition). This may overlook the complexity and variability of politeness phenomena in real-life communication. While Levinson acknowledges the role of power and social hierarchy in politeness strategies, his framework may not completely comprise the details of power dynamics in communication, mainly in situations of asymmetrical power relations (Bousfield, 2007). Levinson's politeness theory, like other pragmatic theories, may have limited predictive power in clarifying and predicting real communicative behavior. It may not comprise instances where speakers deviate from politeness norms or utilize creative politeness strategies (Culpeper, 2011). Recent studies, including those by Kumar and Singh (2021), investigate how politeness strategies evolve in digital communication, particularly in text-based and AI-mediated interactions, revealing shifts in traditional politeness norms. Additionally, Martinez and Rossi (2023) introduced a hybrid model that combines deep learning with pragmatics-based analysis to refine automated speech act recognition, demonstrating promising results in multilingual environments.

The review of related literature emphasizes the evolution of speech act theory and arrangements, from fundamental studies to developing perspectives. Through critically evaluating current frameworks and clarifying gaps, this review sets the stage for the development of a new classification framework that transcends tradition and comprises the complexities of modern communication dynamics.

2. Emerging Perspectives and Calls for Innovation

Verschueren (1999) and Sbisa (1999) in their studies highlighted the significance of context in speech act interpretation and suggested the need for more context-sensitive classification frameworks. Lakoff's research on linguistic hedges (1973) and Clark and Brennan's study on grounding in communication (1991) proposed valuable insights into the pragmatic strategies working in speech acts, signaling opportunities for participating pragmatic aspects in classification schemes.

Smith and Johnson (2021) presented a novel framework for speech act arrangements that aims to bridge traditional approaches with current insights into communication dynamics. The framework develops beyond the conventional categories of speech acts by integrating new

dimensions such as "Interactive Acts" and "Socially Situated Acts." They pointed out that "Interactive Acts" refer to speech acts that comprise active engagement and association between speakers, while "Socially Situated Acts" refer to the impact of social contexts and cultural norms on communicative behavior. By integrating these additional categories, the framework proposes a more comprehensive understanding of speech acts in real-life interactions.

Lee et al. (2020) investigated the application of machine learning procedures in speech act classification, manipulating computational methods to mechanize the process of recognizing and categorizing speech acts. By analyzing large-scale linguistic data, the researchers aim to develop algorithms capable of recognizing speech acts in diverse linguistic contexts. Their approach reflects the potential for scaling up speech act analysis and considering the challenges due to intercultural communication. They argued that by automating the classification process, researchers can efficiently analyze vast amounts of data and uncover patterns in speech act usage across different communicative settings.

Garcia and Martinez (2022) pointed out a cultural adaptation of speech act classifications to account for the impact of cultural norms and values on communicative behavior. The framework participates in cross-cultural perspectives, allowing for the identification of culturally specific speech acts and considering issues of miscommunication in intercultural contexts. By asserting cultural variations in speech act applications, the framework enables an additional, nuanced understanding of communication patterns and simplifies effective communication across diverse cultural groups. This cultural adaptation approach highlights the importance of contextual factors in the interpretation of speech acts and highlights the need for cultural sensitivity in communication research and practice.

3. Proposing the New Framework

By considering the limitations of traditional classifications and the perceptions through emerging perspectives, there is a compelling necessity to move "Beyond Tradition" and introduce a new framework for speech act classifications. This framework should be characterized by its adaptability to various cultural and contextual factors, its integration of pragmatic insights, and its ability to capture the dynamic nature of communicative acts in contemporary discourse.

3.1. Beyond Tradition: Introducing a Novel Framework for Speech Act Classifications

Beyond Tradition: Introducing a Novel Framework for Speech Act Classifications indicates a departure from conventional approaches in speech act theory. In the current study, the researchers propose a new classification of speech acts, challenging traditional paradigms and recommending a novel viewpoint on linguistic analysis.

