HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS ON THE EXAMPLES OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Xudaybergenova Sevara Kuralbay qizi
English teacher at the "Yangi-asr" Non-state Educational Institution
Sevaraxudaybergenova09@gmail.com
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23214555

Abstract. This article investigates the linguistic and pragmatic characteristics of directive speech acts in English and Uzbek from a comparative perspective. Directive speech acts constitute an important category of communicative actions through which speakers attempt to influence the behavior of hearers by expressing commands, requests, advice, suggestions, invitations, warnings, and prohibitions. The study focuses on the ways in which these communicative intentions are realized through direct and indirect linguistic constructions in English and Uzbek. Particular attention is given to imperative structures, interrogative forms, modal expressions, politeness markers, respectful forms, contextual factors, social distance, and power relations. The comparative analysis demonstrates that English and Uzbek share universal pragmatic functions of directive speech acts, while differing in their preferred linguistic and sociocultural realization. English commonly employs modal interrogatives, hedging devices, and indirect request strategies to reduce the degree of imposition, whereas Uzbek frequently combines respectful grammatical forms, conditional constructions, politeness expressions, and culturally determined forms of address. The findings highlight the importance of pragmatic and intercultural competence in successful communication and have practical implications for foreign language teaching, translation studies, and cross-cultural communication.

Keywords: directive speech acts, pragmatics, English language, Uzbek language, politeness, indirectness, speech act theory, intercultural communication.

Introduction. Language serves not only as a means of exchanging information but also as a fundamental instrument through which people perform social, interpersonal, and communicative actions. In everyday interaction, speakers do not simply produce grammatical sentences; they use language to request information, give orders, offer advice, make suggestions, invite others, express warnings, and encourage or prevent particular actions. Such communicative activities are commonly investigated within pragmatics, particularly through the theory of speech acts. Among different categories of speech acts, directive speech acts occupy a significant position because they are directly related to the speaker's intention to influence the hearer's future behavior. The theoretical foundations of speech act theory are primarily associated with J. L. Austin, who demonstrated that language can be used to perform actions rather than merely describe states of affairs. Austin distinguished between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts and emphasized the importance of the

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

communicative force of an utterance [1]. Building on Austin's ideas, John R. Searle developed a more systematic classification of illocutionary acts and identified directives as one of the major categories of speech acts [2]. According to Searle, the essential purpose of a directive is for the speaker to attempt to get the hearer to perform some future action. Commands, requests, questions, advice, invitations, and prohibitions can therefore be understood as different realizations of the directive function. Directive speech acts are particularly interesting from a pragmatic perspective because the same communicative intention can be expressed through different grammatical structures. For instance, the English imperative "Open the window" represents a relatively direct directive, whereas "Could you open the window?" is grammatically interrogative but pragmatically functions as a request. Similarly, "Would you mind opening the window?" represents a more indirect and mitigated form. These examples demonstrate that the grammatical form of an utterance does not necessarily correspond directly to its communicative function. A similar phenomenon can be observed in Uzbek. The directive "Derazani och" is a direct imperative, while "Derazani ochib yuborsangiz" or "Iltimos, derazani ochib yuboring" can express a more polite and indirect request. Therefore, both English and Uzbek provide speakers with various linguistic resources for expressing directive intentions. Nevertheless, the choice of a particular form is influenced by pragmatic and sociocultural factors, including the relationship between the participants, their age, social status, degree of familiarity, communicative setting, and the level of imposition associated with the requested action. Politeness is one of the most important factors influencing the realization of directive speech acts. Since a directive may impose an action on the hearer, speakers often employ different strategies to minimize the potential threat to the hearer's social image or "face." Brown and Levinson's politeness theory emphasizes that certain communicative acts, including requests and commands, can constitute face-threatening acts and therefore require appropriate politeness strategies [3]. Such strategies may include indirectness, modal expressions, hedging, apologies, honorific forms, and politeness markers. In English, indirectness is frequently achieved through modal verbs and interrogative structures. Expressions such as "Could you help me?", "Would you mind closing the door?", and "Would it be possible to send me the document?" allow the speaker to formulate a request without presenting it as an explicit command. The use of please, modal verbs, and mitigating expressions can further reduce the perceived imposition. However, the choice between direct and indirect forms is highly dependent on context. A direct imperative may be perfectly appropriate in an emergency, classroom instruction, workplace communication, or communication between close friends.

