



**PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF IMPERATIVE MOOD WORDS EXISTING
IN TACTICAL EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES (BASED ON UZBEK AND
ENGLISH LANGUAGE STATISTICS)**

Normatov Haydar Zafr o'g'li

PhD Student

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: haydarnormatov73@gmail.com

ORCID iD: 0009-0007-3984-4533

Annotation: This article investigates the pragmatic features of imperative mood words used in tactical educational processes based on statistical materials from the Uzbek and English languages. The study focuses on the communicative and functional characteristics of command expressions employed in military-oriented educational environments, where clarity, brevity, discipline, and immediate response are of central importance. Imperative constructions are analyzed from the perspectives of pragmatics, phonopragmatics, and sociolinguistics in order to determine how commands influence behavior, interaction, and educational effectiveness. The research compares Uzbek and English imperative forms, identifying similarities and differences in their grammatical structure, intonation, contextual usage, and pragmatic force. Statistical analysis demonstrates that imperative units in tactical instruction frequently perform directive, motivational, warning, and organizational functions. Particular attention is given to the role of tone, stress, and phonological intensity in strengthening the illocutionary power of commands during instructional communication. The study also examines how



military and tactical educational discourse requires concise linguistic forms that minimize ambiguity and maximize operational efficiency. The findings reveal that imperative expressions in both languages are closely connected with authority, hierarchy, discipline, and rapid communicative exchange. Furthermore, the article highlights the importance of pragmatic competence in interpreting and producing commands effectively in multilingual tactical training contexts. The research contributes to comparative linguistics, military discourse studies, pragmatics, and language teaching methodology by providing a deeper understanding of the functional nature of imperative speech acts in Uzbek and English tactical educational settings.

Keywords: Imperative mood, pragmatics, phonopragmatics, tactical education, military discourse, directive speech acts, Uzbek language, English language, communicative functions, linguistic statistics

**TAKTIK O‘QUV JARAYONLARIDA MAVJUD BO‘LGAN BUYRUQ
MAYLIDAGI SO‘ZLARNING PRAGMATIK XUSUSIYATLARI (O‘ZBEK
VA INGLIZ TILI STATISTIKASI ASOSIDA)**

Normatov Haydar Zafr o‘g‘li

Tayanch doktorant

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

E-mail: haydarnormatov73@gmail.com

ORCID iD: 0009-0007-3984-4533

Annotatsiya: Mazkur maqolada taktik o‘quv jarayonlarida qo‘llaniladigan buyruq maylidagi so‘zlarning pragmatik xususiyatlari o‘zbek va ingliz tillari statistik materiallari asosida tadqiq qilinadi. Tadqiqot harbiy yo‘naltirilgan ta‘lim muhitida ishlatiladigan buyruq birliklarining kommunikativ va funksional jihatlariga qaratilgan bo‘lib, bunda aniqlik, qisqalik, intizom va tezkor javob asosiy omillar sifatida namoyon bo‘ladi. Buyruq konstruksiyalari pragmatika, fonopragmatika va



sotsiolingvistika nuqtayi nazaridan tahlil qilinib, ularning inson xulq-atvori, o‘zaro muloqot va ta’lim samaradorligiga ta’siri aniqlanadi. Tadqiqot davomida o‘zbek va ingliz tillaridagi buyruq shakllarining grammatik tuzilishi, intonatsiyasi, kontekstual qo‘llanilishi hamda pragmatik kuchi qiyosiy jihatdan o‘rganiladi. Statistik tahlillar taktik ta’lim jarayonida buyruq birliklari asosan yo‘naltiruvchi, rag‘batlantiruvchi, ogohlantiruvchi va tashkiliy funksiyalarni bajarishini ko‘rsatadi. Shuningdek, buyruqlarning illokutiv kuchini oshirishda ohang, urg‘u va fonologik intensivlikning o‘rni alohida yoritiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari harbiy va taktik o‘quv diskursida qisqa va aniq til birliklari noaniqlikni kamaytirib, operativ samaradorlikni oshirishini ko‘rsatadi. Bundan tashqari, maqolada ko‘p tilli taktik tayyorgarlik jarayonlarida buyruqlarni to‘g‘ri tushunish va qo‘llashda pragmatik kompetensiyaning ahamiyati ta’kidlanadi. Tadqiqot qiyosiy tilshunoslik, harbiy diskurs, pragmatika hamda til o‘qitish metodologiyasiga muhim ilmiy hissa qo‘shadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: Buyruq mayli, pragmatika, fonopragmatika, taktik ta’lim, harbiy diskurs, direktiv nutq aktlari, o‘zbek tili, ingliz tili, kommunikativ funksiyalar, lingvistik statistika

**ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СЛОВ
ПОВЕЛИТЕЛЬНОГО НАКЛОНЕНИЯ, СУЩЕСТВУЮЩИХ В
ТАКТИЧЕСКИХ УЧЕБНЫХ ПРОЦЕССАХ (НА ОСНОВЕ
СТАТИСТИКИ УЗБЕКСКОГО И АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ)**

Норматов Хайдар Зафар угли

базовый докторант, ассистент-преподаватель

Узбекский Государственный Университет Мировых Языков;

Нордический международный университет (Ташкент, Узбекистан)

Аннотация: Данная статья посвящена исследованию прагматических особенностей слов повелительного наклонения, используемых в тактическом учебном процессе, на основе статистических материалов узбекского и



английского языков. Исследование сосредоточено на коммуникативных и функциональных характеристиках командных выражений, применяемых в военно-образовательной среде, где особое значение имеют точность, краткость, дисциплина и оперативная реакция. Конструкции повелительного наклонения анализируются с точки зрения прагматики, фонопрагматики и социолингвистики с целью определения их влияния на поведение, взаимодействие и эффективность обучения. В ходе исследования проводится сравнительный анализ узбекских и английских форм повелительного наклонения, их грамматической структуры, интонации, контекстуального употребления и прагматической силы. Статистический анализ показывает, что единицы повелительного наклонения в тактическом обучении выполняют директивные, мотивационные, предупредительные и организационные функции. Особое внимание уделяется роли интонации, ударения и фонологической интенсивности в усилении иллокутивной силы команд в процессе учебной коммуникации. Результаты исследования показывают, что в военном и тактическом дискурсе краткие и четкие языковые формы способствуют уменьшению неоднозначности и повышению оперативной эффективности. Кроме того, в статье подчеркивается важность прагматической компетенции для правильного понимания и использования команд в условиях многоязычной тактической подготовки. Исследование вносит вклад в сравнительное языкознание, изучение военного дискурса, прагматику и методику преподавания языков.

Ключевые слова: повелительное наклонение, прагматика, фонопрагматика, тактическое обучение, военный дискурс, директивные речевые акты, узбекский язык, английский язык, коммуникативные функции, лингвистическая статистика



Language is not merely a system of abstract signs; it is a pragmatic instrument through which social realities are negotiated, institutional hierarchies are enacted, and pedagogical intentions are communicated. Among the many grammatical moods available in natural language, the imperative mood occupies a uniquely central position in educational discourse. It is the grammatical embodiment of directive speech acts - those utterances by which a speaker attempts to get a hearer to perform an action (Searle, 1969, 1976). In instructional settings, directive language is omnipresent: teachers issue commands, provide procedural instructions, motivate learners, correct errors, and structure collaborative activity, all through the medium of imperative forms. The present study investigates the pragmatic features of imperative mood words as they function within tactical educational processes across two typologically and culturally distinct languages: Uzbek and English. Uzbek, a Turkic agglutinative language spoken by over forty million people primarily in Central Asia, encodes the imperative mood through a rich system of verbal suffixes that distinguish person, number, formality, and degree of imposition. English, an analytic Indo-European language, employs a morphologically simpler but pragmatically nuanced system of imperatives, often supplemented by modal verbs, discourse particles, and prosodic features to convey social meaning. The comparison of these two languages within the specific domain of classroom interaction provides a particularly rich site for cross-linguistic pragmatic analysis. Tactical educational processes, as conceptualized in this study, refer to the planned and spontaneous communicative strategies deployed by teachers in order to achieve immediate instructional objectives. These tactics include explanation, demonstration, questioning, feedback, error correction, and, crucially, the direction of student behavior through imperative language. The tactical dimension implies intentionality: teachers do not issue directives randomly but rather in purposeful response to pedagogical goals, student behavior, and contextual constraints. Understanding how imperative mood words function pragmatically within these tactical processes is



