
A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts in Reagan's First Inaugural Speech

Ra'aed Ibraheem Muhsen

raa18h1140@uoanbar.edu.iq

Asst. Prof. Imad Hayef Smeer

ed.emad.samir@uoanbar.edu.iq

University of Anbar - College of Education for Human Sciences

DOI: [10.31973/aj.v2i140.3636](https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v2i140.3636)

Abstract

This paper is primarily concerned with analysing speech acts as a sequence manifested in Reagan's First Inaugural Speech. It aims to analyse the whole five forms of speech acts pragmatically in identified political speech, as described by Searle, 1969 (assertive, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative). To this end, a mixed method research is used. Qualitative part is used to describe and analyse types of speech acts in the selected data using a proposed model of two theories. It merges the theory of speech acts of Searle (1969) and Ferrara's theory of speech acts within sequences (1980). The quantitative part analyses the frequencies and percentages of speech acts types. The findings indicated that the assertive speech act is most frequently used by president Reagan. Thus, the findings of the present study would help researchers who are concerned with the study of language particularly people engaged within specialization of pragmatics. In addition, the study might be a useful for EFL / ESL learners since it attempts to discover speech acts' types and subtypes.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Speech Act Theory, Inaugural Speeches.

1. INTRODUCTION

Yule (1996) states that pragmatics is the analysis of the “invisible” sense or the way we interpret what it is said, even though it is not explicitly written or said. It is a science that represents the relationship between both the sign itself and its employer. Pragmatics in general seeks to look beyond the literal meaning of an utterance and consider how meaning is constructed as well as focusing on implied meanings.

Speech Acts is one of the most important theories in the field of language use. Thus, It is regarded as the heart of pragmatic analysis since the majority of pragmatic studies are mainly based or even have a marginal reference to this theory.

This study is primarily concerned with analysing speech acts as a sequence manifested in inaugural speech of American president Ronald Reagan. It is worth mentioning that inaugural speech is part of political discourse and can be simply defined as a speech given by the new elected president during a formal ceremony or speech event which informs the people of his or her intentions as a leader. The researcher wants to discover that the types of speech acts (assertive, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative) which are suggested by Searle (1969), are not used equally in speech, particularly those relating to the form of directive. Due to the various meanings, they are meant to transmit, they are used at different rates. This research therefore aims to analyse the whole five forms of speech acts pragmatically in Reagan's First Inaugural speech, as described by "Searle, 1969 (assertive, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative)". It also aims to identify which kinds of speech acts are most widely used in these selected political speeches. Besides, it aims to analyse speech acts in sequences to discover whether these sequences have an influence on the kind of speech acts. Thus, this paper is hypothesized that assertive and commissive speech acts are the mostly used in political speeches. Assertives are in the first place in the chosen political speeches, due to their use as justifications for other types (commissives and directives).

Essentially, the paper layout is divided into three sections: the first section is dedicated to describe literature review concerning a brief account of the terms Pragmatics, Speech Act Theories, Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Inaugural Speeches. The second section is related the methodology which is divided into three stages: method followed by model of analysis and data collection. Lastly, the third part is dedicated to the investigation and the frequency of speech acts categories utilized in Reagan's first inaugural speech.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Pragmatics

In the recent times, linguists have been focusing more on depiction and analysis of the structural aspect (phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic) features for language which, to some degree, ignore the functional part that handles the manipulation of the linguistic shapes of communication by the speaker. (Halliday, 2006)

Pragmatics, in simple words, refers to the study of language use. It dates back to the philosophy of language introduced by the American linguist Charles W. Morris lasted from the very beginning of the 19th century as one of the three constituents of the science of signs (i.e., semiotics; Morris, 1938 as cited in Levinson, 1983).

Returning to Morris, he defines pragmatics as one of the three principal dimensions of semiotics along with syntax and semantics, as syntax is involved with the formal relations of signs (Levinson, 1983). For semantics, it is the relation between the sign and object it signifies, whereas pragmatics is concerned with the relations between signs and their users.

