

Analysis of leadership orders in Uzbek and English

Kuchkarova Maftuna Dilmurod qizi
aisha1991@gmail.com

Independent researcher
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Annotation. *This article discusses how leaders give orders. It examines ordering in two distinct languages and cultures: Uzbek and English. It studies how these orders work in real-life situations when leaders (executives, supervisors) speak. Based on Speech Act Theory and cross-cultural pragmatics, this article investigates how executives in companies use direct orders to direct action and show their power. The study examines linguistic markers of directness, forcefulness, and mitigation within orders and discusses the influence of cultural context, power distance, and politeness norms on their interpretation and usage. The article highlights on both structural similarities in the direct expression of directives and potential cultural nuances in their pragmatic implementation, providing a broader knowledge of leadership communication and cross-cultural organizational dynamics.*

Keywords: *speech act theory, direct speech acts, orders, leadership discourse, Uzbek language, English language, cross-cultural pragmatics, organizational communication, directives.*

Анализ лидерских приказов в узбекском и английском языках

Кучкарова Мафтуна Дильмурод кизи
aisha1991@gmail.com

Самостоятельный соискатель
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков

Аннотация. *В данной статье рассматривается, как лидеры отдают приказы. Анализируется процесс приказания в двух различных языках и культурах: узбекской и английской. Исследуется, как эти приказы функционируют в реальных ситуациях, когда лидеры и руководители говорят. Основываясь на теории речевых актов и межкультурной прагматики, данная статья изучает, как руководители компаний используют прямые приказы для управления действиями и демонстрации своей власти. В работе анализируются языковые маркеры прямоты, настойчивости и смягчения в приказах, а также обсуждается влияние культурного контекста, дистанции власти и норм вежливости на их интерпретацию и применение. В статье подчеркиваются как структурные сходства в прямом выражении директив, так и возможные культурные нюансы их прагматической реализации, что способствует более глубокому пониманию коммуникации лидерства и межкультурной динамики в организациях.*

Ключевые слова: *теория речевых актов, прямые речевые акты, приказы, лидерский дискурс, узбекский язык, английский язык, межкультурная прагматика, организационная коммуникация, директивы.*

O'zbek va ingliz tillaridagi rahbar buyruqlarining tahlili.

Kuchkarova Maftuna Dilmurod qizi
aisha1991@gmail.com

Mustaqil tadqiqotchisi
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada yetakchilarning buyruq berish usullari ko‘rib chiqiladi. Ikki xil til va madaniyat ya‘ni o‘zbek va ingliz tillarida buyruq berish jarayoni tahlil qilinadi. Yetakchilar va rahbarlar gapirayotganda ushbu buyruqlarning haqiqiy hayotiy vaziyatlarda qanday ishlatilishi o‘rganiladi. Nutq aktlari nazariyasi va madaniyatlararo pragmatika asosida ushbu maqola kompaniya rahbarlarining bevosita buyruqlardan foydalanish usullarini – harakatlarni boshqarish va o‘z hokimiyatini namoyon etish maqsadida qanday qo‘llashlarini tahlil qiladi. Tadqiqotda buyruqlardagi to‘g‘ridan-to‘g‘rilik, qat‘iylik va yumshatishning lingvistik belgilarini o‘rganish bilan birga, ularning talqini va qo‘llanilishiga madaniy kontekst, hokimiyat masofasi va o‘z me‘yorlarining ta‘siri muhokama qilinadi. Maqolada buyruqlarni to‘g‘ridan-to‘g‘ri ifodalashda mavjud bo‘lgan tuzilmaviy o‘xshashliklar hamda ularning pragmatik qo‘llanilishidagi madaniy tafovutlar yoritilib, yetakchilik kommunikatsiyasi va madaniyatlararo tashkiliy dinamikani chuqurroq tushunishga hissa qo‘shiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: nutq aktlari nazariyasi, bevosita nutq aktlari, buyruqlar, yetakchilik (rahbarlar) diskursi, o‘zbek tili, ingliz tili, madaniyatlararo pragmatika, tashkiliy kommunikatsiya, direktivalar.

