ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

LINGUOPRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF DIRECTIVE, EXPRESSIVE AND COMMISSIVE SPEECH ACTS IN FAMILY DISCOURSE

Nazarova Dilrabo Ne'matjon qizi
PhD student of Namangan State University
ORCID ID:0009-0000-6325-0848
e-mail: 1996dilrabonematjonovna@mail.com
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24193342

ABSTRACT: Speech Act Theory is one of the key directions of modern pragmalinguistics, which reveals the communicative functions of linguistic units in the process of interaction. Within this framework, language is viewed not only as a system of signs but also as a form of social action that shapes interpersonal relations. The concept of family is an important linguocultural phenomenon that embodies national culture, traditions, moral values, and social norms. It functions as a micro-model of society in which communicative behavior is formed, transmitted, and preserved. Identifying the pragmatic and linguoculturological features of speech acts used in the family environment allows for a deeper understanding of the essence of family discourse, its communicative strategies, and the mechanisms through which interpersonal relationships are maintained. This study also highlights the role of cultural norms, politeness strategies, and implicit meanings in shaping communicative interaction within the family.

Keywords: family concept, speech act, pragmatics, linguoculturology, discourse, directive, expressive, commissive, locutionary act, illocutionary act, perlocutionary act.

1. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary linguistic research focused on the relationship between language and thought, as well as language and culture, the analysis of concepts has gained particular scientific significance. Concepts are regarded as fundamental units of cognitive linguistics that integrate knowledge, emotions, cultural values, and social experience. According to cognitive linguistics, a concept reflects not only an individual's mental representation but also collective cultural memory.

A concept is recognized as a complex cognitive unit that embodies a person's knowledge about reality, experience, values, and national worldview. In this sense, concepts function as mediators between language, cognition, and culture. One such concept is the concept of family, which is closely connected with the social life, spiritual values, traditions, and national mentality of each people.

The family serves as a primary social institution where communicative competence is formed. It is within the family that individuals first acquire language, social norms, and communicative strategies. Therefore, family discourse represents a unique communicative space From a theoretical perspective, the study of family discourse is closely related to the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics, which emphasizes the role of the human factor in language. This paradigm shifts the focus from language as a system to language as a means of human interaction.

At present, pragmalinguistics pays special attention to the study of linguistic units in relation to their communicative functions[1]. In particular, the speech act theory developed by John Langshaw Austin and further elaborated by John Searle provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing how language functions as action[2]. Austin introduced the distinction between

[1] Safarov, Sh. *Pragmalinguistics*. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2008.

[2] Searle, J. R. Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, while Searle classified speech acts into categories such as directives, expressives, commissives, representatives, and declarations[3].

In addition to Austin and Searle, the theoretical foundation of this study is supported by the works of scholars such as H. P. Grice, whose Cooperative Principle explains how interlocutors achieve mutual understanding[4], and P. Brown and S. Levinson, whose Politeness Theory highlights the importance of face-saving strategies in communication[5]. These theories are particularly relevant for analyzing implicit speech acts in family discourse.

Thus, speech act theory provides an important methodological basis for revealing the pragmatic nature of speech units such as commands, requests, advice, promises, gratitude, and reproach in family communication.

Family discourse is one of the most natural and dynamic communicative environments. It is characterized by emotional richness, spontaneity, and cultural specificity. The formation and use of speech acts in this context depend on factors such as age, gender, social status, kinship relations, and cultural norms. Therefore, studying the concept of family through speech act theory makes it possible to identify hidden communicative intentions, pragmatic strategies, and national-cultural features.

2. METHODS

The study employs an integrative methodological approach combining pragmalinguistic, discourse-analytical, cognitive, and linguocultural methods. This complex approach allows for a multidimensional analysis of speech acts in family discourse. Pragmalinguistic analysis is used to determine the communicative intentions of speakers and the functional roles of speech acts. Discourse analysis focuses on the organization of communication, coherence, and interactional patterns. Cognitive analysis helps reveal conceptual structures underlying speech behavior, while linguocultural analysis identifies cultural meanings embedded in language use.

Contextual analysis plays a crucial role in distinguishing between explicit and implicit speech acts. Special attention is paid to presuppositions, implicatures, and contextual cues that influence interpretation. The material consists of examples drawn from natural family communication, Uzbek literary texts, and folklore sources. These materials provide authentic data for analyzing the functioning of speech acts in real communicative situations.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Directives (commands, requests, demands, advice, prohibitions)

Directive speech acts are aimed at influencing the behavior of the interlocutor. Their form and function vary depending on the social structure of the family.

In authoritarian family models, directives are expressed through direct commands and prohibitions: “Close the door immediately!”, “Do not speak like that!”

In democratic family models, directives take the form of requests and suggestions: “Could you help me with this?”, “Maybe you should rest a bit.”