Yule (1996) indicates that pragmatics is the study of meaning as delivered by speakers and understood by listeners. Yule's definition can be summarized in the following points:

- a) Pragmatics refers to the study of meaning communicated by speakers / writers, and understood by listeners/readers. For example, when a person says: "It is hot in here", he may want someone to open the air conditioner.
- b) It is the study of meaning in context.

This definition focuses on the interpretation of meaning in a specific context and how such context determines what is said. Though speakers should put consideration the organization of what they want to say, to whom, where and when. For example, the speech presidents vary from one circumstance to another, e.g., declaring war, thanking people, threatening an enemy, etc.

- c) It is the study of how more listeners get communication of what is said.

This definition investigates the listeners' inferences of what is said, in order to hit the clear interpretation of what a speaker said. or it is the exploration of the intended meaning of speakers.

- d) Pragmatics express the analysis of relative distance.

This definition focuses on the choice that determines what is said and unsaid. Thus, a speaker determines his need of saying according to his physical, social or conceptual distance (i.e., whether close or distant).

To summarize Yule's (1996) point of view, we should equalize between two different perspectives of pragmatics. The first one describes pragmatics as an attractive field as it helps people express themselves linguistically. On the other hand, pragmatics can be sometimes frustrating as it demands us to feel of people and to know what they have in mind.

According to Mey (2001), pragmatic meaning is analysed according to how a user uses language to communicate, so he defines pragmatics as "the study of the use of language in human communication as decided by the conditions of the society" (p.6).

Huang (2007) follows Levinson's definition of pragmatics since he explains that "pragmatics is the systematic study of meaning depending on language use and the key aspects of pragmatics are implicature, presupposition, speech acts and deixis" (p.2).

Thomas (1995) suggests three definitions of pragmatics as follows:

a) Pragmatics is the interpretation of utterances:

The focus of this definition is on the cognitive side of the listener or receiver of the message. No interest is given to the social restrictions of producing an utterance.

b) Pragmatics is the interaction of meaning:

The interaction between the speaker and hearer is the fundamental property of this definition. Thus, none of them (i.e., speaker and hearer) has any role in producing meaning individually.

c) Pragmatics is the speaker's meaning:

Unlike the first interpretation, a key aspect of this definition based on the speaker or writer who takes the social views into considerations. Since the speaker is the producer of the message though listeners will face many obstacles in interpreting the meaning of the utterance or force.

Verschueren (1999) describes pragmatics as the link between linguistics and social sciences of human life since it studies people's use of language, behavior and social actions.

For Crystal (2003), pragmatics is the study of the elements that dominate human's choice of words through speech or writing. This means that if someone wants to say something s/he puts in consideration all the elements and situational contexts in order to produce the proper language.

Leech's (1983) definition of pragmatics is similar to Crystal's (2003) as he illustrates that pragmatics is the study of how an utterance has meaning in a situation. It stands for the idea that pragmatics is the understanding of the meaning of an utterance when looking at the situation it takes place.

2.2. Speech Acts Theories

The term "Speech Acts" (henceforth SA) has originally derived from the German term 'Sprechakt' of Bühler 1934. This term adopted and utilized by Austin to be a wide title in his lectures which were printed as a book after his death in 1962 under the title "How to do Things with Words". Speech act theory was discovered due to the restricted semantic analysis which is established on truth conditions and the limitation of semantic treatments to a particular category of sentences. The concept speech act refers to acts performed by utterances. For example, "you are fired" in this statement, the speaker performs the act of dismissing the employee by utterances (Yule, 1996).

2.2.1 Austin's Theory

The British Philosopher J.L. Austin is considered indeed the original author of the concept 'Speech Act Theory' (1962) which

evolved later by Searle (1969). In his collected lectures which are printed under the heading, "How to Do Things with Words" "Austin worked on the development of the first organized notion of words just like human behaviour. The goal of Austin's idea has been to tear down the language point of view which would find "truth conditions" fundamental to comprehend language. He extracted his method depending on the idea that language usage for doing functions. Austin describes a SA as an act of pronouncing a particular statement inside a limited context within a specific goal. Utterances involve using their words to accomplish something.

