



Pragmatic analysis of communicative situations: classical and modern theoretical approaches

Elmira Huseynova

Assoc. Prof. Dr.

Azerbaijan Technical University

Baku, Azerbaijan

Elmira.huseynova@aztu.edu.az

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0775-9151>

Keywords

Pragmatics, Communication, Speech Acts, Communicative Competence, Cognitive Processes, Meaning

Abstract

This study examined communicative situations from a pragmatic perspective to explain how meaning is constructed and interpreted in human interaction. The research was conducted to provide an integrative theoretical framework that combines classical and contemporary approaches to pragmatics and to identify the factors contributing to successful communication and communicative failure. A qualitative descriptive methodology based on theoretical analysis and comparative review of major pragmatic approaches was employed. Classical theories of communication were analyzed alongside recent developments in cognitive and neuropragmatics to evaluate their contributions to the interpretation of communicative situations. The analysis demonstrated that communicative success depended on the dynamic interaction between speaker intention, communicative context, shared background knowledge, and the cognitive processes involved in message interpretation. It was also found that communicative failures arose when one or more of these components were absent or inadequately interpreted. Based on the findings, an integrative pragmatic model incorporating structural, functional, and cognitive dimensions was proposed to explain communicative situations more comprehensively than individual theoretical approaches. The study concluded that a multidimensional perspective provides a stronger theoretical foundation for understanding pragmatic meaning and offers broader opportunities for the analysis of communication across different social and linguistic contexts. The proposed framework contributes to contemporary pragmatic theory and may serve as a basis for future theoretical and applied research in communication studies and linguistics.

Citation

Huseynova, E. (2026). Pragmatic analysis of communicative situations: classical and modern theoretical approaches. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 9(10), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.10.3>

Licensed

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems (SEI)*, under the auspices of IMCRA – International Meetings and Conferences Research Association (Azerbaijan).

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Received: April 14, 2026

Accepted : August 29, 2026

Published Online : September 19, 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

The social changes taking place in contemporary society have led to an even greater role of communication between people. In modern times, communication is not only a means of information exchange but also one of the main mechanisms for establishing, regulating, and managing social relations (Arundale, 2020). Therefore, the study of communicative situations and communicative acts is considered one of the most relevant directions of pragmatics.

Communicative interaction is a form of social interaction in which people convey their thoughts and intentions through purposeful actions such as words, gestures, and facial expressions. Research findings in the fields of animal communication and paleoanthropology show that humans are the only primates that display fully developed communicative interaction, and that this ability evolved to create more complex forms of social cooperation (Reich, 2011; Tomasello, 2008).

These considerations necessitate a reconsideration of the functional essence of communicative acts. It is argued that most communicative acts can be reconceptualized as proposals or requests for the addressee to respond to the speaker. This assumption is especially evident in imperative and interrogative sentences. The proposed reconceptualization of communicative acts is not only consistent with evolutionary theory but also makes it possible to explain some aspects of the concept of speech acts proposed by Austin (1975) and Searle (1969) in a more comprehensive way.

One reasonable assumption for pragmatists is that the structure of communicative exchange and individual communicative acts may reflect their evolutionary and functional roots in social cooperation. In other words, the form of communicative acts and their combination into a coherent discourse can be regarded as the result of social cooperation. This issue has been addressed in pragmatic theories developed from Austin (1975) and Grice (1975) to Levinson (1983) and Clark (1996). In particular, Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle has been presented as the mechanism underlying the interaction between the speaker and the listener during the communication process.

Although classical pragmatic theories provide a solid theoretical foundation for the analysis of communicative acts, recent developments in cognitive pragmatics and neuropragmatics demonstrate that communicative situations involve not only linguistic but also cognitive and social mechanisms. Consequently, there is a need to integrate classical and contemporary approaches in order to provide a more comprehensive explanation of communicative situations.

The main purpose of this article is to demonstrate the need to re-evaluate the communicative act model proposed by Austin (1975) and Searle (1969) in the light of modern scientific approaches. It is argued that the model is incomplete for two reasons. First, explaining communicative acts solely as a means of exchanging ideas only partially reflects their function of influencing social behaviour. Evolutionary biology demonstrates that the communicative ability characteristic of humans could develop only if it contributed to social adaptation and cooperation (Darwin, 1871; Tomasello, 2008; Nowak & Sigmund, 2005). This suggests that communication is not only a means of transmitting information but also a means of influencing social behaviour.