Uzbek also demonstrates a rich system of pragmatic strategies for expressing directives. Respectful forms of address, polite imperative forms, conditional constructions, lexical expressions such as "iltimos", and context-dependent expressions contribute to the mitigation of directive force. For example, the difference between "Kitobni ber", "Kitobni bering", and "Iltimos, kitobni berib yuborsangiz" reflects different degrees of social distance, respect, and politeness. Consequently, Uzbek directive speech acts cannot be fully understood without considering the cultural norms

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

governing interpersonal relationships. The comparative study of English and Uzbek directives is particularly significant because the two languages represent different linguistic systems and communicative traditions. Although speakers of both languages have similar communicative needs, they may use different linguistic strategies to achieve the same pragmatic goal. Cultural expectations concerning hierarchy, age, respect, individual autonomy, solidarity, and social distance can influence how directives are formulated and interpreted. Social power is another important factor in the realization of directive speech acts. The relationship between a teacher and a student, employer and employee, parent and child, or close friends may determine which linguistic form is considered appropriate. In Uzbek communicative culture, age and social status can play a particularly visible role in determining the choice of respectful or informal forms. In English, although power relations are also relevant, speakers in many contexts tend to place considerable emphasis on minimizing imposition and maintaining the interlocutor's autonomy. The comparative investigation of directive speech acts is also important for foreign language learning. Grammatical competence alone does not guarantee successful communication. A learner may produce a grammatically correct English sentence but unintentionally sound too direct, demanding, or impolite because of transferring pragmatic patterns from the native language. For Uzbek learners of English, understanding the pragmatic differences between Uzbek and English directive strategies can help reduce negative pragmatic transfer and improve communicative competence.

For example, an Uzbek learner might directly translate "Eshikni oching" as "Open the door" in a situation where an English speaker would more naturally say "Could you open the door, please?" Although the first expression is grammatically correct, its pragmatic appropriateness depends on the relationship and context. Such differences demonstrate why pragmatic instruction should accompany grammatical and lexical instruction in English language education. The present study is therefore motivated by the need to identify both universal and language-specific characteristics of directive speech acts in English and Uzbek. A comparative analysis can reveal how similar communicative intentions are structured differently across languages and how cultural norms influence linguistic choices. It can also contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between grammar, pragmatics, politeness, and culture. The aim of this study is to conduct a comparative linguistic and pragmatic analysis of directive speech acts in English and Uzbek, with particular attention to their forms, functions, degrees of directness, politeness strategies, and sociocultural determinants.

To achieve this aim, the study pursues the following objectives: to examine the theoretical foundations of directive speech acts within speech act theory, to identify the major types of directive speech acts in English and Uzbek, to analyze direct and indirect strategies for realizing directives in the two languages, to examine the role of politeness, social distance, and power relations in directive communication, to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek directive constructions, to determine the implications of these differences for intercultural communication and English language teaching. The object of the research is directive speech acts occurring in English and

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Uzbek communicative discourse. The subject of the research is the linguistic, pragmatic, and sociocultural mechanisms through which directive intentions are expressed and interpreted in English and Uzbek. The scientific significance of the study lies in its comparative examination of directive speech acts as a point of interaction between language structure, communicative intention, and cultural norms. The findings may contribute to research in comparative pragmatics, intercultural communication, contrastive linguistics, and speech act theory. The practical significance of the study is associated with its potential application in English language teaching, translation, language assessment, and intercultural communication. Understanding how directives are formulated in different languages can help learners develop pragmatic competence and use English more appropriately in real-life communicative situations. Thus, the comparative study of directive speech acts in English and Uzbek provides an important framework for understanding how speakers of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds perform similar communicative actions through different linguistic strategies. Such research not only contributes to pragmatic theory but also supports more effective and culturally sensitive communication between English- and Uzbek-speaking communities.

Literature review. The study of directive speech acts has developed significantly within pragmatics, speech act theory, discourse analysis, and intercultural communication. Researchers have examined directives from different perspectives, including their philosophical foundations, linguistic realization, pragmatic functions, politeness strategies, and cultural variation. The theoretical and empirical literature provides an important basis for comparing directive speech acts in English and Uzbek. One of the fundamental theoretical contributions to speech act research was made by J. L. Austin in his influential work How to Do Things with Words. Austin challenged the traditional view that language primarily describes facts and demonstrated that utterances can also perform actions [1]. He distinguished between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. The illocutionary dimension is particularly relevant to directive speech acts because it concerns the communicative force or intention associated with an utterance. From this perspective, saying something may simultaneously constitute an action such as requesting, ordering, advising, or warning. John R. Searle further developed Austin’s theory and established a more systematic classification of speech acts. He divided illocutionary acts into representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations [2]. Directives were defined as attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to perform some future action. Searle's classification remains one of the most influential theoretical frameworks for the study of directives. According to this approach, commands, requests, questions, advice, and invitations can be interpreted as different manifestations of the directive category. Searle's work is particularly important for comparative research because it provides a functional basis for analyzing directive expressions regardless of their grammatical form. For example, an English interrogative such as “Could you open the door?” has the grammatical form of a question but performs the pragmatic function of a request. Similarly, an Uzbek construction such as “Eshikni ochib yuborsangiz” may formally appear as a conditional construction while functioning pragmatically as a polite request. Thus, speech act theory