As cited in Coulthard (1985), Austin argues that four requirements are required for a performative act not to be unsuccessful:

- The whole participants must carry out the procedure properly.
- It has to be achieved entirely.
- A specific individual and suitable conditions must achieve the procedure.
- It is important to find an agreed traditional procedure; in another meaning, certain words should be pronounced by certain individuals in particular situations.

He distinguishes three aspects of a SA: (i) Locutionary act (the pronouncement of the linguistic components). (ii) Illocutionary act (the speaker's intention when he utters the words). (iii) Perlocutionary act (the utterance effect on the audience). At the present day, the expression of SA is oftentimes utilized to particularly point out (illocutionary act) and (illocutionary force) to indicate the intended effect. Devitt and Hanley (2003) remark on Austin's three elements saying that the locutionary act is an utterance that carries a meaning, and the illocutionary act takes into account the actual action carried out by utterance whereas the perlocutionary is the utterance which affects the hearer. In reference to the SA, Austin employs the expression illocutionary act as the core of his theory.

Austin (1962) categorizes SAs depending on the characteristics of verbs and their illocutionary forces. He classifies illocutionary acts into five types, even though such classification seems difficult to do or to understand since there are a lot of potential illocutionary acts, and in many cases the speaker's intentions are vague. These types are:

1- Excercitives

The objective of this group of verbs is to demonstrate the practice of authorities, rights, or effect, like name, sentence, appoint, order, dedicate, dismiss, claim, etc. For example, if the judge declares "I sentence you to five years". The furious manager says, "you are fired".

2- Verdicatives

This type of verbs is presented for the purpose of expressing verdicts, rulings or discoveries like appreciation, characterization, assessment, estimation, significance, grade, etc.

3-Commissives

These groups of verbs refer to committing or various kinds of promises or contain obligation or expressing an intention in the future. The verbs in this class are: swear, plan, bet, guarantee, promise, etc. These verbs oblige the speaker to future action. For instance, I promise to support you.

4-Behabitives

This group's verbs include utterances of situation and social conduct, like apologizing, congratulate, compliment, welcome, etc.

5-Expositive

Austin (1962) states that this type of verbs cannot be simply explained. This kind of verbs is not explicit because interferes with other types, but the common performance of each utterance is often very obvious. The verbs such as concede, remark, assume, hypothesize, expect, etc., belonging to this category.

2.2.2 Searle's Theory

According to Searle (1969), the felicity conditions of Austin represent only speech acts of ceremonies and rites, like; pronouncing a couple husband and wife. Searle mentions four types of conditions that control the successful performance of the illocutionary act:

1. The Propositional Content Conditions

This type of conditions tries to limit and restrict the speech component of the speaker presented in a statement (declarative, imperative, interrogative, etc.). For instance, to express promise, *I promise to help you*. The condition of propositional content needs a future action to behalf the hearer.

2. Preparatory Conditions

These conditions determine the basic requirements of the realistic world for each act of illocutionary. They design the speaker's status that performs the act and match the applicable speech with the associated illocution act. For instance, the preparatory conditions of the execrative SA (power exercise) demand that the speaker has the authority and that a crime or error has been committed by the addressee.

3. Sincerity Conditions

They refer to the speaker's intensions, emotions and doctrines, being suitable to the type of illocutionary act. The act will be unsuccessful if the speaker doesn't own the suitable wish or doctrine. If someone says they will do something, but they don't actually plan to, the act is called a misuse.

4. Essential Conditions

They take into account constituent standards because they control the production of a specific illocutionary act. They symbolize the semantic and syntactic standards needed to design an expression concerning a specific SA. The act must be inferred when making a request.

Searle reviews the classification of Austin because it depends on interfering standards. He notes that the distinction between verbs of SA and SAs is not explained by Austin. He classifies SAs into five categories (assertive, directives, commissures, expressive and declaratives) that in the next chapter will be explored in details because they are the model of this study.

Searle is considered one of the most important developers of SA theory. He modifies Austin's theory on the level of taxonomy. It is necessary to mention that Searle relies on 12 major dimensions of difference, when there is a distinction between illocutionary actions but Searle focuses on three dimensions around which much of his taxonomy is based. The three dimensions are illocutionary point, direction of fit, and propositional content.