The second reason is that the Austin–Searle model explains communicative situations primarily from the perspective of the speaker's intention to convey information. However, in real communicative situations, speakers frequently use various verbal and non-verbal means to influence the behaviour of listeners. This characteristic makes it necessary to take into account not only the linguistic but also the social and cognitive aspects of communicative acts.

Although evolutionary theory has not yet been widely incorporated into pragmatic research, the Neo-Darwinian approach has been successfully applied in many areas of the behavioural sciences (Jaszczolt & Allan, 2016). The application of this approach to the explanation of communicative acts may contribute to a more comprehensive theoretical model of communication.

Within this framework, the present study addresses the following research questions:

- determination of the structure and main components of a standard communicative situation;
- explanation of the essence of the concept of a communicative act;
- analysis of the main principles of speech act theory;
- investigation of the causes of communicative failures;
- comparative evaluation of the communicative act theories proposed by Austin (1975) and Searle (1969).

The objective of this study is to provide an integrative pragmatic analysis of communicative situations by combining classical and contemporary theoretical approaches. The study is expected to contribute to the theoretical development of pragmatics by offering a more comprehensive understanding of the interaction among communicative intention, context, cognition, and social behaviour.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted as a qualitative theoretical investigation using a descriptive-comparative research design. The study was based on a review and comparative analysis of classical and contemporary publications on pragmatics, including speech act theory, the Cooperative Principle, Relevance Theory, cognitive pragmatics, and neuropragmatics.

The selected literature was analyzed to identify the main theoretical approaches to communicative situations, compare their explanatory potential, and evaluate their strengths and limitations. Based on this analysis, an integrative pragmatic model combining structural, functional, and cognitive components was proposed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. The concept of communicative situation and its main components

The study of communicative situations is currently one of the most important research directions in pragmatics. Because pragmatics studies the meaning formed depending on the context during speech. During interaction and communication, people's goals, worldview, interests, beliefs, and other socio-psychological factors have a direct impact on the communication process. In this regard, the study of communicative situations is considered one of the main research areas of pragmatics. The studies by scientists such as Clark (1996), Van Dijk (2008), Hymes (1972), Jakobson (1960), Lakoff (1973), and Leech (1983) have played an important role in the development of this direction. However, there are still issues regarding the structure of communicative situations and their functional characteristics that require further research.

Before proceeding to the main part of the topic, it is appropriate to define the concept of "successful communicative situation". A successful communicative situation arises when the participants in the speech follow the rules of social dialogue that allow them to realize their communicative goals and expectations. In other words, communication isn't limited only to the transmission of information, but also serves the mutual understanding of the participants and the realization of their communicative goals (Goodwin, 2021)

Most researchers note that a standard communicative situation consists of five or six main components. Although different authors express these components in different terms, their essence is basically the same (Jakobson, 1960; Hymes, 1972; Leech, 1983).

According to Jakobson (1960), a standard communicative situation consists of six components:

- addresser;
- addressee;
- message;
- context;
- code;
- connection.

Jakobson (1960) further explains that communication is a channel that ensures interaction between communicants, context is the situation to which the transmitted information belongs, and code is the system of language and signs used in the communication process.

According to Speech Act Theory, a communicative act involves a speaker, a hearer, an utterance produced in a particular context, and an intended communicative purpose (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1969). In this model, communication is evaluated not only as information transmission, but also as an activity aimed at a certain goal.

Summarizing the above approaches, it is possible to determine the following structure of a communicative situation:

- situation or communicative environment;
- communicators and their individual characteristics;
- subject of speech;
- functional goals;
- means of communication.
 - The form of communication, in turn, consists of the following elements:
- communication channel (oral or written);
- code, that is, a system of speech signs;

- speech norms accepted within a certain code;
- non-verbal signals.

It should also be noted that during each communicative act, the speaker creates a certain communicative-pragmatic field. This field includes the speaker, the addressee, the idea, the subject of the idea, the time, the place of the act of communication and the social environment in which it occurs. Thus, the center of the standard communicative situation is the communicants who transmit and receive information. Therefore, the terminological differences among authors don't alter the essence of the communicative situation.

Additionally, Gorodetsky (1990), taking into account the features of the organization of cognitive activity, proposed the following model of the communicative situation:

- communicants;
- communicative text;
- verbalization process;
- understanding process;
- conditions in which the communicative act occurs;
- practical goals;
- communicative goals.

When more than two people participate in communication, it is considered more appropriate to use the term "communicants". This term generalizes all persons participating in the communication process.