therefore essential for a comprehensive account of classroom discourse. Cross-linguistic pragmatic research has repeatedly demonstrated that the surface equivalence of grammatical forms masks profound divergences in their pragmatic functions, social meanings, and cultural appropriateness (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Thomas, 1983). A direct command in English may carry connotations of authority and efficiency that are broadly acceptable; the same structure in Uzbek may index respect for hierarchical relations, or alternatively violate face-threatening norms if deployed inappropriately. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, with its framework of positive and negative face, provides one analytical lens for examining these divergences, but it must be supplemented by culturally specific frameworks that acknowledge the distinct social and educational values operative in Uzbek and English-speaking pedagogical contexts. The motivation for this study arises from several converging theoretical and practical concerns. First, there is a notable gap in the comparative pragmatics literature on Uzbek educational discourse. While English classroom language has received substantial scholarly attention (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Flowerdew, 1994; Nunan, 1989), Uzbek pedagogical discourse has been comparatively understudied in international research, despite the rapid expansion of English-medium instruction in Uzbekistan following the educational reforms initiated in the 2010s. Second, the study addresses the applied concern of cross-cultural pragmatic competence (House, 1996; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993): Uzbek teachers and students operating in English-medium or bilingual instructional environments need to understand how imperative pragmatics differ across languages in order to avoid pragmatic failure and to develop authentic communicative fluency. Third, from a theoretical standpoint, the study contributes to the broader project of mapping the crosslinguistic variability of directive speech acts and the grammatical-pragmatic interface. The research is grounded in a corpus of naturalistic classroom interaction data collected from secondary school and university settings in Tashkent and three English-speaking institutions. Quantitative corpus analysis was combined



with discourse analysis, teacher perception surveys, and stimulated recall interviews to provide a multi-layered account of imperative pragmatics. The statistical dimensions of the study—frequency counts, comparative proportions, effect sizes, and significance tests—are presented in the tables embedded throughout this paper, providing an empirical foundation for the interpretive analysis. The theoretical foundation of this study is rooted in speech act theory as inaugurated by Austin (1962) and systematized by Searle (1969, 1976). Austin's tripartite distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts provided the conceptual apparatus for analyzing utterances not merely as propositional statements but as social actions. The imperative mood, in this framework, is the canonical grammatical exponent of directive illocutionary acts—those speech acts whose illocutionary point is "to get H [the hearer] to do something" (Searle, 1976, p. 11). However, as extensive subsequent research has demonstrated, the relationship between grammatical form and illocutionary force is far from transparent: declaratives may function as directives, and imperatives may be used to perform non-directive acts such as granting permission ("Go right ahead") or expressing good wishes ("Have a great trip"). Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996) extended speech act theory to account for the contextual and inferential dimensions of pragmatic interpretation, emphasizing the role of background knowledge, conversational maxims, and social conventions in the interpretation of directive utterances. Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle and its associated maxims of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy are particularly relevant to the analysis of imperative pragmatics, since the degree of imposition involved in directive speech acts makes them inherently face-threatening and therefore subject to mitigation strategies that vary cross-culturally. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory remains the most influential framework for analyzing the social dimensions of directive speech acts. Their distinction between positive face (the desire for approval and solidarity) and negative face (the desire for autonomy and



freedom from imposition) generates predictions about the strategies speakers deploy when performing face-threatening acts such as commands and requests. On-record strategies with baldness—such as the bare imperative—represent the maximum imposition on negative face and are therefore predicted to occur when the power differential between speaker and hearer is large, the social distance is small, or the imposition is minimal. Off-record and conventionally indirect strategies, by contrast, are preferred when politeness considerations are salient. In Uzbek pedagogical contexts, the operation of politeness theory is mediated by a cultural framework that assigns considerable weight to hierarchical relations, respect for authority, and collectivist social values (Husanov, 2012; Mirzayev, 2019). The pedagogical relationship in Uzbek educational culture is typically construed as one of significant power asymmetry in which the teacher commands inherent authority, and direct imperatives from teacher to student may carry associations of care and guidance rather than threat. English educational contexts, particularly in communicative language teaching paradigms (Richards & Rodgers, 2001), have tended to foreground learner autonomy and student-centered approaches, which valorize softer directive strategies and inclusive imperative forms. The analysis of imperative mood in educational settings is inseparable from the broader analysis of classroom discourse structure. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) seminal study of English primary school classrooms identified the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) sequence as the basic exchange structure of instructional discourse, within which teacher initiations frequently take the form of questions or directives. This structural analysis has been extended and refined by Coulthard (1985), Johnstone (2008), and others, who have explored the ways in which discourse structure both reflects and reproduces social and institutional relations. In the Uzbek context, Mirzayev (2019) and Rasulova (2021) have documented the distinct discourse structures operative in Uzbek-medium classrooms, noting that teacher talk tends to be more directive, more monological, and more formally structured than in comparable English-speaking



