EURASIAN JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH
Innovative Academy Research Support Center
IF = 9.3 www.in-academy.uz/index.php/ejar

PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS IN ENGLISH, UZBEK, AND TURKISH

Kuchkarova Maftuna
Teaching English methodology department, UzSWLU
Emek Usenmez
Dr. Associate Professor, Doc. Istanbul Universitesi
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20049227

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 28th April 2026
Accepted: 05th May 2026
Online: 06th May 2026

KEYWORDS

Directive speech acts, pragmatics, English, Uzbek, Turkish, politeness, requests, cross-cultural communication.

ABSTRACT

This article examines the pragmatic functions of directive speech acts in English, Uzbek, and Turkish from a comparative perspective. Directive speech acts, including requests, commands, advice, warnings, invitations, and suggestions, are central to interpersonal communication because they aim to influence the behavior of the hearer. Drawing on speech act theory, politeness theory, and cross-cultural pragmatics, the study explores how these directives are realized and pragmatically conditioned in the three languages. The research employs a qualitative comparative method based on representative examples from scholarly literature and naturally occurring usage patterns discussed in prior studies. The findings show that while all three languages share the core illocutionary purpose of directives, they differ in the degree of directness, the choice of mitigation strategies, and the role of social hierarchy, solidarity, and cultural expectations. English tends to prefer conventionally indirect and highly mitigated forms, whereas Uzbek and Turkish allow more explicit directive forms in contexts where relational norms, age hierarchy, and shared social expectations license directness. At the same time, Uzbek and Turkish also rely heavily on honorifics, softeners, and supportive moves to maintain politeness. The article argues that directive speech acts are not merely grammatical constructions but culturally embedded pragmatic actions, and that understanding their functions is essential for intercultural communication and language teaching.

Introduction

Speech act theory treats language not only as a means of describing reality but also as a form of action. Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1975) established that utterances perform communicative acts such as requesting, ordering, promising, and apologizing. Within Searle's classification, **directives** are those speech acts by which speakers attempt to get hearers to do something. They include commands, requests,

suggestions, advice, invitations, warnings, and pleas. Indirect speech acts are especially important in this area because speakers often perform a directive through another sentence type, such as a question or statement, in order to soften force or increase politeness (Searle, 1975).

Directives are particularly significant in cross-cultural pragmatics because they are closely tied to interpersonal relations, face management, and social norms. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory explains that directives are potentially face-threatening acts because they may restrict the hearer's freedom of action. Leech (2014) similarly notes that requests and other directives display broad variation in directness, modality, and mitigation. Thomas (1983) further demonstrated that cross-cultural pragmatic failure often arises not from grammar, but from mismatches in the use and interpretation of pragmatic force. These insights are highly relevant when comparing English, Uzbek, and Turkish, since the same communicative intention may be encoded with very different degrees of explicitness and politeness across languages.

In English, requests are widely reported to favor conventionally indirect forms such as *Could you open the window?* or *Would you mind helping me?* In studies comparing English and Uzbek, English is characterized by stronger restrictions on bare imperatives in ordinary polite interaction and a greater preference for indirect requests. By contrast, Uzbek directive use is often more visibly shaped by social hierarchy, kinship relations, and cultural expectations of respect, while Turkish also shows rich use of directness combined with pragmalinguistic modifiers and socially appropriate forms. Research in Turkish pragmatics has shown that request realization patterns, directness levels, and modification strategies vary systematically by context and social relation.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the pragmatic functions of directive speech acts in English, Uzbek, and Turkish. The study addresses three questions:

1. What major directive types are shared across the three languages?
2. How do the languages differ in directness, mitigation, and sociopragmatic conditioning?
3. What pragmatic functions do directives perform beyond simple command, especially in relation to politeness, solidarity, authority, and interpersonal regulation?

Method

This study uses a **qualitative comparative research design**. Rather than collecting a new spoken corpus, it synthesizes established theoretical work on speech acts and politeness together with comparative and language-specific studies on requests and related directives in English, Uzbek, and Turkish. The method is interpretive and contrastive: representative directive patterns were grouped into functional categories and then compared across the three languages. This approach is appropriate because cross-cultural pragmatics research frequently analyzes directive realization through typologies of directness, supportive moves, and context-sensitive pragmatic choices.

The analytical framework combines four components. First, Austin's and Searle's speech act theory provides the basic distinction between locutionary form and illocutionary force (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Second, Searle's discussion of indirect speech acts is used to explain why interrogatives and declaratives often function as directives (Searle, 1975). Third, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and Leech's account of requests and other directives are used to interpret how speakers mitigate imposition and negotiate face (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Leech, 2014). Fourth, comparative pragmatics studies on request realization and directive behavior in English-Uzbek and Turkish contexts are used to identify recurrent language-specific patterns.