It has been repeatedly emphasized in various studies that mutual understanding is one of the main conditions for a successful communicative situation (Clark, 1996; Grice, 1975; Sperber & Wilson, 1995). When the interlocutors use the same linguistic code, and the communication channel operates without obstacles, the correct transmission and perception of information is possible. This creates conditions for the successful implementation of communicative goals.

Bakhtin (1986), Clark (1996), Sperber & Wilson (1995), and other researchers consider understanding to be one of the main conditions for communication. In their opinion, mutual understanding between people is associated not only with common language knowledge, but also with a common knowledge base and communicative experience. Communication between two partners is formed as a result of the interaction of both individual knowledge and speech ability. This process ensures not only the transmission of information, but also the enrichment of the general knowledge of the participants.

Mamysh (2021) considers professional discourse as a thinking-communicative activity. The authors note that in modern times, the expansion of the scope of professional language and its interaction with special-purpose languages of other national cultures, especially English, have increased the relevance of research in this area. In their opinion, professional discourse is a dynamic communicative phenomenon that includes written and oral forms, and its study requires the application of a pragmatic approach. This approach confirms the importance of analyzing communicative situations not only based on linguistic units, but also taking into account social, contextual, and cognitive factors.

Modern pragmatic research also examines the manifestation of communicative situations in various professional fields. Legal discourse is of particular interest in this regard, since communicative success here depends not only on language knowledge, but also on communicative competence, politeness strategies, and mutual understanding. Studies conducted in this direction have investigated the pragmatic features of communicative activity in the field of law, the formation of linguistic politeness, and mutual understanding. The authors note that the development of communicative competence is one of the main conditions for successful communication in real communicative situations (Lanius, 2019; Keil & Poscher, 2017).

Thus, the processes of speech and understanding play a leading role in the implementation of the communicative act and act as dominant components of the communicative situation. At the same time, communicative and practical goals are closely related to the personal characteristics and social relationships of the participants.

3.2. Communicative deficiencies and communicative failures

A communicative situation is successful only if all its components work together. Incorrect determination of goals, code used, or context among the parties involved in the communication process leads to various types of communicative problems. These problems can manifest themselves as communicative deficiency, communicative anxiety, and communicative failure.

Sometimes, ignorance of the rules of communication or insufficient communicative competence of one of the parties leads to the selection of an inappropriate code for the transmission or reception of information. In this case, communicative deficiency and communicative defect appear. Although these concepts are close to each other, they do not have the same meaning, and in most cases, one leads to the emergence of the other.

If the communicative situation is structured in a way that makes it difficult for the speakers to realize their goals or expectations, communicative anxiety arises. This anxiety can be felt by one or both of the communication participants. In such cases, the speaker may use expressions that don't meet the expectations of the other party during the dialogue or demonstrate inappropriate communicative behavior.

Another reason for the emergence of communicative anxiety is external or internal factors that prevent the interlocutors from achieving their strategic or practical goals. Psychological tension, emotional state, physiological discomfort, distraction or changes in the communication environment can negatively affect the quality of information exchange. In some cases, the psychological or physiological discomfort experienced by the speaker acts as an initial sign that communication will result in communicative failure.

Communicative misunderstanding is one of the main manifestations of communicative failure. However, such misunderstandings can often be eliminated through additional communicative actions. Such communicative actions include the following:

- asking additional questions;
- providing explanations;
- re-explaining;
- expressing the idea in a different form;
- clarifying or provocative questions.

These tools allow the speaker to refocus on the main topic and the other party to understand the message correctly.

Not only verbal tools, but also non-verbal elements play an important role in eliminating communicative failures. Gestures, facial expressions, tone of voice, and intonation sometimes help to understand the expressed idea correctly, but in some cases, on the contrary, they can create additional misunderstandings. Therefore, a successful communicative situation is formed as a result of the mutual compatibility of both verbal and non-verbal tools.

At the same time, in real communication, people, when expressing certain ideas, also perform various actions to support them. These actions sometimes lead to a different understanding of the sentences spoken.

3.3. Grice's Cooperative Principle and the Formation of Pragmatic Meaning

The successful implementation of a communicative situation depends not only on the correct selection of language units, but also on the cooperation of the communication participants. Therefore, one of the theories that played an important role in the development of pragmatics is the Cooperative Principle put forward by Herbert Paul Grice (1975).

Grice (1975) considered the communication process not just as a transfer of information, but as an activity based on cooperation. In his opinion, communication becomes more efficient and successful when the speaker and listener follow certain rules to achieve a common goal. In other words, the communication participants work together to correctly understand the idea expressed by the other party and clearly express their own ideas.