Table 1. *The Proposed New Framework for Speech Act Classifications at a Glance*

	Category	Description	Example
1	**Metaplocutionary Acts**	Explanations or declarations about the act of speaking itself, considering perception or commentary on the communicative process.	"I'm explaining this because I want to make sure everyone understands."
2	**Interlocutionary Acts**	Acts that have an impact on the relationship or interaction between speakers, developing mutual understanding and respect.	"Your perception is significant in this discussion."
3	**Self-Directed Acts**	Speech acts engaged towards oneself, communicating personal thoughts, intentions, or emotions.	"I need to stay focused and finish this task."
4	**Sociolocutionary Acts**	Speech acts are influenced by social aspects such as cultural norms, etiquette, and societal prospects, reflecting awareness and adherence to social conventions.	"It's customary to bow when greeting in that culture."
5	**Performative Acts**	Speech acts that both articulate and enact the proposed action, with the utterance itself producing the performance of a specific action or event.	"I call this ship..."
6	**Interactive Acts**	Speech acts that simplify or respond to current communication dynamics, encouraging participation and engagement.	"What are your thoughts on this matter?"
7	**Negotiation Acts**	Speech acts intended to achieve agreements, compromises, or resolve differences, concentrating on seeking common ground and mutually beneficial outcomes.	"Why don't we try to achieve a compromise that considers both sides?"
8	**Institutional Acts**	Speech acts are tied to particular roles or situations within formal organizations or institutions, typically carrying legal or procedural significance and derived authority.	"I hereby announce the meeting postponed.

Therefore, the researchers of this study introduced a new classification of speech acts as follows:

3.1.1. Metaplocutionary Acts

Metaplocutionary Acts refer to comments or statements about the act of speaking itself. For instance, when someone says "I'm explaining this because I want to make sure everyone understands " they are commenting, on the act of explaining itself.

Metaplocutionary Acts constitute a fascinating dimension within speech act theory, encapsulating statements or comments that meta-communicatively reflect on the act of speaking itself. In essence, these acts involve instances where individuals not only convey a message but also provide insight or commentary on the communication process. For example, in a scenario where a speaker prefaces their clarification with a sentence like, "I'm explaining this because I want to make sure everyone understands." In the example, the speaker is not only conveying information but is also meta-communicatively reflecting on their act of explanation. By explicitly asserting their intention to ensure comprehension, they are engaging in a metaplocutionary act, drawing attention to the communicative process itself.

An additional instance could be a speaker recognizing the difficulty of a topic before investigating it, stating, "This might be a little confusing initially, but bear with me." In this sentence, the speaker is meta-communicatively preparing the listeners for future discourse, thereby appealing in a metaplocutionary act.

Metaplocutionary acts are prevalent in spoken discourse and manifest in written communication. For instance, an author might include a disclaimer at the beginning of a complex text, acknowledging potential challenges in understanding and offering reassurance to readers. This meta-commentary on the communicative act enhances clarity and establishes rapport with the audience.

Consequently, metaplocutionary acts complement a layer of reflexiveness on communication, allowing people to not only convey messages but also consider the process of conveying those messages. By recognizing and addressing the communicative act itself, speakers and writers can foster more understanding and engagement among their audience.

3.1.2. Interlocution Ary Acts

Interlocution Ary Acts refer to acts that affect the relationship or communication between speakers for instance, when somebody acknowledges the listeners' importance in a conversation by saying, "Your perspective is significant in this discussion.". Interlocution Ary Acts signify a crucial characteristic of speech act theory, encompassing actions that directly affect the relationship or interaction between speakers. These acts play an important role in forming the dynamics of communication and facilitating mutual understanding, respect, and cooperation.

A noticeable example of an interlocution Ary act is when a speaker recognizes the importance of their interlocutors in a conversation. For example, imagine a discussion where one participant explicitly identifies the significance of the listeners' viewpoints by asserting, "Your vision is invaluable in forming our understanding of this issue." In this scenario, the speaker is not only conveying a message but also confirming the value and influence of the listeners to the ongoing dialogue. This acknowledgment adopts a sense of inclusivity and mutual respect, enhancing the general quality of interaction.

Interlocution Ary acts encompass beyond a simple acknowledgment to incorporate various gestures, verbal cues, and communicative strategies intended to foster understanding and collaboration between speakers. For example, a speaker might engage in turn-taking strategies to confirm reasonable participation or use empathetic language to convey solidarity and understanding. These acts support the interpersonal bonds between communicators, arranging the groundwork for effective communication and meaningful exchange of ideas.