For analytical clarity, directive speech acts were classified into six broad subtypes: **commands**, **requests**, **suggestions**, **advice**, **warnings**, and **invitations**. Each subtype was examined in relation to three pragmatic parameters:

(a) degree of directness;
(b) use of internal and external modification;
(c) sociopragmatic constraints such as age, power, distance, and solidarity. This made it possible to compare not only what speakers say, but what they are doing socially when they say it.

Results

1. Shared directive functions across the three languages

The analysis shows that English, Uzbek, and Turkish all use directive speech acts to perform at least four major pragmatic functions:

1. **regulating action**,
2. **negotiating social relations**,
3. **displaying authority or deference**, and
4. **maintaining cooperation**.

At the most basic level, directives regulate the hearer's behavior. Commands such as *Close the door*, Uzbek *Eshikni yoping*, and Turkish *Kapıyı kapatın* all encode an attempt to make the hearer perform an action. However, the pragmatic meaning of these utterances depends heavily on context. In all three languages, the same directive form may function as a strict order, a routine reminder, or even a caring prompt, depending on speaker-hearer relations and situational expectations. This confirms the general speech act claim that illocutionary force cannot be reduced to grammatical form alone (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969).

2. English: mitigation and conventionally indirect directives

In English, directives are strongly associated with politeness management. The data reviewed indicate that speakers often avoid bare imperatives in equal-status everyday interaction unless the context is urgent, intimate, or institutionally authorized. Instead, they commonly use conventionally indirect forms such as *Can you…?*, *Could you…?*, *Would you mind…?*, or *I was wondering if you could…* These forms reduce the force of imposition and make the directive more acceptable by presenting it as a question about ability, willingness, or convenience rather than as a direct order. This pattern aligns with Leech's account of requests and with classic cross-cultural work on request realization.

Thus, in English, a directive frequently serves not only to obtain compliance but also to preserve the hearer's negative face. The pragmatic function of the directive is therefore dual: it seeks action while simultaneously signaling respect for personal autonomy. English directives also make extensive use of internal modifiers such as *please*, *just*, *possibly*, and *a bit*, as well as external supportive moves such as grounders (*I'm sorry to bother you, but…*) or preparators (*Can I ask you something?*). These features support the view that English directive behavior is highly sensitive to imposition and interpersonal distance.

3. Uzbek: relational hierarchy and culturally embedded directness

Uzbek directive speech acts reveal a stronger connection between language and social hierarchy. In family, educational, and community settings, directives are often structured by age difference, status, kinship, and expectations of role-appropriate behavior. A form that may appear direct at the grammatical level can be interpreted as normal, caring, or socially appropriate when produced by an elder, parent, or teacher. Therefore, the pragmatic force of Uzbek directives depends heavily on shared cultural assumptions about respect and obligation. Studies comparing English and Uzbek requests suggest that English tends to prefer conventionally indirect structures more consistently, while Uzbek permits more direct expression when cultural norms clearly define the relationship between interlocutors.

At the same time, Uzbek is not simply "more direct." It often mitigates directives through respectful verb forms, address terms, plural politeness marking, and explanatory support. For example, a request may be softened not by changing an imperative into a question, but by adding a respectful pronoun, a deferential verb ending, or a relational frame that invokes solidarity and courtesy. This means that the pragmatic function of Uzbek directives is frequently **relational regulation**: the speaker guides the hearer's action while reaffirming social order, mutual obligations, and culturally appropriate respect. In this sense, the directive is both an actional and a social act.

4. Turkish: directness with modification and interactional balance

Turkish directive behavior occupies an interesting position in comparative pragmatics. Research on Turkish request realization and naturally occurring requests shows that Turkish speakers use both direct and indirect strategies, but the choice is closely conditioned by context, familiarity, and institutional role. Studies indicate that Turkish request behavior often combines relatively direct strategy selection with a wide range of modification devices. In other words, the directive may remain structurally clear while being pragmatically softened through lexical, morphological, or discourse-level means.

This makes Turkish directives pragmatically flexible. A speaker may produce a direct request, yet accompany it with politeness markers, formulaic expressions, or contextual justification that reduces its interpersonal weight. Turkish evidence also shows that directive use is sensitive to pragmatic competence: learners and speakers do

not merely need grammar, but must understand when directness is acceptable and how much mitigation is required. This supports Thomas's distinction between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge. Turkish directives thus serve a balancing function: they efficiently pursue the intended action while maintaining social harmony and situational appropriateness.