Introduction

Language is more than just a method for exchanging information; it is primarily a tool for action. This fundamental concept, central to Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), provides a solid framework for understanding how our words truly function in communication. They actively shape our social environment and the way we interact with one another. In the workplace, leaders routinely use language to advise, encourage, assess, and coordinate their teams’ actions. Among the many forms of speech acts used by leaders, directions - essentially, utterances aimed to get someone to do something - are especially crucial for putting leadership into action and ensuring the organization runs efficiently. This article will focus on one type of directive: orders, which are defined as a firm and direct form of instruction provided from a position of authority. However, effective use of directives, particularly orders, requires more than just the words themselves. It is inseparable with cultural norms and expectations on authority, hierarchy, and politeness. As organizations become increasingly multinational, understanding cross-cultural variances in leadership communication becomes vital. This study intends to solve this issue by comparing how direct commands are realistically implemented in leadership communication across Uzbek and English culture and linguistic contexts.

Uzbekistan, being a Central Asian country with its own history, society, and language, offers an important contrast to English-speaking organizational cultures. These English-speaking contexts frequently predominate Westernization management studies. This study compares how direct commands are expressed and understood in Uzbek and English leadership situations in order to highlight both universal and culturally particular features of giving command within the structures of an organization.

Literature review

This study is based on Speech Act Theory (SAT), which was initially put forward by J. Austin in 1962 and extended by John Searle in 1969. The SAT suggests that language can be used not simply to convey information but also to conduct diverse tasks. Austin previously distinguished between “constatives”, which are assertions that can be judged as true or incorrect, and “performatives”, which are utterances that carry out an activity simply by expressing themselves. He further extended this classification, claiming that all utterances contain a performative aspect wrapped in what he called “illocutionary force” – the action that the speaker intends to carry out. Searle (1969) defined this framework, classifying illocutionary acts into five categories: *assertives* (committing to the truth of a proposition), *directives* (attempting to persuade the hearer to do something), *commissives*

(committing the speaker to a future action), *expressives* (which expresses psychological states), and *declaratives* (causing a change in reality through words).

This study considers directives, specifically orders, as an important speech act type in leadership communication. Directives are crucial to leadership or administrative, supervisory duties and include instructions, commands, requests, suggestions, and orders. Orders, as a sort of directive, stand out by their forcefulness, directness, and link to authority. They differ from indirect speech acts due to the fact the illocutionary force is not explicitly stored in the linguistic form and must be processed implicitly by the listener (Searle, 1975). While indirectness is commonly used for politeness and can be preferred under certain social circumstances, direct speaking acts, particularly orders, have importance in leadership for clarity, efficiency, and precise communication of expectations (Weizman, 1993).

Cross-cultural pragmatics emphasizes that cultural norms and values have a substantial impact on the interpretation and effectiveness of speech acts (Wierzbicka, 2003). Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) stresses the concept of “face” – the public self-image that people try to maintain, and how politeness methods can be applied in order to mitigate potential face threats contained in specific speech acts, notably commands. Cultures place different emphasis on the positive face (want for approval and praise) and the negative face (want for autonomy and freedom from imposition). Cultural politeness norms can have a significant impact on the decision between direct and indirect speech acts, as well as the particular mitigation measures adopted.

Furthermore, Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions Theory (Hofstede, 2001) adds light on cultural differences along dimensions such as power distance – the degree to which less powerful members of organizations tolerate and expect unequal power distribution. Cultures with a high-power distance may have a higher acceptance and expectation of direct directives, including orders, from superiors, whereas low power distance cultures may prefer more consultative and indirect communication approaches. Understanding the power distance factor in Uzbek and English-speaking cultures is vital for interpreting the pragmatic complexities of leadership speech.

Language plays an integral part in leadership, according to organizational communication research (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004). Effective leadership communication is more than just providing information; it is also about forming views, encouraging actions, and developing connections (Yukl, 2010). The way leaders use directives, particularly commands, has a tremendous impact on employee morale, team relationships, and organizational outcomes. Cross-cultural leadership research indicates the importance of adapting communication methods to different cultural situations in order to ensure effective leadership and minimize misconceptions (House et al., 2004). This study extends literature by focusing on the pragmatic implementation of direct orders in Uzbek and English leadership contexts, causing a more respectful understanding of directive leadership communication.