Grice (1975) expressed this approach with the following principle: *"Make a communicative contribution in accordance with the accepted goal and direction of the conversation."* This principle determines the mutual responsibility of the speaker and listener during communication. The speaker tries to provide information in a form the listener can understand, and the listener tries to interpret it correctly. The Cooperative Principle is built on four basic maxims.

Maxim of Quantity. According to this maxim, the speaker should provide as much information as necessary. Neither too much nor too little information should be provided.

For example:

A: *Where is the library?*

B: *It is next to the university.*

This answer provides enough information to the listener.

Maxim of Quality. According to the maxim of quality, the speaker should provide information that they believe to be true and should avoid false or unfounded claims. For example, a person who doesn't have accurate information about an event shouldn't present it as a fact. Following this rule serves to build trust between speakers.

Maxim of Relation. This maxim requires the speaker not to deviate from the topic. The answer given should be related to the current communicative situation.

For example:

A: What time is it?

B: The meeting will start in ten minutes.

If this answer indirectly indicates what time it is, it can be considered consistent with the maxim of appropriateness. Otherwise, communicative inconsistency arises.

Maxim of Manner. This maxim requires the speaker to express his opinion clearly, briefly, and unambiguously. Mixed, vague, and confusing expressions can lead to communicative misunderstanding. A clearly expressed opinion allows the listener to understand the message more quickly and correctly.

Violation of maxims and pragmatic meaning

Grice (1975) showed that in real communication, people don't always follow these maxims. Interestingly, their intentional violation also leads to the emergence of new meanings. In such cases, the listener determines the speaker's true intention based on the context. This phenomenon is called conversational implicature.

For example:

A: How was the lecture?

B: Well... the coffee was excellent.

This answer doesn't directly provide information about the lecture. The listener understands, based on Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle, that if the speaker only praises the coffee, then the lecture wasn't successful. Thus, the unexpressed meaning is taken out of context.

Most indirect communicative acts are also understood based on this principle. The speaker doesn't try to convey the literal meaning of the utterance, but the communicative intention hidden behind it. The listener determines this intention based on the principles of cooperation described by Grice (1975) and shared knowledge.

The relationship of Grice's theory to the theory of communicative acts

We argue that Grice's Cooperative Principle is of great importance in explaining the theory of communicative acts. Although Austin (1975) and Searle (1969) explain the structure and functions of communicative acts, they don't explain in detail how the listener determines the speaker's true intention. To some extent, Grice's theory of implicature fills this gap.

That is why the successful understanding of communicative acts is conditioned not only by the semantic meaning of language units, but also by the cooperation, shared knowledge, and communicative context that exist between the speaker and the listener. In this regard, Grice's theory (1975) can be considered one of the main theoretical foundations in the pragmatic analysis of communicative situations.

3.4. Relevance Theory and the Interpretation of Pragmatic Meaning

One of the important contributions to the development of pragmatics in the late 20th century was Relevance Theory, proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1995). This theory, by developing Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle, attempts to explain from a cognitive perspective how people understand speech.

According to Sperber and Wilson (1995), people don't check all possible interpretations to understand a speaker. They only choose the interpretation that provides enough information and requires the least cognitive effort. In other words, the human brain is based on the principle of maximum cognitive benefit and minimum processing cost when processing communicative information.

According to this approach, each communicative act creates a certain expectation of relevance in the listener. The listener interprets the speaker's statement in such a way that this interpretation gives him as much new information as possible and does so with the least mental effort.

For example:

A: Will you come to the party tomorrow?

B: I have a class at nine o'clock.

Here, the second speaker doesn't use the word "no" to answer the question. However, the listener immediately understands that it won't be possible to attend the party due to the class. This conclusion isn't derived from the semantic meaning of the sentence, but from the principle of context and relevance.

Thus, Relevance Theory shows that the understanding of communicative acts depends not only on the structure of the language, but also on the cognitive activity of the listener. This theory is of great importance in explaining indirect communicative acts, metaphors, irony, and other pragmatic phenomena. We argue that Relevance Theory can be considered as a theoretical approach that complements Grice's Cooperative Principle, determining communicative intention when analyzing communicative acts.

3.5. Cognitive pragmatics and neurotraumatic: modern approaches

In recent decades, pragmatics has begun to develop not only within the framework of linguistics, but also in interaction with cognitive science, psychology and neuroscience. As a result, new directions such as cognitive pragmatics and neuropragmatics have been formed.