A- Illocutionary Point

Illocutionary force refers to the aim or intent of a kind of illocution which Searle names illocutionary point. Therefore, we can infer that the “illocutionary points” request is similar to command and both try to make the listener for doing something but the illocutionary force is not the same. One can say that many factors work together to form illocutionary force and illocutionary point is one of them.

B- Direction of Fit

Direction of Fit is the relationship between word (language) and the world (reality). Thus, the 'fit' is between a language and reality, and it can be interpreted either from language to reality, or from reality to language, so, we either 'word the world', i.e. language is fitted to reality or 'world the word', i.e. reality is fitted to language.

C- Expressed psychological state

It refers to the attitudes and feelings expressed by the speaker when performing illocutionary acts. Searle (1971) attempts to illustrate an idea that the speaker when speaking a language needs to engage in a form of behavior. This means when the speaker does illocutionary acts like a promise, he performs the intention. SAs are universally divided into five types under Searle's taxonomy.

1- Assertive (Representatives)

According to Searle (1979), the purpose of this category is to obligate the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. Thus, it carries the value of the truth. It expresses the belief of the speaker.

The verbs which clarify this category are (claim, conclude, state, assert, report, etc.).

2- Directives

These forms of SAs reflect the speaker's attempts to make the hearer to do something. They convey the wish or desire of the speaker for the hearer to do something. This category of verbs includes: advise, order, request, ask, command, permit, entreat, plead, pray, beg and invite.

3- Commissives

This kind of SAs focuses on committing the speaker to a kind of future path of action. They convey the intention of the speaker of doing something. This type includes paradigmatic states such as : promises, threats, offers , refusals and pledges .

4- Expressives

This type of SAs is used when shows his or her thoughts and behaviours to others. The included illocutionary point in this group is to show the particular psychological condition in the sincerity condition about a specific state of affairs symbolized by propositional content. The verbs such as “congratulate”, “apologize”, “condole”, “deplore” and “welcome” represent the paradigmatic state which relates to this kind.

5- Declaratives

This category of SAs can make instant modifications in some present situation of affairs. This kind needs the agreement between the reality and propositional content. It contains cases which enable the speaker to: declare the war, fire employee, nominate a candidate, etc.

2.2.3. Bach and Harnish Theory

After the establishing work carried out in parallel by Austin-Searle, Bach and Harnish made a significant effort to combine the insights of the founders into united theory. They (1979) took on a synthesized model both of Searle and Austin in which four acts are involved in a communicative SA:

1-Utterance Act

In the utterance context, the language expression is conveyed by the speaker to a hearer.

2-Locutionary Act

When the speaker tells the listener so- and so- in the utterance context.

3-Illocutionary Act

When the speaker in utterance context does such- and such-.

4-Perlocutionary Act

When the speaker influences the listener in a particular way.

They classify a large number of types of illocutionary act in their SAs' classification. Their effort seems to be more extensive and

follows a systematic framework. They identify six main categories based on the psychological condition or behaviour of the speaker, as they term it. Two of these types are traditional: verdictives and effective, while the other are communicative SAs such as directives, commissive, constative and acknowledgment (Bach & Harnish, 1979). The last four groups hardly match the exercitives, expositives and actions of Austin, in a respective way. These types are similar to Searle's directives, commissives, representatives and expressives.

1. Directive

They explain the attitude of the speaker toward some potential actions by the hearer and his intent that his speech, or expressed behaviour, be regarded as a justification for the action of the hearer.

2. Constatives

They reflect the belief of the speaker and his intent or wish for the hearers to have or formulate a similar belief.

3. Commissives

They are verbs that commit the speakers to do or say something later. These forms used to express intention in future or giving promises. (Possibly under definite situations).

4. Acknowledgements

They express a particular emotion towards the hearer, or in specific situations where the utterance is obviously superficial or formal, the intention of the speaker that his utterance serves society's expectations to express particular emotions and his tenet that it happens.

5. Effectives

The influence of these traditional illocutionary acts makes changes in institutional states of affairs. They are traditional necessarily to the same extent that they only accomplish their results because they are mutually assumed to do so. For example:

1- A bill voted.