5. Functional comparison

Across the three languages, directive speech acts perform overlapping but differently weighted pragmatic functions.

First, in **English**, directives primarily function as **negotiated requests for action**, where the management of imposition is central.

Second, in **Uzbek**, directives often function as **relationship-indexing acts**, where the speaker's social position and the hearer's obligations are foregrounded alongside the requested action.

Third, in **Turkish**, directives frequently function as **interactional balancing acts**, combining clarity of intention with context-sensitive modification.

These differences can be summarized as follows: English privileges indirectness as a politeness strategy; Uzbek privileges socially licensed directness tempered by respect forms; Turkish often integrates directness and mitigation within the same utterance. Despite these contrasts, all three languages demonstrate that directives are shaped by more than syntax: they are socially embedded pragmatic choices.

Discussion

The findings support the broader claim of cross-cultural pragmatics that directive speech acts cannot be interpreted adequately without attention to sociocultural norms. Although English, Uzbek, and Turkish all share the same broad category of directives, they differ in how directive force is distributed across form, politeness, and context. This is consistent with CCSARP-style work showing that requests vary across languages in directness, modification, and supportive moves, and with later pragmatic research showing that speech act realization is culture-specific rather than universal in its surface expression.

One important implication is that **directness does not always equal impoliteness**, and indirectness does not automatically equal politeness. In English interaction, indirectness often indexes courtesy and respect. In Uzbek, however, a more direct directive can be socially acceptable, especially when role relations are clear. In Turkish, directness may coexist with appropriate mitigation and therefore remain pragmatically acceptable. What matters is not only linguistic form, but the alignment between form, relationship, and cultural expectations. This point helps explain why second-language learners often experience pragmatic failure even when their grammar is correct.

The analysis also shows that directive speech acts carry important **interpersonal functions** beyond behavioral control. They may express care, solidarity, authority, hospitality, or moral positioning. An invitation, for example, is formally directive because it encourages the hearer to act, yet its social

function is affiliative rather than coercive. Turkish work on invitation strategies illustrates this clearly, while Uzbek hospitality discourse and English polite invitations show parallel tendencies in different forms. Thus, the category of directives should be understood as pragmatically diverse rather than narrowly imperative.

From a pedagogical perspective, the findings suggest that teaching directives in foreign language education should move beyond grammar drills. Learners need exposure to how requests, advice, warnings, and suggestions are shaped by power, distance, urgency, and cultural norms. For Uzbek and Turkish learners of English, this means learning when English requires stronger mitigation. For English-speaking learners of Uzbek or Turkish, it means understanding that pragmatically appropriate directness may be greater in some contexts, but must still be paired with culturally suitable forms of respect. Research on instructional pragmatics in Turkish EFL contexts supports the value of explicit teaching for request strategies and pragmatic awareness.

Conclusion

Directive speech acts in English, Uzbek, and Turkish share the same general illocutionary goal of influencing the hearer's future action, but they differ substantially in their pragmatic functions and preferred realization patterns. English generally favors conventionally indirect and highly mitigated directives, especially in non-urgent and equal-status interaction. Uzbek permits greater social directness when hierarchy, familiarity, and role expectations legitimize it, while still relying on respect markers and relational softening. Turkish demonstrates a flexible combination of explicit directive intent and rich modification strategies.

The comparative analysis shows that directive speech acts are best understood as culturally situated tools for managing action, face, hierarchy, solidarity, and cooperation. Their study contributes not only to pragmatics and contrastive linguistics, but also to translation, intercultural communication, and language pedagogy. Future research could strengthen this comparison through corpus-based analysis of naturally occurring directives in spoken interaction across the three languages.

References:

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns. *Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 196–213. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Gazioğlu, T., & Çiftçi, H. (2017). Developing pragmatic competence through teaching requests in English classrooms. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 30*(1), 139–165. https://doi.org/10.19171/uefad.323400

5. Karagöz, T., & İşisağ, K. U. (2019). An investigation into the request realization patterns of Turkish ELT students. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 13*(1), 84–102.
6. Khamidjonova, D. M. Q. (2022). Investigation of the speech act "request" in English and Uzbek. *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 9*, 86–90.
7. Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press.
8. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 59–82). Academic Press.
10. Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91
11. Ünsal Şakiroğlu, H., & Özyıldırım, I. (2024). The strategies of invitation speech act in Turkish. *OPUS Journal of Society Research, 21*(5), 274–286. https://doi.org/10.26466/opusjsr.1518494