Cognitive pragmatics studies how communicative meaning is formed in the human brain. According to this approach, to understand the speaker's intention, the listener relies not only on linguistic knowledge, but also on previous experience, encyclopedic knowledge, social norms and situational context. Therefore, the same expression can express different meanings in different communicative situations.

Modern research shows that understanding indirect communicative acts is carried out as a result of complex cognitive processes in the human brain (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). To determine the speaker's intention, the listener evaluates not only the lexical meaning of words, but also intonation, facial expressions, gestures, and other elements of the communicative situation.

Neuropragmatics studies the neurobiological basis of these processes. Studies have shown that during the interpretation of metaphor, irony, humor, and indirect communicative acts, different areas of the brain are activated simultaneously. This indicates that pragmatic meaning is processed not only through language mechanisms, but also through broader cognitive networks.

From this point of view, a communicative act should be evaluated not only as a linguistic event, but also as a psychological and cognitive event. In the process of communication, the speaker and the listener mutually perform various cognitive operations. The speaker encodes his intention, and the listener interprets this intention based on the available context and prior knowledge.

We believe that the modern pragmatic analysis of communicative acts should not be limited to the classical speech act theory. Although Austin (1975) and Searle (1969) explained the structure and functions of communicative acts, modern cognitive pragmatics explains in more detail how these acts are processed in the human brain. Therefore, applying classical pragmatic theories in combination with cognitive and neuroscientific approaches in the analysis of communicative situations allows for more complete results.

3.6. Concept of communicative act and Speech Act Theory

In real communication, interlocutors express certain ideas and perform various actions in order to support those ideas or to exert a certain influence on the other party. These actions can cause the expressed sentences to be understood in different ways. Such purposeful behaviors are called communicative acts or speech acts.

A communicative act is an action performed by the speaker with the intention of conveying information to the listener, influencing him or achieving a certain goal. Since many communicative acts are performed through oral speech, some researchers prefer to use the term "speech act". However, we believe that the term "communicative act" has a broader meaning. Because it is possible to warn, agree, protest, express gratitude, or show a certain attitude not only by verbal means, but also by gestures, facial expressions, and other non-verbal means.

The theory of communicative act is one of the main directions of pragmatics. This theory studies how words are used not only to convey information but also to perform various actions. In other words, communicative act theory examines the functional side of language units and explains what role they play in social interaction.

The theory of the communicative act was founded by the Oxford philosopher Austin (1975) and later developed more systematically by the American philosopher Searle (1969).

Austin (1975) believed that when any sentence is expressed, three different acts are actually performed:

- act of locution;
- illocutionary act;
- act of perlocution.

A locutionary act is the pronunciation of a sentence that expresses a certain meaning. At this stage, the speaker simply expresses a certain idea, and mainly narrative sentences are used.

The act of illocution is the speaker expressing that sentence with a certain communicative purpose. It includes various communicative intentions such as informing, commanding, warning, requesting, promising, and committing. The same sentence can have different illocutionary force depending on different intonation and communicative purpose.

The act of perlocution is related to the effect the speaker wants to create on the listener. At this time, the speaker tries to convince or change the other party's mind, induce action, surprise, or create a certain emotional reaction.

The practical application of Austin's theory (1975) can be observed in the following examples:

- *Please leave my office.*
- *You will leave my office.*
- *Will you leave my office?*

Although these three sentences relate to the same situation, they have different illocutionary forces. The first sentence is a request, the second is a command or prediction, and the third is a question. So, the same content can be expressed with different communicative purposes.

Another important division of communicative acts is their direct and indirect forms. In direct communicative acts, the speaker clearly expresses what he wants to say. For example, the sentence "Give me the salt" at the table is considered a direct communicative act. In indirect communicative acts, there is a difference between the meaning expressed by the speaker and the real meaning he wants to convey. Pragmatic context plays a key role in explaining such acts.

For example, "*You are standing in my way*" literally means "*You stand in my way*". However, in most communicative situations, the purpose of this statement is not just to inform the other party. Actually, the speaker means "*Get out of my way*". Here, the listener can determine the hidden meaning only from the context.

Thus, the successful understanding of a communicative act depends not only on the semantic content of the sentence, but also on the situation, the shared knowledge of the participants, and the communicative context.