2- A-Student is graduated

6. Verdictives

They are verdicts that have legal obligated significance by convention in the situation context in which they occur. It is not just an act of judging to call a runner out, find a suspect guilty or judge a piece of property; given the position and attendant of an umpire authority, a judge or a tax assessor it is also to make it the case.

2.3. Discourse Analysis

According to Paltridge (2012), Zellig Harris (1952) first used the term discourse analysis as a method of examining related speech and writing. Discourse analysis deals with the investigation the relation between language and the contexts in which it is used (McCarthy, 1991). Discourse Analysis can be viewed from two perspectives. In

accordance with the formalist or structuralist model, discourse is “language above the clause” (Stubbs,1983, p.1). The first approach concentrates on the structure taken by the language above the statement, examining the structural features like regulation and coherence, but without giving enough attention to social thoughts that guide how people utilize and explain language.

Brown and Yule (1983) emphasize the importance of the second, so called functionalist paradigm, which is the second aspect of language. They explain that discourse analysis refers to the language analysis within the use because it can not only be limited to a descriptive linguistic form without concentrating on the objectives or roles that those shapes are composed or created to help in the issues of humanity. The functionalist model shows that language analysis cannot be detached or excluded from the functional and purposeful linguistic analysis in life of human. Therefore, discourse analysis is considered as a cultural and social structured speaking way (Brown & Yule ,1983). Further, Van Dijk (1977) claims that the connection between community and discourse often becomes indirect and depending on how the users of language identify the style or communication event that they participate in. Richardson (2007) says that discourse means that language is utilized to mean something and to do something and that this sense and doing is connected to its usage context.

Talbot (2007) claims that if we need to properly explain a speech, we have to interpret or discover the talker or writer's acts via discourse, and try to link these acts to broader personal, institutional, socio-cultural and material contexts. He explains that “text refers to the observable product on interaction, whereas discourse is the process of interaction itself: a cultural activity” (Talbot, 2007, p.9).

Fairclough (1992) considers discourse as a social activity presupposes two relationships between a digressive occurrence (any usage of discourse) and the condition, foundation and social form in which it happens. Discourse is formed by all these, but it formed them as well.

2.4. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Paltridge (2012) says that Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) investigates discourse use in regard to cultural and social matters like ethnicity, politics, gender and identity, and questions whether the discourse is utilized in a specific way and what the effects of this kind of use are. Van Dijk (1993) argues that practitioners of CDA take an obvious socio-political viewpoint because the analysts are concerned with analysing the often-ambiguous relations between discourse performances and broader social and cultural forms.

Fairclough (2001) defines CDA saying that “It deals with text analysis and interactions, but it doesn't begin from text and interactions. The important aspect and the landmark of this field are problems facing persons in their social life and affairs that are dealt with by sociology, political sciences and/or cultural studies” (p.26).

The researchers of CDA are interested in investigating how language microstructures are related to and help to form society's macrostructures. CDA emphasizes that speech (the use of language in speaking and writing) should be considered as an asocial activity.

The main emphasis of CDA is to analyse the components of language that have been added a vital role in the social production of injustice, authorities, ideologies and manipulations. Some authors focus on the visual images into concepts of discourse. Some authors focus on the visual images into concepts of discourse. For instance, political and ideological viewpoints of newspapers may be expressed or explained through the use of specific terms such as: (“resistance fighters” versus “insurgent” and various constructions of grammar (passive constructions versus active), same focus is applicable on the visual representation of events or what is termed the visual grammar design (Kress & van Leeuwen ,1996, p. 13).

2.5 Inaugural Speeches

The most important political discourses are presidential inaugural speeches. The inaugural speech is often included the administration's tone as president frequently says to reveal the requisite governmental policies and ideology behind any presidential administration.

Inauguration is seen as a big event in America, mainly because it preserves the previous historical opportunities of the USA and highlights the world's mass media. American president also has a prepared speech text to draw the attention of the audience to what he intends to convey in his speech.

According to Campell and Jamieson (1990), the inaugural speeches are set out to reunite the audience members into an assembly of valid witnesses of the presidential installation, to advise the nation on democratic concepts taken from the past, and to set out political values for the new government.