Implicit directives play a significant role in Uzbek family communication due to politeness norms[6].

For example:

---

[3] Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962..

[4] Grice, H. P. Logic and Conversation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

[5] Brown, P., Levinson, S. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987

[6] Mirzayev, T. et al. *Uzbek Folk Proverbs*. Tashkent: Sharq, 2005.

"It is getting dark outside" (meaning: "Please turn on the light.") "The guests will arrive soon" (meaning: "Prepare the house.")

These examples illustrate the use of indirect speech acts, which rely on shared knowledge and contextual understanding.

3.2. Expressives (emotions, gratitude, apology, reproach, dissatisfaction)

Expressive speech acts reflect the emotional and psychological state of the speaker. They are essential for maintaining interpersonal relationships.

Positive expressives: "May your path always be bright," "You are the pride of our family," "Thank you for your help."

These expressions serve to strengthen emotional bonds and create a positive communicative atmosphere.

Negative expressives often appear in implicit form: "Well done, you remembered at last…" (irony) "Of course, you are always right…" (sarcasm)

Such expressions demonstrate how indirectness is used to convey criticism while avoiding open conflict.

3.3. Commissives (promises, oaths, commitments) Commissive speech acts are oriented toward future actions and involve a commitment by the speaker.

Examples include: "I will support you in every situation," "I promise to study harder," "I will never forget what you have done for me."

In the context of Uzbek culture, such statements are closely linked to moral responsibility and family honor. Breaking a promise may lead to a loss of trust and social disapproval.

3.4. Levels of Speech Act Realization

Speech acts are realized at three levels:

- Locutionary level – the literal meaning of the utterance;
- Illocutionary level – the communicative intention;
- Perlocutionary level – the effect on the listener.

Example: "Why is the room so cold?"

- Locutionary meaning: a question about temperature.
- Illocutionary meaning: a request to close the window.
- Perlocutionary effect: the listener closes the window.

This example demonstrates how indirect speech acts function through inference and shared understanding.

Example:

"I will tell you something, Kumush," said Mirzakarim Qutidor to Oftob oyim, "I have invited a guest for today. Have the servant clean the guest room. Bring out the newly covered quilts and spread them on the platform. Take out the large carpet as well. Do you have any fruits at home?"[7]

This example illustrates a series of directive speech acts reflecting hierarchy, hospitality traditions, and communicative norms. It also demonstrates how multiple speech acts can be combined within a single communicative situation to achieve a specific goal.

3.5. Comparative Table of Speech Act Types in Family Discourse

Speech Act Type	Illocutionary Purpose	Direction of Fit	Typical Linguistic Forms	Examples in Family Discours	Pragmatic Function in Family Context

[7] Qodiriy, A. *Bygone Days*. Tashkent: Universitet, 2018.

				e	
Directives	To make the listener perform an action	World-to-words	Imperatives, interrogatives, modal verbs (must, should	"Close the door." / "Could you help me?" / "It's getting late."	Regulating behavior, expressing authority, maintaining order
Expressives	To express psychological state or emotions	No direction of fit	Exclamations, evaluative phrases, emotional expressions	"Thank you." / "I'm sorry." / "You made us proud."	Maintainin g emotional bonds, expressing attitudes
Commissives	To commit the speaker to future action	World-to-words	Future tense, performative verbs (promise, swear)	"I will help you."/"I promise to come."	Building trust, expressing responsibili ty
Representativ es (contextual reference)	To assert truth or belief	Words-to-world	Declarative sentences	"He is at home."	Providing information , supporting communica tio
Declarations (rare in family discourse)	To change reality through speech	Words ↔ world	Institutional expressions	"You are forgiven	Symbolic authority, rare but culturally significant

3.6. Scientific Analysis of the Comparative Table

he comparative analysis of speech act types demonstrates that directive, expressive, and commissive acts occupy a central position in family discourse, while representatives and declarations function as supporting or peripheral categories. This distribution aligns with Searle's classification, where each speech act is defined by its illocutionary point, direction of fit, and psychological state .

➢ Firstly, directives are characterized by their world-to-words direction of fit, meaning that the speaker's utterance is intended to change reality by influencing the listener's behavior. In family discourse, directives are highly frequent due to hierarchical relations (e.g., parent–child interaction). Their pragmatic strength varies depending on social roles: commands reflect authority, while requests and suggestions indicate politeness strategies. This confirms that directives are inherently action-oriented and listener-centered .

➢ Secondly, expressives differ fundamentally from other speech acts because they lack a direction of fit. Their primary function is not to change reality but to reflect the speaker's internal psychological state. In family communication, expressives play a crucial role in maintaining

emotional cohesion and interpersonal harmony. The frequent use of gratitude, apology, and praise indicates the importance of affective communication in close social relationships.