3.7. Searle's Classification of Communicative Acts and Contribution to the Theory

One of the researchers who played an important role in the development of the theory of communicative acts was Searle (1969). He developed the ideas put forward by Austin (1975) in his work in a more systematic way and gave a classification of communicative acts. Searle (1969) believed that each communicative act is carried out based on certain rules and conditions. Therefore, the successful execution of each act depends on the fulfillment of these conditions.

For example, when a person makes a promise, he first determines the action he intends to perform in the future and then expresses it. The listener also expects the performance of that action. However, neither the speaker nor the listener is completely sure that this action will definitely occur. The speaker simply takes on a certain obligation.

Searle (1969) noted that each communicative act is accompanied by a certain psychological state. In other words, a communicative act not only conveys certain information, but also expresses the speaker's belief, desire, intention, or attitude.

For example, when we express the sentence "*It is snowing.*", we express our belief that it is snowing. In the sentence "*Give me some water.*", we want the other party to perform a certain action. Another sentence, "*I will arrive in five minutes.*", reflects the speaker's intention regarding a future action.

Based on these principles, Searle (1969) divided communicative acts into five main categories.

Assertives. They serve the speaker to provide information about any event or situation, express an opinion, or confirm a certain fact.

Here are included:

- descriptions;
- statements;
- explanations;
- predictions;
- conclusions.

In these types of acts, the speaker shows that he believes that the expressed idea is true.

Directives. They aim to induce the listener to perform a certain action.

They include:

- commands;
- requests;
- recommendations;
- advice;
- instructions.

The main goal here is to influence the behavior of the other party.

Commissives. In commissive acts, the speaker commits to his future behavior.

They are:

- promises;
- oaths;
- guarantees;
- proposals;
- obligations.

In such communicative acts, the speaker demonstrates that he is responsible for his future actions.

Expressives. They express the emotional and psychological state of the speaker.

This group includes:

- greetings;
- thanks;
- congratulations;
- apologies;
- condolences;
- expressions of regret.

The main purpose of these acts isn't to provide information, but to express the speaker's attitude and feelings.

Declaratives. Declarative acts are communicative actions that change social or legal status.

Examples of these include:

- hiring;
- firing;
- declaring a marriage;
- declaring war;
- passing a sentence.

Such acts produce legal or social consequences only when performed by persons with appropriate authority.

Evaluation of Searle's classification

We consider Searle's classification (1969) more systematic than Austin's (1975) classification. Because Austin (1975) didn't group communicative acts based on precise criteria. As a result, some categories in his classification overlap and their boundaries aren't fully defined.

Searle (1969), on the other hand, managed to systematize communicative acts in terms of their function, purpose, and psychological direction. Therefore, his classification allows us to distinguish different types of communicative acts more clearly.

At the same time, it should be noted that the development of the concept of indirect communicative act is also one of Searle's (1969) contributions. In indirect communicative acts, a difference arises between the speaker's expressed meaning and the true meaning he wants to convey, and the determination of this difference depends on the correct interpretation of the pragmatic context.

We think that communicative acts don't operate in isolation from each other. They are formed as a result of the interaction of unexpressed beliefs, intentions, assumptions, and other psychological states.

For example, "*I'll treat you to dinner.*" The sentence isn't just a promise to have dinner in the future. This expression also includes the speaker's understanding of the restaurant, monetary relations, social norms of behavior, and acceptance. Therefore, the correct interpretation of a communicative act is determined not only by the lexical and grammatical meaning of the sentence, but also by the common knowledge ground that exists between the speaker and the listener.

3.8. Theoretical significance of the Speech Act theory

The theory of the communicative act isn't only a theory that explains the function of language to transmit information. This theory examines the purposes for which language units are used in various social situations and how they affect the interactions between people. Therefore, the theory of the communicative act is considered one of the most important directions of pragmatics.

The theory of the speech act is of great importance in the philosophy of language not only for demonstrating the broad meaning of language, but also for explaining many fundamental problems. These problems include the difference between the speaker's expressed meaning and the traditional meaning of the sentence, the interaction of semantics and pragmatics, as well as the limits of linguistic knowledge.

The speaker's expressed meaning doesn't always fully coincide with the lexical or grammatical meaning of the sentence. In some cases, the speaker does not intend the literal meaning of the sentence, but rather, through that expression, he realizes a different communicative purpose. This difference is especially clearly observed in indirect communicative acts, metaphors, irony and sarcastic expressions.

Thus, the difference between the speaker's meaning and the semantic meaning of the sentence is one of the main problems of the theory of communicative acts. The main question here is to what extent this difference coincides with the difference between context-independent semantic meaning and context-dependent pragmatic meaning.