It is obvious that the inaugural speeches of American presidents are specific types of speeches which are primarily persuasive and ideological and these factors play a very key role on political scenarios of a country.

Focusing on the function of the inaugural political address, Gruber (1993) affirms that such address is “not merely a monologue, but it is an ideal of social interaction which aims at influencing people, or is considered an important diplomatic means allowing the negotiations of specific meanings” (p. 305). This is merely because an inaugural

address is observed as “the deliberate oratory in which there is an emphasis on the politician to convey his speech. He may deviate from ordinary usage and even develop a special language of his own” (Collins, 2002, p.1). So, a politician in his inaugural speech attempts to “communicate ideas, feelings, attitudes and information to his audiences”, and therefore transmission the intended meanings to them (Akmajian *et al.* 2007, p. 730).

3. Methodology

This section deals with the method, and the data collection and the sample of analysis. It also presents the model adopted.

3.1 Method and Sample

The researcher uses a mixed method involving both qualitative and quantitative procedures in his research to describe and analyze the data and obtain the data results. The data are gathered from Inaugural Address of American President (Ronald Reagan, 1985) available on the net.

3.2 Model of Analysis

The data is analysed using a proposed model of two theories. It merges the theory of Speech Acts of Searle (1969), Ferrara's theory of speech acts within sequences (1980). In his theory, he supports Searle's theory of identifying the type of sentences that have been made, whether commissive or directive. He shows that speech acts create connection with each other in a sequence. He tries to shed the light on one of the difficulties with the theory of speech act is that felicity conditions are often formed with very easy linguistic contexts in mind. He proves that speech acts contract relationships with one another in a sequence. In most cases, speech acts do not usually occur in isolation in real life but they come as clusters or sequences. These speech acts in sequences are normally related to one another; while they share a different status in the flow of the speaker's actions. His model depends on discovering the relationships among the speech acts within one sequence where she distinguishes three relationships which are: justification, contrastive apposition and amplification.

The inaugural speech is pragmatically analysed, i.e. the detection and justification of the types of speech acts used in the text.

Consequently, the data are counted sentence by sentence manually because the analysis is based on the intended meaning. Then, two paragraphs will be chosen randomly and analysed according to Searle's taxonomy of speech acts. In addition, giving a brief discussion for each speech act within the selected paragraph.

After analyzing the selected extracts in each individual speech, the frequencies and percentages are summarized in a table, that allocates all speech acts types. As far as counting the percentages is concerned, a descriptive statistical way is applied since the researcher proposes a

formula based on the number of acts for each speech cat type individually, multiplied by 100 and then divided by the total number of speech act types in each speech. The formula is summarized as follows:

Number of speech act type × 100 ÷ Total Number of speech acts.

After obtaining the frequencies and percentages of speech act types for each speech sample chosen, the results will be discussed, compared and concluded.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. The Analysis of Reagan's Speech

First Paragraph

The business of our nation goes forward (assertive). These United States are confronted with an economic affliction of great proportions (assertive). We suffer from the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history (assertive). It distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike (assertive). It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people (assertive).

The current paragraph contains five SAS. Each one of them correlates to the expected message. The illocutionary point contained in the first speech act (The business of our nation goes forward) is assertive where the speaker emphasizes that the economy and works are good and we will pass the economic crisis. The direction of fit of this act is words-to-world: as the speaker tries to make his words fit to the audience. The expressed psychological state of this act is “belief” as the speaker believes the expressed proposition and also wants the hearer to believe it too. For this reason, an assertive SA is presented in this context.

The illocutionary point in the second SA (These United States are confronted with an economic affliction of great proportions) is assertive where the speaker states to the American people that the country is in the midst of a major economic crisis and also, to show that his plan is ready to face that. Regarding its direction of fit, it is words fit to the world: since the speaker tries to persuade the audience in his claim. The expressed psychological state of the SA is “belief” (that p): where the president Reagan wants the hearers to believe his words too. Therefore, it represents an assertive SA.