➢ Thirdly, commissives share similarities with directives in terms of future orientation; however, the key difference lies in the agent of action. While directives require action from the listener, commissives commit the speaker to future behavior. This distinction is central in pragmatics and highlights the dual structure of interaction, where responsibility may shift between interlocutors . In family discourse, commissives strengthen trust and reinforce moral obligations, especially in parent–child relationships.

Furthermore, the table illustrates the role of direction of fit as a fundamental theoretical parameter. Representatives follow a words-to-world direction, directives and commissives follow a world-to-words direction, while expressives operate outside this dichotomy . This classification provides a systematic framework for understanding how different speech acts function pragmatically.

7. Structural-Pragmatic Model of Speech Acts in Family Discourse

Based on the theoretical framework of speech act theory and the analysis conducted above, the interaction of directive, expressive, and commissive speech acts in family discourse can be represented as a dynamic communicative model.

The model consists of three interconnected layers:

1. **Regulative Layer (Directives)** This layer governs behavior and interaction within the family. Directive speech acts function as regulatory mechanisms that organize everyday activities and maintain social order.

2. **Affective Layer (Expressives)** This layer reflects emotional relations between family members. Expressive speech acts contribute to the formation of emotional bonds, psychological comfort, and interpersonal harmony.

3. **Commitment Layer (Commissives)** This layer ensures continuity and stability of relationships. Commissive speech acts establish trust and responsibility through commitments to future actions.

These three layers interact dynamically and form a unified communicative system. The effectiveness of family discourse depends on the balance between regulation (directives), emotional expression (expressives), and commitment (commissives).

From a theoretical perspective, this model corresponds to Searle's classification of speech acts based on illocutionary purpose and direction of fit. Directive and commissive acts exhibit a world-to-words direction of fit, as they aim to change reality, while expressive acts have no direction of fit, as they primarily reflect psychological states .

Another important observation is the distinction between explicit and implicit realization across all speech act types. In Uzbek family discourse, implicit forms are particularly dominant due to cultural norms of politeness and indirectness. For example, an implicit directive ("It is cold here") relies on contextual inference, which aligns with Grice's theory of conversational implicature and cooperative principles.

Finally, the comparative analysis confirms that speech acts in family discourse are not isolated phenomena but part of a dynamic communicative system. Their interaction reflects social hierarchy, emotional relationships, and cultural values. Directive acts regulate behavior, expressive acts maintain emotional balance, and commissive acts ensure continuity and trust.

Thus, the inclusion of a comparative table not only systematizes speech act types but also enhances the analytical depth of the study by demonstrating their interrelations and functional differences within family discourse.

4. DISCUSSION

The analysis shows that speech acts in family discourse function as complex socio-cultural phenomena. Their interpretation depends on contextual factors such as social roles, cultural norms, and communicative goals.

Directive speech acts reflect hierarchical relations, expressive acts reveal emotional dynamics, and commissive acts demonstrate trust and responsibility.

The frequent use of implicit speech acts confirms the importance of politeness strategies and cultural etiquette. According to Brown and Levinson's theory, such strategies help preserve the "face" of interlocutors and maintain harmonious relationships. Furthermore, Grice's Cooperative Principle explains how speakers rely on shared assumptions and conversational maxims to interpret indirect meanings[8]. This is particularly evident in family communication, where mutual understanding is often based on implicit knowledge.

5. CONCLUSION

The concept of family, from the perspective of speech act theory, represents a complex linguoculturological and pragmatic phenomenon. Speech acts in family discourse perform not only communicative but also social and cultural functions.

Directive, expressive, and commissive acts reflect hierarchy, emotional relations, and responsibility, respectively. Their interaction reveals the underlying structure of family communication and the role of language in maintaining social harmony.

Thus, speech act theory provides an effective analytical framework for studying the communicative-pragmatic features of the family concept and contributes to a deeper understanding of language as a social phenomenon.

REFERENCES:

1. Austin, J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
2. Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts.
3. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics:
4. Brown, P., Levinson, S. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
5. Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students. London: Routledge
7. Grice, H. P. Logic and Conversation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
8. Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior. New York: Anchor Books
9. Grundy, P. (2008). Doing Pragmatics. 3rd ed. London: Hodder Education.
10. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An Introduction. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
13. Mirzayev, T. et al. Uzbek Folk Proverbs. Tashkent: Sharq, 2005.
14. Qodiriy, A. Bygone Days. Tashkent: Universitet, 2018.
15. Safarov, Sh. Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2008.

[8] Grice, H. P. Logic and Conversation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

16. Searle, J. R. Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
17. Tannen, D. (2004). Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men at Work. New York: HarperCollins.
18. Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.
19. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Yule, G. (2006). The Study of Language. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Verschueren, J. (1999). Understanding Pragmatics. London: Arnold.