The correct interpretation of communicative acts is not limited to determining the lexical meaning of language units. This process requires taking into account the speaker's intention, the listener's expectations, the communication situation, and the common knowledge of the participants. That is why pragmatic analysis plays a crucial role in the study of communicative acts.

The explanation of communicative acts shouldn't be limited only to the framework of classical speech act theory. Modern pragmatic research shows the importance of taking into account the results of cognitive linguistics, neurolinguistics, and behavioral sciences to explain communicative processes. In particular, research conducted in recent years has revealed the need to reassess the role given to the inference process in Neo-Gricean approaches (Levinson, 2000; Horn, 2004; Gibbs, 2002).

The purpose of this article is to link existing theoretical approaches to the cognitive analysis of communicative acts with modern scientific development directions. The development of this field should not be limited only to evolutionary theory, but should also be based on the results obtained by cognitive science, neuroscience, and social psychology. This approach can create conditions for a more complete explanation of the essence of communicative acts and the development of pragmatic theories in new directions.

Since it is not possible to analyze all aspects of the presented approach in detail within the framework of a single article, the theoretical propositions put forward here can be considered as a conceptual basis for future research.

3.9. An integrative model for the pragmatic analysis of communicative situations

The theoretical approaches considered above show that the explanation of the communicative situation is not fully possible within the framework of only one theory. Each approach explains a certain aspect of the communication process, and in this respect they complement each other.

Jakobson (1960) explained the organization of the communication process by identifying the structural components of the communicative situation. In his model, communication is based on the interaction of such basic elements as the addressee, the message, the context, the code and the connection. Although this model determines the general structure of the communicative situation, it does not fully explain how the speaker's intention is formed and how the listener interprets it.

This gap is to some extent filled by Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. Grice (1975) shows that the successful understanding of a communicative act depends on cooperation between the speaker and the listener. The maxims of quantity, quality, appropriateness and expressiveness that he put forward help the listener determine the speaker's true intention.

Sperber and Wilson (1995) explain the cognitive mechanism of the communicative process and show that the listener chooses the option that provides the highest cognitive benefit and requires the least cognitive effort from among the possible interpretations. This approach allows for a more detailed explanation of the understanding of indirect communicative acts, metaphors, and irony.

Austin (1975) and Searle (1969), examining the functional characteristics of communicative acts, show that the speaker not only transmits information, but also performs certain social actions. The purpose of the communicative act is to influence the behavior, thought, or emotional state of the listener. Thus, communication is considered a form of social activity.

Modern cognitive pragmatics and neuropragmatics, on the other hand, examine the psychological and neurobiological foundations of these processes and explain how communicative meaning is processed in the human brain. These approaches show that the interpretation of a communicative act is based not only on linguistic knowledge, but also on previous experience, general encyclopedic knowledge, social norms, and situational context.

We claim that the pragmatic analysis of a communicative situation can be carried out based on the following sequence:

1. A communicative situation is formed, and its participants, purpose, context, and means of communication are determined.
2. The speaker forms his communicative intention and encodes it by verbal or non-verbal means.
3. A communicative act is performed. At this stage, the acts of locution, illocution and perlocution described by Austin (1975) and Searle (1969) are realized.
4. The listener tries to determine the speaker's true intention using Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle and the communicative context.
5. During the process of cognitive interpretation, the listener determines the pragmatic meaning of the statement by combining his existing knowledge, previous experience and situational information.
6. A communicative result is achieved. If the speaker's purpose and the listener's interpretation coincide, the communicative situation is considered successful. Otherwise, a communicative deficiency or communicative failure occurs.

Thus, the integrative model we propose assesses the communicative situation not as static, but as a dynamic process. In this model, communication is presented as a multilevel activity formed as a result of the interaction of structural, functional and cognitive components. We believe that such an approach allows us to connect classical pragmatic theories with modern cognitive directions and to explain communicative situations more fully.

Table 1. Integrative pragmatic model of the communicative situation

Communicative situation → Speaker's intention → Communicative act (Austin – Searle) → Cooperation principle (Grice) → Cognitive interpretation → Pragmatic meaning → Communicative result (Sperber & Wilson) (success/failure)

CONCLUSION

The present research shows that the pragmatic analysis of communicative situations requires taking into account not only the semantic properties of language units but also the communicative conditions in which they are used, the speaker's intention, and the listener's interpretation process. A communicative situation is a multi-component and dynamic system formed through the interaction of verbal and non-verbal means, social relations, and cognitive processes.