In connection with the third act mentioned in the preceding text (“we suffer from the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history”), its illocutionary point is assertive where the speaker emphasizes that the United States economy suffers from the worst and longest continuous inflation in its history in addition, increasing unemployment, economic recession and increased taxes. Its direction of fit is words fit to world since Reagan wants to fit his

claim, that America suffers the worst inflation in its modern history, to the addressees. The expressed psychological state of this act is” belief”: as the speaker wants the hearers to believe his words too. This speech act’s conditions meet the criteria of the assertive speech which represents the main SA in the text.

With respect to the fourth act (It distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike) that is mentioned above, its illocutionary point is assertive where the president Reagan explains the negative effects and results on the economic, social and political side in the whole country. Regarding its direction of fit, it is words-to-world as the president works to make his utterances fit to the audience. The expressed psychological state is” belief” as Reagan wants the audience to believe his claiming. Therefore, This SA's conditions meet the criteria of the assertive SA.

Relating to the last SA aforementioned (It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people), its illocutionary point is assertive SAs where the speaker states the threaten of such inflammation on the lives of millions of Americans. The direction of fit is words-to-world as the president attempts to convince the addressees to his words. The expressed psychological state is” belief” (that p): the speaker believes the stated proposition and wishes for the addressees to believe it too. Consequently, this situation contains an assertive act.

As a final point, Ferrara mentions in his suggested theory, that all the forms of assertives when they come together as a sequence, they form an amplification relationship for the main SA in the text above because all of them convey the same message which talks about the economic crisis and the negative effects of the inflation on the country.

Second Paragraph

“We hear much of special interest groups (**assertive**). Well, our concern must be for a special interest group that has been too long neglected (**directive**). It knows no sectional boundaries, or ethnic and racial divisions, and it crosses political party lines (**assertive**). It is made up of men and women who raise our food, patrol our streets, man our mines and factories, teach our children, keep our homes, and heal us when we’re sick -- professionals, industrialists, shopkeepers, clerks, cabbies, and truck drivers (**assertive**). They are, in short, “We the People.” (**assertive**) This breed called Americans (**assertive**)”.

In total, there are six SAs in this section. The illocutionary point contained in the first SA (“We hear much of special interest groups”) is to assert that the speaker wants to hear all, not only special interest groups . He needs the support from all the American people not only “elite groups”. Its direction of fit is words fit to world: the words

shows that Reagan uses phrases that are appropriate for the circumstances. The expressed psychological state of this act is "belief": as the speaker wants the hearers to believe his words too. This SA's conditions meet the criteria of the assertive SA.

Regarding the illocutionary point contained in the second act ("Well our concern must be for a special interest group that has been too long neglected"), is to exhort the government concentrating the other ordinary people who had been neglected for long time by previous administrations. The direction of fit of this act is world-to-words as the president Reagan attempts to make the audience to fit with his direction to achieve this goal. The expressed psychological state of the current act is *desire*: that the president wishes the addressees to support him to fulfil his political program. As a result, this SA satisfies the requirements for a directive. Therefore, it is a directive SA which conveys the major idea of this text.

In the matter of the third act ("It knows no sectional boundaries, or ethnic and racial divisions, and it crosses political party lines"), its illocutionary point is assertive, where the president Reagan affirms that his presidency is for all American people and he wishes to be able to communicate with all sectors of society, rather than a privileged class or political class. Regarding its direction of fit, it is words-to-world since Reagan wants the audience to fit with his statement. According to expressed psychological state of this act, it is "belief": these words reveal that Reagan seeks the support from people to his presidency to be successful. Consequently, the present act matches the assertive criteria.

With regard to the fourth act the above mentioned, its illocutionary point is to assert the nationalism in his policy and construction his government. The direction of fit is words-to-world: the president wants the audience to fit with his speech. The expressed psychological state of this act is "belief": Reagan wants the addressees to believe his words too.

Referring to the fifth and sixth SAs in the preceding text, their illocutionary point is assertive, where the president Reagan emphasizes the importance of the role of different groups of the American people in supporting and forming his government and exceeding America crisis. Their direction of fit, it is words-to-world. According to expressed psychological state of these acts, it is "belief": as Reagan wants the addressees to believe what he says.