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

allows researchers to distinguish between the grammatical structure of an utterance and its communicative function. Another major contribution to the study of directives is associated with politeness theory. Brown and Levinson proposed that certain speech acts constitute face-threatening acts because they may threaten an individual's desire to maintain social approval or personal autonomy [3]. Requests, commands, and other directives may impose an action on the hearer and therefore potentially threaten the hearer's negative face. Speakers consequently employ various politeness strategies to reduce the force of such acts. Brown and Levinson identify several broad politeness strategies, including bald-on-record strategies, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategies [3]. These categories are highly relevant to directive speech acts. A direct imperative such as "Close the window" can represent a bald-on-record directive, whereas "Could you possibly close the window?" represents a more mitigated strategy. Similar distinctions can be identified in Uzbek, although the linguistic resources used to express politeness may differ from those commonly found in English. Research in second-language pragmatics has also emphasized the problem of pragmatic transfer. Kasper and Rose demonstrate that learners may transfer pragmatic patterns from their first language when communicating in a second language [10]. Such transfer can result in pragmatic failure even when the learner's grammatical knowledge is adequate. This issue is particularly relevant to Uzbek learners of English, who may transfer culturally familiar patterns of politeness, directness, or address into English communication. The distinction between pragmatic competence and grammatical competence is therefore important in English language teaching. A learner may know the grammatical structure of modal verbs such as could and would but may not know when or why these forms should be used to mitigate a request. Similarly, an Uzbek learner may understand the lexical meaning of please but may not fully understand how its use interacts with social distance and the degree of imposition.

Directive Speech Acts in English. Previous research indicates that English provides a wide range of linguistic strategies for realizing directives. The imperative is one of the most direct forms:

"Close the door."

However, English speakers frequently use interrogative and modal structures to soften requests:

"Can you close the door?"

"Could you close the door, please?"

"Would you mind closing the door?"

These constructions differ in their degree of directness and pragmatic force. Modal verbs such as can, could, would, and might can contribute to the mitigation of directives. The use of please, hedges, apologies, and introductory expressions can further reduce the perceived imposition. The literature suggests that English request behavior is particularly sensitive to contextual variables such as social distance, relative power, and the degree of imposition. A request directed toward a close friend may be expressed more directly than a request directed toward a stranger, teacher, manager, or other socially distant interlocutor.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Directive Speech Acts in Uzbek. Uzbek directive speech acts have their own linguistic and sociocultural characteristics. The imperative mood plays an important role in expressing commands and requests. However, the pragmatic force of an imperative may vary depending on grammatical person, respectful forms, lexical choices, intonation, and context.

For example:

“Kitobni ber.”

“Kitobni bering.”

“Iltimos, kitobni berib yuboring.”

These expressions refer to a similar communicative action but differ in their interpersonal force. The first may be appropriate in an informal relationship, whereas the second and third can indicate greater respect or politeness. Uzbek directive communication is also closely associated with culturally established forms of address. Respect toward older people, teachers, parents, and socially respected individuals may influence the selection of directive forms. Consequently, age, status, familiarity, and kinship relations may play a significant role in determining the appropriate linguistic form.

Conditional constructions can also contribute to the indirect expression of requests:

“Kitobni berib yuborsangiz.”

In appropriate contexts, such a construction does not function simply as a conditional statement but can pragmatically communicate a polite request. This illustrates the importance of contextual interpretation in Uzbek directive speech acts.

Comparative Perspective. The reviewed literature demonstrates that English and Uzbek share several fundamental characteristics in their realization of directive speech acts. Both languages distinguish between direct and indirect directives and employ linguistic strategies to regulate interpersonal relationships. Commands, requests, advice, invitations, warnings, and prohibitions occur in both languages. However, important differences can be observed in the linguistic mechanisms used to express politeness and indirectness. English commonly relies on modal interrogatives, hedging, and conventionalized request formulas. Uzbek frequently combines imperative morphology, respectful forms, conditional constructions, politeness markers, and contextually determined address forms.