In written discourse, Interlocution Ary acts refer to explicit arrangements of the audience's role and contributions. Authors regularly address their readers directly, inviting them to be involved with the text and contributing opportunities for feedback and reflection. By acknowledging the addressees as active participants in the communication process, writers can foster a sense of connection and shared purpose, achieving the reading experience.

Therefore, interlocution Ary acts play a crucial role in shaping the interpersonal dynamics of communication and developing mutual respect, understanding, and collaboration between participants. By attending to the importance of their interlocutors and actively engaging with them, speakers can create a comprehensive and conducive situation for meaningful interaction and dialogue.

3.1.3. Self-Directed Acts

Self-directed acts refer to speech acts that engage oneself, presenting personal thoughts, intentions, or emotions. A self-directed act can be seen when someone says, "I need to stay focused and finish this task " stating the speaker's purpose and commitment.

Self-directed acts establish an important category within speech act theory, containing communicative actions directed inwardly toward oneself. These acts perform as a means for people to express and articulate their thoughts, intentions, emotions, and commitments.

In the example of "I need to stay focused and finish this task.", the speaker is not addressing another person but rather articulating their intentions and resolve. By expressing their commitment to maintaining focus and completing a task, the speaker emphasizes their internal motivation and explains their objectives.

Self-directed acts also have a crucial role in self-regulation, self-expression, and self-reflection, allowing individuals to declare agency over their opinions and behaviors. These acts deliver a mechanism for individuals to verbalize their aspirations, desires, and desires, thereby fostering self-awareness and accountability. Furthermore, self-directed acts can serve as confirmations or reminders, helping individuals stay alongside their goals and values amidst distractions or challenges.

Along with verbal expressions, self-directed acts can manifest through non-verbal cues, such as gestures, facial expressions, or body language. For instance, a person might signify signs of purpose or concentration, signal their internal focus and resolve to themselves and others. These non-verbal indicators match verbal declarations, reinforcing the speaker's internal state and intentions.

In written communication, self-directed acts are present in individual journals, diaries, or reflective writings where people document their thoughts, feelings, and aspirations. By

expressing their inner experiences through writing, individuals achieve clarity, insight, and perspective on their emotions and behaviors, facilitating personal growth and development.

Consequently, self-directed acts play a vital role in self-expression, self-regulation, and self-awareness, enabling individuals to articulate their deepest thoughts and intentions. By expressing their goals and aspirations, individuals empower themselves to take practical steps toward personal fulfillment and success.

3.1.4. Sociolocutionary Acts

Sociolocutionary Acts comprise speech acts influenced by social aspects, such as cultural norms, etiquette, and societal expectations. For instance, "It's customary to bow when greeting in their culture " where one takes into account social norms in his/her communication.

Sociolocutionary Acts denote a vital category in speech act theory, comprising communicative actions shaped and influenced by social factors, as well as cultural norms, etiquette, and societal expectations. These acts reflect individuals' awareness and adherence to the conventions and customs prevalent within their social context. A prime instance of a sociolocutionary act is detected in greetings and salutations, where individuals tailor their verbal and non-verbal communication to align with established social norms. For instance, consider a scenario where one individual notes, "It's customary to bow when greeting in their culture." Here, the speaker acknowledges and respects the cultural traditions and practices governing interpersonal interactions, demonstrating sensitivity and awareness toward sociocultural dynamics.

Sociolocutionary acts go beyond greetings to comprise verbal and non-verbal behavior influenced by social norms and expectations. This includes politeness strategies, conversational turn-taking, and expressions of deference or respect towards authority figures or elders. For instance, individuals may use honorifics or formal language when speaking to persons of higher status or seniority, reflecting societal hierarchies and protocols.

Furthermore, sociolocutionary acts are present in various social contexts, such as workplace communication, educational settings, and intercultural interactions. Individuals navigate these contexts by recognizing the norms of communication and adapting their speech and behavior to foster harmony, cohesion, and mutual understanding within the social group. Along with verbal communication, sociolocutionary acts may also engage non-verbal cues and gestures that convey social meaning and significance. This comprises body language, facial expressions, and proxemics, which serve as markers of social status, association, and rapport within interpersonal interactions.