The article analyzed the main components of communicative situations, identified the causes of communicative failures, and demonstrated the role of context, shared knowledge, and communicative strategies in overcoming them. It was determined that the main condition for communicative success is ensuring mutual understanding between participants and the effective achievement of communicative goals.

Within the framework of the study, the Cooperative Principle, speech act theory, Relevance Theory, as well as modern approaches in cognitive pragmatics and neuropragmatics, were comparatively analyzed. It was determined that each of these theories explains different aspects of the communication process and that they complement one another.

One of the main results of the study is the proposal of an integrative pragmatic model for the analysis of communicative situations. In this model, the communicative situation is presented as a unified process, beginning with the formation of the speaker's intention, continuing through the realization of the communicative act and its interpretation by the listener, and ending with the achievement of the intended communicative outcome. The proposed model allows for a more comprehensive explanation of communicative processes by linking classical speech act theory with modern cognitive-pragmatic approaches.

Thus, the pragmatic analysis of communicative situations remains a relevant field of research not only in linguistics but also in cognitive science, psychology, and communication theory. Future studies may further investigate communicative acts using the methods of experimental pragmatics, corpus linguistics, and artificial intelligence technologies, thereby contributing to the further development of this field.

FUNDING INFORMATION

The author states that no funding was involved in the research or preparation of this article.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Elmira Huseynova: Conceptualization (lead); methodology (lead); investigation (lead); formal analysis (lead); writing – original draft (lead); writing – review and editing (lead).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The author declares that there are no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data availability does not apply to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

REFERENCES

1. Arundale, R. (2020). *Communicating & relating: Constituting face in everyday interacting*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190210199.001.0001>
2. Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001>
3. Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. University of Texas Press.
4. Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Clark, H. H., & Bly, B. (1995). Pragmatics and discourse. In J. L. Miller & P. D. Eimas (Eds.), *Speech, language, and communication* (pp. 3–50). Academic Press.
6. Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. John Murray.
7. van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Keil, G. & Poscher, R. (2016). Vagueness and Law. Philosophical and Legal Perspectives. In Geert Keil & Ralf Poscher, *Vagueness and Law: Philosophical and Legal Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1-20.
9. Gibbs, R. W., Jr. (2002). A new look at literal meaning in understanding what is said and implicated. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(4), 457–486. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00046-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00046-7)

10. Goodwin, J. (2021). The pragmatics and argumentation interface. *Languages*, 8(3).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030210>
11. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, *Speech acts*, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
12. Gorodetsky, B. Yu. (1990). *Ot lingvistiki yazyka k lingvistike obshcheniya*. In *Yazyk i sotsial'noye poznaniye* (pp. 39–56). Tsentr. Sovet Filos. (Metodol.) Seminarov pri Prezidiume AN SSSR.
13. Horn, L. R. (2004). Implicature. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 3–28). Blackwell.
14. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
15. Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350–377). MIT Press.
16. Jaszczolt, K. M., & Allan, K. (Eds.). (2016). *Evolutionary pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton.
17. Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292–305.
18. Lanius, D. (2019). *Strategic indeterminacy in the law*. Oxford University Press.
19. Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
20. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. MIT Press.
22. Mamych, M. V. (2021). Verbal and linguocultural content of a text. *Ukrainian Language*, (2), 18–32.
<http://jnas.nbuv.gov.ua/article/UJRN-0001293940>
23. Nowak, M. A., & Sigmund, K. (2005). Evolution of indirect reciprocity. *Nature*, 437(7063), 1291–1298.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04131>
24. Reich, W. (2011). The cooperative nature of communicative acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43. 1349- 1365.
10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.024.
25. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
26. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
27. Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of human communication*. MIT Press.

BIOGRAPHY OF AUTHOR

Elmira Huseynova is an Associate Professor and holds a PhD in Philology. She is currently an English Language Teacher at Azerbaijan Technical University, Baku, Azerbaijan. Her research interests include pragmatics, discourse analysis, communicative meaning, pragmatic inference, cognitive approaches to language, and contemporary issues in linguistics. Her research focuses particularly on the relationship between linguistic form, communicative context, speaker intention, and interpretation.

In the present study, she developed the theoretical framework, conducted a comparative analysis of classical and contemporary approaches to communicative situations, and was responsible for interpreting and synthesizing the findings and preparing the manuscript.

Google Scholar: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=c1oqCDkAAAAJ&hl=en>

Web of Science ResearcherID: MGU-2034-2025