In conclusion, all the assertives that aforementioned in the text above work together to form the relationships of amplification each one with another and all of them hold justification relation with the second SA which conveys the essential point of the text. The directive SA comprises the basic idea of the sequence. It is the primary

illocutionary objective, whereas the assertives are the subordinate goals providing justification (motivation) for the directive one. The assertives combine to encourage the people to stand beside the president and support him.

Table of Numbers and percentages of Reagan's SAs

Speech Acts	Frequencies	Percentages
Assertive	79	61.7%
Commissive	24	18.8%
Directive	24	18.8%
Expressive	1	0.7%
Declarative	0	0%
Total Number of Acts	128	100%

The table above shows the many types of SAs that are performed by President Reagan. His speech is considered the longest speech among the other speeches in this study. From the results, assertives are most dominant type in this speech, about (61%). The reason behind this, Reagan uses assertive SAs to express, affirm, explain, and assess the truthfulness of the statements related with their agendas and programs. Besides, according to Huang (2007) the assertives reflect the speaker's belief. Concerning the commissives and directives, they represent the same rate (18%) from the total number of acts, to show that the speaker wants to obligate himself to promise and pledge, do action and acting definite duties connected to governmental responsibilities. In addition, directives exhort and ask citizens of the nation to collaborate, unite, and remove barriers to the country's progress. Finally, a small percentage is identified in the performance of expressive SAs. The act with (0%) in this speech is the declarative as this act needs particular paradigmatic cases like "bidding in bridge, declaring war, excommunicating, firing from employment, and nominating a candidate" (Huang, 2007, p. 108) and none of them are mentioned in this speech.

5. CONCLUSION

According to the results shown in the previous section, it is concluded that four types of Searle's classification of speech acts appeared in this genre i.e. assertives, expressives, commissives and directives. Assertive and commissive SAs come in the first rank and they are most frequently used in Reagan's speech. It also shows that assertives are at the top of this genre, confirming Ferrara's theory which states that this category serves as justification for commissives and directives. The same speech act can carry more than one message;

therefore, a proposed model of two theories is adopted to emphasize that a specific sentence is a commissive one regardless of its form.

SAs are performed in this style because the speaker utilizes them as a means of communicating his message to his audience without directly embarrassing them. SAs are used in political speech to give them accuracy because, while assertives commit the speaker to the truth of the text, commissives indicate a responsibility to do something in the future.

Finally, a suggested model of two theories is used to underline that a given sentence is a commissive one regardless of its form because the same SA can contain more than one message. Each SA expresses a particular use and importance within the context of speech. Therefore, the speaker employs a variety of SAs to convey his or her meaning purposes. The use of the “SA Theory” as a framework in the analysis of the selected speech allow the readers exploring the language use of those political leaders.

7. REFERENCES

Akmajian, A, R. Demers; A Farmer, R. Harnish, (2007). *linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. (5th Ed). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

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

Bach, K. and Harnish (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Brown, G and Yule, G.(1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, K. K. and Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds Done in Words: Presidential Rhetoric and the Genres of Governance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collins, C. (2002). *Thucydides On justice, Power, and Human Nature: Study Guide on the Analysis of Speeches*.

Coulthard, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Discuss Analysis*. London: Longman.

Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics & phonetics* (5th ed). Blackwell Pub.

Devitt, M. and Hanley, R. (2003). *Speech Acts and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis*, in McHoul, A. and Rapley, M. (ed), *How to Analyze Talk in Institutional Settings*. London: Continuum, pp.25-41.

Ferrara, A. (1980). *An extended theory of speech acts: Appropriateness conditions for subordinate acts in sequences*. Journal of pragmatics, 4(3), 233–252.

Gruber, H. (1993). *Political Language and Textual Vagueness. Pragmatics*, 3:1.1-28.

- [Halliday, Michael A.K.](#); Jonathan Webster. (2006). *On Language and Linguistics*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T. (1996/2006). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd Ed). Blackwell Publishers.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis*, 2nd, New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Richardson, J. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*, 1st Ed : Palgrave Macmillan.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1971). *What is Speech Act*. In J. Searle (ed) *The Philosophy of Language*.
- Searle, J. (1979). *Semantics*. London: T.J. Press Ltd.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Talbot, M. (2007). *Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman Publishing.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. Arnold; Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G (1996a). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.