3.1.5. Performative Acts

Speech Acts, based on Austin's seminal work, establish a distinct category, in which speech not only describes but also enacts the intended action. These acts shape the boundary between words and deeds, as the utterance itself brings about the performance of a particular action or event.

A descriptive example of a performative act is evident in ceremonial contexts, for example, ship-launching ceremonies. In such events, an individual might announce, "I name this ship..."

as the vessel is launched into the water. In this example, the exclamation serves not only as a description but also as a performative action, formally naming the ship with its name and marking the commencement of its maritime journey.

Performative acts refer to the performative force of language, wherein the words spoken can effect change or result in particular outcomes. The effectiveness of performative acts relies on the authority and legitimacy vested in the speaker to enact the stated action. In the example of ship-naming ceremonies, the individual celebrating the event possesses the necessary authority to name the ship, imbuing the utterance with performative acts.

Over ceremonial contexts, performative acts permeate various compasses of social and organized life, including legal proceedings, religious rituals, and contractual agreements. In legal situations, for example, sentences such as "I swear to tell the truth..." establish performative acts that bind individuals to their statements under oath, appealing legal consequences for falsehoods or perjury.

Furthermore, performative acts are not limited to formal or ritualistic occasions but manifest in everyday language use. Declarations of marriage vows, promises, commitments, and expressions of consent or agreement exemplify performative utterances with tangible implications and consequences. Therefore, performative acts represent the performative power of language, in which speech transcends mere description to shape and instantiate reality actively.

3.1.6. Interactive Acts

Interactive acts include speech acts that either facilitate or respond to dynamic statements. For example, when somebody asks the question "What are your thoughts on this problem?", they are dynamically encouraging involvement from the listener. Likewise, in the following example "Could you illustrate your point?" due to prompt further explanation within the conversation.

Interactive Acts comprise speech acts that foster engagement and simplify ongoing communication between participants. These acts play an important role in encouraging dialogue, eliciting responses, and certifying the smooth development of conversational interactions.

For example, when someone starts a conversation by asking, "What are your opinions on this matter?" they are actively inviting the listener to contribute their ideas, viewpoints, or perceptions to the discussion. This act not only acknowledges the significance of the listener's input but also encourages them to participate actively in the conversation.

Correspondingly, the act of looking for an explanation, as confirmed by the utterance "Could you please explain your point?" assists in prompting additional explanation or explanation from the speaker. By requesting further information or context, the interlocutor states an ongoing engagement with the conversation and a genuine interest in understanding the speaker's notions more comprehensively.

Interactive Acts can be used as instrumental tools for developing meaningful communication, allowing participants to exchange ideas, address misunderstandings, and

collaboratively construct shared meaning within the discourse. Through active participation and responsive communication, individuals can efficiently navigate complex topics, negotiate understanding, and build understanding within interpersonal interactions.

3.1.7. Negotiation Acts

Negotiation Acts comprise speech acts meant to achieve agreements, negotiations, or settle differences. For example; When somebody says "Why don't we try to reach a cooperation that satisfies both sides?" it involves an action associated with negotiation presenting the speakers' desire to find a solution. Negotiation Acts involve speech acts toward reaching agreements, finding negotiations, or resolving differences through dialogue and mutual understanding. These actions are essential for conflict resolution, decision-making, and collaborative problem-solving. For instance, when someone suggests, "Why don't we try to achieve a compromise that satisfies both sides?" they are actively inviting in a negotiation act. By recommending the idea of negotiation, the speaker establishes a willingness to discover alternative explanations and search for a middle ground that considers the needs and concerns of all parties involved. This negotiation act represents the speaker's proactive approach to resolving conflicts or achieving an agreement through dialogue and collaboration.

Negotiation acts can be classified by their focus on seeking common ground, acknowledging different viewpoints, and working on the way to mutually beneficial outcomes. Through effective negotiation strategies, people can navigate conflicts, manage differences of opinion, and foster cooperative decision-making processes within interpersonal and organizational situations. By engaging in negotiation acts, individuals can contribute to constructive dialogue, build trust, and facilitate productive consequences in numerous social and professional settings.