Methodology

This article uses a comparative pragmatic analysis approach, with displayed examples of direct orders from Uzbek and English leadership discourse. This study uses some realistic examples of leadership communication in both languages to explore cross-cultural pragmatic differences.

The study centres on finding important linguistic markers of directness and forcefulness in the constructed cases, determining the existence or absence of mitigation techniques, and interpreting these linguistic choices in accordance with cultural characteristics such as power distance and politeness norms.

The comparative analysis will take the following steps:

- ⇒ Providing realistic examples of leaders issuing direct commands in normal organizational contexts in both Uzbek and English. These examples will cover a variety of **leadership contexts** (e.g., project management, industrial operations, administrative activities) to demonstrate the variety of scenarios in which orders are used.

- ⇒ Examining the **linguistic structure** of each example, noting *grammatical forms* (e.g., imperative mood, declarative sentences), *lexical choices* (e.g., verb choice, intensifiers), and *pragmatic markers* (e.g., politeness particles, justifications) that contribute to the order's directness and forcefulness.
- ⇒ Reviewing the linguistic aspects of direct instructions in Uzbek and English, noting similarities and contrasts in tactics for expressing directness, forcefulness, and moderation.
- ⇒ Considering the observed linguistic patterns in relation to relevant cultural factors, particularly power distance and politeness norms in Uzbek and English-speaking cultures. Discussing how these **cultural characteristics** affect the *perception, interpretation, and effectiveness* of direct orders in leadership discourse.

Findings and Analysis

Direct orders in leadership discourse: *"Team, I want all progress reports on my desk by 9 AM tomorrow morning, without exception."*

Linguistic markers: (*I want*) – A direct expression of the speaker's will that acts as a strong directive. While grammatically it is a declarative sentence, it serves as an order in the context of authority.

Expressing personal desires, like, "I want" can be a way to frame a command as a request, even if it is still an expectation.

(*by 9 a.m. tomorrow morning*) is an explicit and precise deadline that leaves no room for ambiguity.

(*without exception*) is a strong intensifier that eliminates any potential of deviation or excuse for noncompliance. While not a true imperative in form, the whole utterance serves as a strong command. This order is very direct, with minimal space for negotiation or interpretation. It implies urgency and a high expectation of immediate cooperation.

"Supervisor, shut down Line 3 immediately and initiate safety protocol 7B. There's been a potential malfunction reported."

Linguistic Markers: In English, the imperative mood is the most direct way to give commands. Examples of imperative verbs found in this sentence, include "*shut down*" and "*initiate*".

"*Immediately*" is a temporal adverb that emphasises urgency and the need for quick action.

Some specific details like "*Line 3*" and "*safety protocol 7B*" make the directive more explicit and actionable. This instruction is extremely direct and aggressive, expressing the urgency and potential severity of the problem (safety malfunction). In safety-critical situations, directness is frequently required to ensure prompt action and avoid harm.

The justification supplied (*There's been a potential malfunction reported.*), while brief, underlines the order's rationale and helps reduce impressions of inconsistency.

"Sarah, book a conference room for a meeting this afternoon at 2 PM and send out meeting invites to the senior staff. Make sure room 205 is available."

Linguistic Markers: Direct imperative forms are used for each required activity, including "*book*", "*send*", and "*make sure*". Some details, such as indicating to the precise hour (2 PM), target audience (*senior staff*), and room choice (205) make the order highly particular and actionable.

While straightforward, this order is for a normal administrative duty. In hierarchical companies, direct commands from a department head to an administrative assistant are frequently regarded normal and efficient delegating tasks. The directness is less powerful than in the safety example, but it communicates a clear expectation of compliance within the organizational hierarchy.

Uzbek direct orders, comparing them to their English counterparts:

"Hurmatli jamoa, ertaga (ertalab) soat 9 gacha barcha hisobotlar, hech qanday istisnolarsiz, (mening) stolim ustida bo'lishini ta'minlang."