Although directive speech acts have been extensively studied in English and in cross-cultural pragmatics, comparatively fewer studies provide a systematic contrastive analysis of English and Uzbek directive strategies from linguistic, pragmatic, and sociocultural perspectives. Existing research often focuses either on general speech act theory or on English-language requests without sufficiently considering the specific pragmatic resources of Uzbek. A further research gap concerns the relationship between linguistic realization and sociocultural variables. In particular, age, social status, power relations, familiarity, and cultural expectations can significantly affect the interpretation and production of directives, but these factors require further systematic comparison between English and Uzbek. Another important gap concerns the implications of directive differences for English language education in Uzbekistan. Learners may experience pragmatic difficulties when transferring Uzbek

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

communicative patterns into English. Therefore, comparative research can provide useful insights for developing teaching materials that explicitly address pragmatic competence. The present study attempts to address these gaps by examining directive speech acts in English and Uzbek from three interconnected perspectives: linguistic structure, pragmatic function, and sociocultural context. Such an integrated approach makes it possible to identify not only formal differences between the two languages but also the cultural principles underlying their communicative use. Overall, the reviewed literature provides a strong theoretical foundation for the present research. Austin and Searle establish the conceptual basis of speech act theory, while Brown and Levinson, Leech, Blum-Kulka and other scholars provide frameworks for analyzing politeness, indirectness, and cross-cultural variation. At the same time, research in second-language pragmatics demonstrates the importance of comparative analysis for foreign language education. Building upon these theoretical perspectives, the present study focuses specifically on the similarities and differences between English and Uzbek directive speech acts and their implications for intercultural communication.

Results and discussion. The comparative analysis of directive speech acts in English and Uzbek demonstrates that the two languages share a common communicative purpose but differ considerably in the linguistic and pragmatic strategies used to express that purpose. In both languages, speakers use directives to influence the behavior of hearers by requesting, ordering, advising, suggesting, inviting, warning, or prohibiting particular actions. However, the degree of directness, the choice of grammatical structures, the use of politeness markers, and the influence of social relations vary according to linguistic and cultural norms. The results of the analysis can be grouped into several major areas: direct and indirect realization of directives, linguistic realization of requests, politeness strategies, the role of social distance and power, cultural factors, and implications for intercultural communication.

General Characteristics of Directive Speech Acts. The analysis demonstrates that directives in both English and Uzbek can be classified into several major functional categories:

1. commands;
2. requests;
3. advice;
4. suggestions;
5. invitations;
6. warnings;
7. prohibitions;
8. instructions.

Although these categories occur in both languages, their realization is not identical. The same communicative intention can be expressed through different grammatical forms depending on the relationship between the speaker and hearer.

For example, the English expression:

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

"Open the window."

and the Uzbek expression:

"Derazani och."

represent relatively direct commands. In both cases, the speaker explicitly indicates the action expected from the hearer.

However, the same intention can be expressed more indirectly:

"Could you open the window, please?"

"Derazani ochib yuborsangiz."

The comparison demonstrates that directness is not determined exclusively by grammatical structure. It is also related to pragmatic intention and contextual interpretation.

Directives and Degree of Directness. One of the most significant findings is that both English and Uzbek possess a continuum of directive directness. At one end of the continuum are explicit commands, while at the other end are highly indirect expressions whose directive meaning is inferred from context.

The following examples illustrate this continuum in English:

"Close the door."

"Please close the door."

"Could you close the door?"

"Would you mind closing the door?"

"Is it a little cold in here?"

The first expression is a direct imperative. The second adds the politeness marker please. The third and fourth employ conventional indirectness, while the final expression can function as an indirect request depending on context.

A similar continuum can be observed in Uzbek:

"Eshikni yop."

"Eshikni yoping."

"Iltimos, eshikni yoping."

"Eshikni yopib yuborsangiz."

The Uzbek examples demonstrate that politeness and indirectness can be achieved through respectful verb forms, lexical markers, and conditional constructions. Therefore, the results support the theoretical position that speech act function cannot be determined exclusively by sentence type. A grammatical imperative may function as a command, request, instruction, or even friendly suggestion depending on context.

Comparative Analysis of Requests. Requests represent one of the most important types of directive speech acts in both languages. The analysis indicates that English speakers frequently use modal verbs and interrogative constructions when making requests.