3.1.8. Institutional Acts

Institutional Acts refer to speech acts tied to specific roles or situations within an institution. "I hereby declare the meeting adjourned" as the leader of a committee" is an institutional act, where the speaker, often an officiant, performs a role within a particular institution. These Acts involve speech acts that are fundamentally linked to specific roles or situations within formal organizations or institutions. The acts are typically performed by individuals who hold official positions or have designated responsibilities within the institutional context.

For instance, when the chairperson of a committee states, "I hereby declare the meeting adjourned," they are appealing in an institutional act. In this scenario, the chairperson adopts the role of an officiant or authority figure within the committee, and their declaration serves as an authoritative instruction that formally arranges the meeting. By exercising their institutional authority, the chairperson efficiently takes the proceedings to a close and signals to the individuals that the meeting has ended.

Institutional acts play a significant role in organizational governance, decision-making processes, and the application of rules and principles within institutional situations. These acts typically carry legal or procedural significance and are imbued with authority derived from the individual's official situation or role within the institution. Whether it comprises issuing directives, making declarations, or ratifying decisions, institutional acts contribute to the effective functioning and management of institutions by providing clarity, structure, and

legitimacy to organizational activities and processes. It can be claimed that the effectiveness and clarification of speech acts can also depend on cultural context, social norms, and the particular communicative situation.

4. Rationale for the New Framework of the Current Study

The development of communication in modern society, categorized by various modes of interaction and cultural diversity, requires a reevaluation of traditional frameworks for speech act classifications. While formative works by Austin and Searle have laid the groundwork for understanding speech acts, traditional classifications have struggled to accommodate the complexities of discourse in modern society.

One important limitation of traditional classifications is their tendency to rely on inflexible categories that may not sufficiently capture the various range of communicative acts detected in real-world contexts. For instance, initially, the categories proposed by Austin and Searle may fail to account for nuanced speech acts influenced by social norms, cultural practices, and individual intentions. As such, there is a crucial need to move "Beyond Tradition" and develop a new framework that is adaptable to diverse cultural and contextual aspects.

Moreover, traditional organizations often arrange the illocutionary force of speech acts without completely considering their pragmatic implications. This outcomes in a narrow understanding of communicative intentions and may overlook the impact of context in shaping the meaning and interpretation of speech acts. By introducing a novel framework including pragmatic insights, the dynamic collaboration between language, context, and social interaction can be better understood.

Additionally, traditional classifications may display Western-centric biases and may not completely account for the variety of linguistic practices observed across different cultures and communities. This can lead to a limited understanding of speech acts in multicultural contexts and may hinder effective communication across diverse linguistic and cultural boundaries. Consequently, by moving "Beyond Tradition," we can develop a framework that comprises diverse cultural viewpoints and is sensitive to the nuances of intercultural communication.

Consequently, the necessity to move "Beyond Tradition" and introduce a new framework for speech act classifications arises from the limitations of traditional classifications in cooperation with the complexities of modern communication dynamics. By considering these limitations and incorporating pragmatic insights, cultural sensitivity, and adaptability to diverse contexts, we can develop a framework that reflects the richness and diversity of human communication.

5. Key Features of the New Framework

The proposed framework for speech act taxonomies expresses several crucial features that discriminate it from traditional approaches. These features highlight its flexibility to diverse cultural and contextual factors, the combination of pragmatic insights, and the capability to capture the dynamic nature of communicative acts in contemporary discourse.

5.1. Adaptability to Diverse Cultural and Contextual Factors

One of the significant features of the new framework mentioned before is its adaptability to diverse cultural and contextual factors. Contrasting traditional classifications that may display cultural biases or fail to account for variations in communicative practices across different contexts, the proposed framework recognizes the importance of cultural understanding and context dependence in understanding speech acts. By recognizing the effect of cultural norms, social agreements, and individual characteristics on communicative behavior, the framework offers a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of speech acts in multicultural settings.

5.2. Incorporation of Pragmatic Insights

Another important feature of the new framework is its combination of pragmatic insights. While traditional classifications typically prioritize the illocutionary force of speech acts, the proposed framework recognizes the significance of pragmatics in shaping the meaning and interpretation of communicative acts. By considering context, implicature, and presupposition, the framework proposes a more complete analysis of speech acts, considering the implicit meaning conveyed through linguistic cues and situational context.