(*Hurmatli jamoa*) – is a formal address, establishing a hierarchical tone.

(*ta'minlang*) – is a strong imperative, demanding compliance.

The Uzbek statement is likely to be viewed as a clear and firm order. The lack of softening language reinforces the leader's power. Team members will understand that compliance is mandatory.

“Nazoratchi, 3-chegara chizig‘ini darhol to‘xtating va 7B xavfsizlik protokolini boshlang. Nosozlik haqida xabar kelib tushdi.”

(Nazoratchi) – a direct, formal address, highlighted the supervisor's role and responsibility, the verbs (“to‘xtating”/“shut down” and “boshlang”/“initiate”) is a direct imperatives.

(darhol) – emphasizes urgency.

(Nosozlik haqida xabar kelib tushdi) – it provides a reason for the order, but remains concise.

The degree of directness is quite similar, showing that both cultures understand the need for clear and quick action in such situations.

“Sara, bugun tushdan keyin soat 2 ga konferensiya zalini (muzokaralar xonasini) band qiling va yuqori lavozimdagi xodimlarga yig‘ilish taklifnomalarini yuboring. 205-xona bo‘shligini ham nazoratga oling”

Both languages use clear, short, and efficient orders delivered by direct imperatives (“band qiling”/“book” and “yuboring”/“send”, “nazoratga oling”/“make sure”), with linguistic indicators focusing on urgency and priority, all within an underlying cultural context.

Discussions

In both examples of Uzbek and English leadership speeches use grammatically direct forms to issue orders. Imperative verbs and direct expressions (such as “I want” in English, “bo‘lishini ta‘minlang” in Uzbek) are important linguistic markers for directness. There are noticeable similarities and differences in the language pattern used to convey orders. The Uzbek examples reveal a slight but potentially significant difference: the regular use of polite plural imperative forms. While the imperatives are grammatically correct and act as orders, the usage of “qiling”, “yuboring”, and “nazoratga oling” (polite plural) adds a layer of formality and politeness that is not linguistically emphasised in the English examples.

Both languages may show a variety of forcefulness in direct orders using language choices (for instance: “immediately”/“darhol”, “without exception”/“hech qanday istisnolarsiz”) and contextual clues (the urgency of safety issues, the significance of project deadlines). The pragmatic force of directives is significantly context dependent, influenced not just by linguistic form, but also by the speaker's perceived authority and the organizational structure. The politeness contained within direct orders in Uzbek, as expressed through the use of polite imperative forms, may indicate cultural values linked with formality, hierarchy, and politeness in Uzbek communication norms. In contrast, while English direct orders can be softened with politeness markers “please”, the examples analysed here show a tendency towards more bare imperative forms in English examples, which may be perceived as more direct and less overtly marked for politeness in some contexts.

Conclusion

This paper presents a preliminary comparative pragmatic analysis of direct orders in Uzbek and English leadership language. Through the examination of example sentences, the study discovered structural similarities in the direct linguistic realization of orders across both languages, as well as potential cultural nuances in pragmatic implementation, particularly in the incorporation of politeness within Uzbek direct orders.

Although both Uzbek and English leadership communication use blunt commands to motivate action, the specific language and pragmatic tactics used are influenced by cultural context.

The study emphasises the need of cultural awareness in leadership communication, as well as the necessity to move beyond simplistic ideas of directness and indirectness in order to understand the complex ways in which culture and language interact to shape directive speech acts.

References:

1. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. L. (2004). *Organizations as discursive constructions. Communication theory*.
4. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. SAGE.
5. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. SAGE Publications.
6. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Searle, J. R. (1975). *Indirect speech acts*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, 3: Speech acts (pp. 59-82). New York: Academic Press.
8. Vocabulary.com. (n.d.). Westernization. In *Vocabulary.com Dictionary*. Retrieved February 22, 2025, from <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/westernization>
9. Weizman, E. (1993). Interlanguage requestive hints. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds), *Interlanguage pragmatics*, 123-137. New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction* (Vol. 53). Berlin. Walter de Gruyter.
11. Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.