Common English patterns include:

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

"Can you help me?"

"Could you help me?"

"Would you mind helping me?"

"Could you possibly send me the document?"

These expressions reduce the directness of the directive and provide the hearer with a greater sense of choice.

Uzbek requests may be expressed through several different structures:

"Menga yordam bera olasizmi?"

"Iltimos, menga yordam bering."

"Menga yordam berib yuborsangiz."

"Vaqtingiz bo'lsa, menga yordam bersangiz."

The comparison indicates that Uzbek also possesses highly developed mechanisms for indirect requests. However, the linguistic realization often relies more heavily on respectful grammatical forms, conditional constructions, lexical politeness markers, and contextual factors. Thus, the major difference does not lie in the existence or absence of indirectness. Rather, it lies in the preferred linguistic means of expressing indirectness.

The Influence of Social Distance. Social distance was found to be an important factor in the choice of directive strategy. Speakers tend to use more direct forms when communicating with people with whom they have a close relationship, while greater indirectness is generally preferred in socially distant relationships.

For example, in English, a person might say to a close friend:

"Give me your phone."

whereas in a formal situation the same communicative goal may be expressed as:

"Could you please give me your phone for a moment?"

Uzbek demonstrates a similar distinction:

"Telefoningni ber."

versus:

"Iltimos, telefoningizni bir daqiqaga berib tursangiz."

The difference involves not only lexical choices but also grammatical marking of respect. The analysis therefore indicates that directive speech acts are highly sensitive to interpersonal distance. The closer the relationship, the more acceptable direct forms may become. Conversely, greater social distance generally increases the need for politeness and mitigation.

The Role of Power and Social Status. Power relations also significantly influence directive strategies. The relationship between a teacher and student, employer and employee, parent and child, or manager and subordinate can determine the degree of directness considered appropriate.

For example, an English teacher may say:

"Please open your books."

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

or

“Could everyone open their books, please?”

A similar directive in Uzbek may be expressed as:

“Kitoblaringizni oching.”

or:

“Iltimos, kitoblaringizni oching.”

In both languages, individuals with greater institutional authority may have more freedom to use direct directives. However, professional norms can encourage mitigation even when the speaker has greater power. The Uzbek context is particularly interesting because age and status may intersect with power relations. A younger speaker addressing an older person may select a respectful form even when the younger person has some institutional authority. Thus, directive formulation may depend not only on formal power but also on culturally established expectations concerning age and respect.

Cultural Differences in Directive Communication. One of the most important findings is that directive speech acts are strongly influenced by cultural norms. English-speaking communication, particularly in many formal and professional settings, frequently emphasizes individual autonomy. Consequently, speakers may prefer indirect request forms that give the hearer an apparent choice:

“Would you be able to send me the file?”

Such constructions reduce the impression that the speaker is imposing an obligation.

Uzbek communication also values politeness and respect, but these values are frequently connected with age, social hierarchy, kinship, hospitality, and interpersonal solidarity. The choice of a directive may therefore reflect the speaker's relationship with the hearer. For example, the use of respectful verb forms in Uzbek can communicate not simply grammatical plurality but also social respect. This makes grammatical morphology an important component of pragmatic meaning. Therefore, cultural context should be considered when interpreting directive speech acts. A form that is perceived as polite in one language may not have precisely the same pragmatic effect in another language.

Comparative Table of Directive Strategies

Communicative function	**English**	**Uzbek**	**Main difference**
Direct command	Open the door.	Eshikni och.	Imperative in both languages
Polite command	Please open the door.	Iltimos, eshikni oching.	English uses please; Uzbek combines iltimos and respectful form
Indirect request	Could you help me?	Menga yordam bera olasizmi?	Modal/interrogative structures in both
Highly polite request	Would you mind helping me?	Yordam berib yuborsangiz.	Different mitigation mechanisms

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Advice	You should rest.	Dam olishingiz kerak.	Modal/advisory constructions
Suggestion	Why don't we start?	Boshlasak-chi?	Interrogative/conditional strategies
Warning	Be careful!	Ehtiyot bo‘ling!	Similar functional structure
Prohibition	Don't touch it.	Bunga tegmang.	Negative imperative
Invitation	Would you like to join us?	Bizga qo‘shilasizmi?	Different conventional formulas

The table confirms that the basic communicative functions are largely universal, whereas their linguistic realization is language-specific.