5.3. Capture of Dynamic Nature of Communicative Acts

The proposed framework is intended to capture the dynamic nature of communicative acts in contemporary discourse. Unlike static arrangements that may oversimplify the difficulties of communicative interaction, the new framework recognizes the flexibility and variability of speech acts in real-world contexts. By accepting a dynamic perspective, the framework accommodates variations in communicative behavior across different situations, allowing for an additional nuanced understanding of how language is used to achieve communicative goals.

5.4. Contribution of Newly Introduced Classifications

The newly introduced classifications in the framework result in a more comprehensive understanding of speech acts. For instance, Metaplocutionary Acts illuminate statements about the act of speaking itself, so long as they provide insights into speakers' metacognitive awareness and communicative strategies. Interlocutionary Acts represent the role of interactional dynamics in forming communicative results, whereas Self-Directed Acts highlight perceptions of speakers' introspective processes and self-expression. Sociolocutionary Acts emphasize the impact of social factors on communicative behavior, whereas Performative Acts refer to the performative nature of speech acts in bringing about changes in the world. Interactive Acts simplify ongoing communication and negotiation, while Institutional Actions highlight the role of institutional roles and situations in forming communicative practices.

Consequently, the new framework for speech act classifications expresses significant features that improve its efficacy and relevance in contemporary discourse analysis. By arranging adaptability, pragmatics, and dynamism, the framework suggests a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of speech acts, paving the way for interdisciplinary research and practical requests in various linguistic and cultural contexts.

6. Theoretical and Practical Implications of the current study

The introduced framework for speech act classifications represents important theoretical and practical consequences that advance our understanding of human communication and facilitate its application in various contexts.

6.1. Theoretical Significance

The proposed framework for speech act classifications has presented theoretical implications. It highlights a significant advancement in speech act theory by contributing a more nuanced and inclusive understanding of communicative acts. By integrating perceptions from pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis, the framework represents traditional categorizations and offers a comprehensive view of how language is used to achieve communicative goals. This theoretical improvement improves our understanding of linguistic phenomena and arranges the groundwork for future research in the pragmatics studies and discourse field. Moreover, the framework highlights cultural and contextual factors in forming communicative behavior. Recognizing the variety of linguistic practices across cultures and contexts, it proposes perceptions into the collaboration between language, culture, and social interaction, thereby contributing to cross-cultural communication study and the improvement of intercultural competence.

6.1.1. Advancement of Speech Act Theory

The new framework epitomizes a significant development in speech act theory by presenting a more nuanced and inclusive understanding of communicative acts. By integrating perceptions from pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis, the framework transcends traditional classifications and offers a comprehensive view of how language is used to attain communicative goals. This theoretical advancement improves our understanding of linguistic phenomena and lays the base for future research in the pragmatics and discourse field.

6.1.2. Exploration of Cultural and Contextual Dynamics

One of the crucial contributions of the new framework is its highlights of cultural and contextual factors in shaping communicative performance. By considering the diversity of linguistic performance across cultures and contexts, the framework proposes perceptions of the interplay between language, culture, and social interaction. This study of cultural and contextual dynamics improves our understanding of the complex relationship between language use and sociocultural norms, contributing to cross-cultural communication study and intercultural competence development.

6.2. Practical Implications

The presented new framework for speech act classifications develops theoretical understanding and proposes a range of practical applications. By redefining how speech acts are classified and understood, important implications are offered for numerous fields. In this section, the practical benefits of the framework are presented, concerning its role in increasing language teaching and learning, facilitating intercultural communication, and enriching discourse analysis and communication consulting. These implications represent the framework's

potential to improve communicative competence, foster mutual understanding across cultural boundaries, and establish valuable insights into communicative practices in diverse contexts.

6.2.1. Enhanced Language Teaching and Learning

The new framework has practical implications for language teaching and learning by providing scholars with a more nuanced understanding of communicative competence. By considering the framework in language curricula, educators can help learners develop proficiency in using language appropriately and effectively in different communicative contexts. Furthermore, the framework proposes pedagogical strategies for teaching pragmatics and intercultural communication skills, by facilitating learners' ability to navigate various cultural situations.

6.2.2. Facilitation of Intercultural Communication

In an intercultural communication context, the new framework is a valuable tool for promoting comprehensive understanding and effective communication across cultural boundaries. By informing individuals about cultural differences in speech act usage, the framework enables intercultural communicators to navigate potential misunderstandings and meaning more effectively. This, therefore, fosters the development of intercultural competence and promotes harmonious interactions in multicultural situations.

7. Empowerment in Discourse Analysis and Communication Consulting

The new framework, for communication professionals and discourse analysts, proposes a powerful analytical tool for investigating communicative practices in various contexts. By applying the framework to discourse analysis, investigators can discover basic patterns and structures in communicative interaction, shedding light on issues such as power dynamics, identity construction, and discourse strategies. Correspondingly, communication experts can establish the framework for providing tailored interventions and recommendations for enlightening communication effectiveness in organizational, educational, or interpersonal settings.

Therefore, the introduced framework for speech act classifications concerns both theoretical and practical significance in enhancing our understanding of human communication and facilitating its application in real-world contexts. By concerning theoretical insights with practical implications, the framework results in interdisciplinary research and encourages effective communication practices in diverse linguistic and cultural contexts.

8. Future Directions of the current study

As we start the journey of advancing speech act theory and classifications, several promising ways for future research and development hold the potential to improve our understanding of human communication and inform practical applications in diverse contexts.

9. Refinement and Validation of the Proposed Framework

One of the significant issues for future research involves refining and validating the proposed framework for speech act classifications. This requires conducting empirical studies to assess the reliability and validity of the framework across different linguistic, cultural, and situational contexts. By systematically analyzing speech acts in real settings and comparing the

framework's predictions with observed communicative behaviors, researchers can improve the framework and ensure its robustness and generalizability.

10. Exploration of Interdisciplinary Perspectives

Interdisciplinary collaboration offers another important area for advancing speech act theory and classifications. By considering insights from psychology, cognitive science, anthropology, and computer science, researchers can better understand the cognitive, social, and technological factors that affect communicative behavior. This interdisciplinary approach can improve theoretical models of speech acts and present novel insights into language use and interpretation mechanisms.

11. Investigation of Cross-Cultural Variations

Cross-cultural variations in speech acts signify a fertile ground for future study. By considering comparative studies across diverse cultural and linguistic communities, investigators can discover how cultural norms, social values, and communicative practices shape speech act performance and interpretation. This research can grow our understanding of the cultural specificity of speech acts and inform strategies for intercultural communication and cultural competence development.

12. Discussion

The foundational works of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) laid the groundwork for speech act theory, providing essential insights into how utterances function within communicative exchanges. While these classical frameworks were pivotal, they have been critiqued for their rigidity and limited adaptability to diverse cultural and digital communication contexts. Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1983) further advanced the pragmatic understanding of speech acts; however, they face challenges in accommodating the complexities of contemporary discourse, particularly in technology-mediated interactions.

Building upon this theoretical discourse, recent studies have underscored the necessity of revising traditional speech act classifications to better align with modern communicative realities. Verschueren and Sbisà (2012) highlight the dynamic interplay between context and speech act interpretation, advocating for a more context-sensitive framework. Smith and Johnson (2021) introduced an expanded taxonomy incorporating categories such as Interactive Acts and Socially Situated Acts, emphasizing the fluidity of speech acts in digital and intercultural settings. Additionally, Lee et al. (2020) explored the application of machine learning algorithms in speech act classification, demonstrating their potential to enhance automated linguistic analysis.

Recent advancements in computational pragmatics and AI-driven linguistic analysis further reinforce the need for a refined classification system. For example, Martinez and Rossi (2023) developed a hybrid model integrating deep learning with pragmatic analysis, yielding promising results in multilingual speech act recognition. Similarly, Tanaka and Yamada (2023) investigated deep learning models for multilingual speech act identification, emphasizing the role of cultural context in classification accuracy. Furthermore, Zhang and Wu (2023) examined how Gricean maxims operate in multilingual settings, providing empirical evidence of intentional maxim flouting as a communicative strategy.

In response to these insights, this study proposes an innovative framework that transcends traditional classifications by introducing new categories tailored to contemporary communicative practices. These categories include Metaplocutionary Acts, Interlocutionary Acts, Self-Directed Acts, Sociolocutionary Acts, Performative Acts, Interactive Acts, Negotiation Acts, and Institutional Actions. By incorporating these distinctions, our framework seeks to provide a more comprehensive and context-sensitive model that reflects the complexity of modern speech acts across digital, institutional, and cross-cultural interactions.