Directives in Formal and Informal Contexts. The analysis also demonstrates that the communicative context strongly affects directive formulation.

In informal English conversations, direct forms may be relatively common:

“Come in.”

“Take a seat.”

“Give me a minute.”

These expressions are not necessarily interpreted as impolite because the social relationship and context reduce their perceived force.

Similarly, Uzbek speakers may use direct imperatives among close friends or family members:

“Kel.”

“O‘tir.”

“Bir daqiqa kut.”

However, the same forms may be inappropriate when directed toward an unfamiliar person or an older interlocutor. This demonstrates that directness itself should not automatically be equated with impoliteness. Pragmatic appropriateness depends on the communicative context.

The findings generally support the theoretical assumptions of Austin and Searle concerning the action-oriented nature of language. Directive utterances cannot be adequately analyzed solely according to their grammatical form because their primary significance often lies in their illocutionary function [1; 2]. The results also support Brown and Levinson's argument that directives can constitute face-threatening acts and therefore motivate politeness strategies [3]. However, the comparison of English and Uzbek suggests that politeness cannot be reduced to a universal set of linguistic formulas. Cultural norms influence which strategies are preferred and how they are interpreted. The findings are also consistent with cross-cultural pragmatic research demonstrating that speakers from different linguistic backgrounds may employ different realization patterns for equivalent speech acts [5]. English and Uzbek provide a clear example of this phenomenon: both languages have requests, commands, advice, warnings, and invitations, but their conventional realization patterns are not identical. Furthermore, the results support the importance of pragmatic competence in second-

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

language learning. Knowledge of grammatical structures is insufficient when learners need to determine which form is socially appropriate in a particular situation. Overall, the results demonstrate that directive speech acts represent an important area in which language structure, communicative intention, and culture intersect. Although English and Uzbek speakers perform broadly similar directive functions, they may rely on different linguistic resources and cultural conventions to achieve those functions. A comparative pragmatic approach is therefore essential for understanding the subtle differences between the two languages and for improving communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

Conclusion. The comparative analysis of directive speech acts in English and Uzbek demonstrates that directives constitute a significant category of communicative behavior through which speakers attempt to influence the actions, decisions, or behavior of hearers. Although English and Uzbek speakers perform similar communicative functions, the linguistic realization and pragmatic interpretation of directives are strongly influenced by the structural characteristics of each language and by culturally determined patterns of interpersonal communication. The findings indicate that both English and Uzbek employ a wide range of directive speech acts, including commands, requests, advice, suggestions, invitations, warnings, instructions, and prohibitions. These speech acts can be realized through both direct and indirect linguistic forms. Direct imperatives generally express a stronger directive force, whereas indirect constructions allow speakers to reduce the degree of imposition and maintain interpersonal harmony. The study has shown that English frequently employs modal verbs, interrogative structures, hedging devices, and conventional politeness markers to formulate indirect requests. Expressions such as “Could you...?”, “Would you mind...?”, and “Could you possibly...?” demonstrate how English speakers can mitigate the force of a directive. In Uzbek, similar pragmatic effects are achieved through respectful grammatical forms, conditional constructions, politeness markers such as “iltimos”, and culturally determined forms of address. One of the most important findings concerns the role of social distance and power relations. In both languages, the degree of familiarity between interlocutors, their relative social status, age, and the level of imposition influence the choice of directive strategy. However, Uzbek directive speech acts demonstrate a particularly strong relationship with age, respect, social hierarchy, and interpersonal solidarity. Respectful grammatical forms can therefore carry significant pragmatic meaning beyond their basic grammatical function. The study concludes that directive speech acts represent an important point of interaction between language, culture, and social behavior. English and Uzbek share universal communicative functions, but they differ in the linguistic resources and sociocultural conventions through which these functions are realized. A contrastive pragmatic approach can therefore contribute to a deeper understanding of intercultural communication and help language learners use directives more effectively and appropriately. Future research may expand the present analysis by using larger authentic speech corpora, examining gender and age differences, analyzing directives in social media

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

and digital communication, and investigating the development of pragmatic competence among Uzbek learners of English.

References

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
3. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.
6. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
7. Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students. London: Routledge.
8. Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An Introduction (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
9. Verschueren, J. (1999). Understanding Pragmatics. London: Arnold.
10. Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
11. Holmes, J. (1995). Women, Men and Politeness. London: Longman.
12. Trosborg, A. (1995). Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
13. Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? Journal of Pragmatics, 11(2), 131–146.
14. Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. Journal of Pragmatics, 14(2), 219–236.
15. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.