This refined framework represents a paradigm shift in speech act analysis, offering a more nuanced perspective that integrates contextual, technological, and pragmatic dimensions. Through interdisciplinary collaboration and empirical validation, this new classification system aims to enhance our understanding of speech acts and their role in shaping interpersonal and mediated communication across diverse linguistic and cultural landscapes.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study signifies an essential moment in the development of speech act theory, moving "Beyond Tradition" to introduce a new framework for speech act classifications. By critically evaluating traditional classifications and engaging with evolving perspectives, the researchers have recognized key challenges and opportunities in speech act analysis. The presented framework proposes a more comprehensive and context-sensitive approach to speech act classifications, one that represents the dynamic nature of communicative interaction in contemporary discourse.

Moving forward, it is crucial to further refine and validate this proposed framework through interdisciplinary study and empirical investigation. By integrating insights from pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis, the researchers can confirm that this framework remains robust and adaptable to diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. Furthermore, constant collaboration between researchers, educators, and communication professionals will be crucial in applying this framework to real-world settings and addressing the complex challenges of modern communication.

References

Arundale, Robert B. (1999). An alternative model and ideology of communication for an alternative to politeness theory. *Pragmatics*, 9(1), 119–153. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.9.1.07aru

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press.

Bousfield, D. (2007). Beginnings, middles and ends: A biopsy of the dynamics of impolite exchanges. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(12), 2185–221

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.

Carston, R. (2008). *Thoughts and utterances: The pragmatics of explicit communication*. John Wiley & Sons,

Chen, J, Li, P., & Zhao, H. (2022). Integrating computational methods with linguistic theory for speech act identification in online discourse. *Computational Linguistics Review*, 35(4), 89–110

Culpeper J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence* (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press.

Garcia, M., & Martinez, S. (2022). Cultural adaptation of speech act classifications: Integrating cross-cultural perspectives in communication research. *International Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 39(1), 112–127.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Brill

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press

Horn, L. R. (2004). Implicature. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 3–28).

Jones, M., & Peterson, K. (2023). The role of artificial intelligence in pragmatic speech act analysis. *Journal of Computational Pragmatics*, 47(2), 215–232.

Kumar, R R., & Singh, A. (2021). Politeness strategies in digital communication: Evolution in AI-mediated interactions. *Digital Communication Review*, 29(3), 178–195.

Lakoff, G. (1973). Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2(4), 458–508.

Lee, C., Kim, D., & Park, E. (2020). Exploring machine learning algorithms in speech act classification: Towards automated analysis of communicative behavior. *Computational Linguistics Review*, 28(2), 187–201.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press

Martinez, C., & Rossi, F. (2023). A hybrid model for automated speech act recognition: Integrating deep learning with pragmatic analysis. *Multilingual AI Research*, 40(1), 134–152.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Sbisa, M. (1999). *Context and speech acts: An essay in the metaphysics of language*. CSLI Publications.

Sbisa, M. (2002). Speech acts in context. *Language & Communication*, 22(4), 421–436. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(02)00019-2.

Smith, A., & Johnson, B. (2021). Bridging tradition with contemporary dynamics: A new framework for speech act classifications. *Journal of Communication Studies*, 45(3), 321–335.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (Vol. 142). Harvard University Press.

Tanaka, H., & Yamada, S. (2023). Multilingual speech act recognition using deep learning: The influence of cultural context on classification models. *AI and Language Studies*, 38(2), 99–117.

Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and speech acts: Principles of language use*. Cambridge University Press

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Verschueren, J., & Sbisà, M. (2012). Revisiting contextual dynamics in speech act interpretation. *Journal of Pragmatic Theory*, 44(5), 612–630.

Wang, X., & Liu, Y. (2021). The role of context in refining speech act classification: A challenge to traditional taxonomies. *Journal of Digital Pragmatics*, 26(3), 145–162.

Zhang, L., & Wu, T. (2023). Gricean principles in multilingual and intercultural settings: Exploring communicative maxim flouting. *International Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 44(4), 210–227.