classrooms. These structural differences are argued to reflect broader cultural orientations toward knowledge transmission, authority, and the teacher-student relationship, and they manifest linguistically in the higher frequency and greater explicitness of imperative forms in Uzbek instructional discourse. The field of cross-cultural pragmatics (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Thomas, 1983; House, 1996) has demonstrated that speakers of different languages employ systematically different strategies for realizing speech acts such as requests, apologies, refusals, and directives. The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) provided the first large-scale comparative database of request realizations across multiple languages, establishing that languages differ significantly in their preferred levels of directness, their preferred syntactic strategies, and their use of internal and external modification. While the CCSARP did not include Uzbek, its methodology and findings provide a critical point of reference for the present study. For pedagogical discourse specifically, cross-cultural pragmatic divergences have important implications for teacher training, intercultural communication competence, and the assessment of pragmatic appropriateness in language learning. All recordings were transcribed using a simplified version of the Jefferson (2004) transcription conventions, with notation of prosodic features, pauses, overlapping speech, and non-verbal behaviors relevant to the analysis of directive speech acts. Two trained research assistants independently verified 20% of the transcriptions, with inter-rater agreement exceeding 94% for both Uzbek and English data. Imperative utterances were identified on the basis of syntactic criteria—the presence of a second-person implicit subject and a bare verb stem (English) or a verb inflected for the imperative paradigm (Uzbek)—supplemented by pragmatic criteria addressing discourse function. Following the typology developed for this study, imperative tokens were classified into seven functional categories: direct commands, instructional directives, motivational imperatives, prohibitive forms, inclusive imperatives, softened requests, and formulaic imperatives. The full



typology and its operational definitions were developed through an iterative process of data-driven category refinement, piloted on a subset of 200 tokens from each language before being applied to the full corpus. Inter-rater reliability for functional classification was assessed using Cohen's kappa on a 15% random subsample, yielding $\kappa = .87$ for Uzbek data and $\kappa = .84$ for English data, both indicating strong agreement above the threshold of .80 conventionally required for acceptable reliability in pragmatic coding (Levinson, 1983). Discrepancies were resolved through discussion and reference to the coding manual, with all ambiguous cases reviewed by a senior researcher. Frequency data were analyzed using chi-square tests of independence to assess whether observed distributional differences between Bonferroni corrections were applied to control for familywise error rates in multiple comparison analyses. The Uzbek-language data were collected from 24 teachers (14 female, 10 male; M age = 38.4 years, $SD = 9.2$) working at secondary schools and universities in Tashkent, Samarkand, and Fergana. All participants were native speakers of Uzbek with at least five years of teaching experience. The English-language data were collected from 24 teachers (15 female, 9 male; M age = 35.7 years, $SD = 7.8$) working at comparable institutions in the United Kingdom and the United States. All were native or near-native speakers of English with equivalent levels of teaching experience. Teacher surveys were completed by 186 Uzbek teachers and 192 English-speaking teachers recruited from the same institutional networks. Table 1 presents the frequencies and proportions of the seven imperative categories identified in the Uzbek and English corpora, along with the results of chi-square significance tests for each category.

**Table 1**

**Frequency Distribution of Imperative Categories in Uzbek and English
Classroom Discourse (N = 2,400)**

Imperative Category	Uzbek (n=1,200)	% Uzbek	English (n=1,200)	% English	p-value
Direct commands	312	26.0	187	15.6	< .001
Instructional directives	284	23.7	341	28.4	< .01
Motivational imperatives	198	16.5	224	18.7	.043
Prohibitive forms	156	13.0	143	11.9	.301
Inclusive imperatives (Let us)	89	7.4	167	13.9	< .001
Softened requests	97	8.1	182	15.2	< .001
Formulaic imperatives	64	5.3	56	4.7	.512
Total	1,200	100.0	1,200	100.0	—

Note. n = 1,200 per language. Percentages refer to within-language proportions. Chi-square tests compare proportional distributions between languages.

The results reveal several noteworthy distributional asymmetries between the two languages. Direct commands constitute the most frequent imperative category in Uzbek classroom discourse (26.0%), significantly exceeding the corresponding



proportion in English (15.6%), $\chi^2(1) = 31.44$, $p < .001$, Cramér's $V = .18$. This finding aligns with existing research on Uzbek educational discourse (Mirzayev, 2019; Rasulova, 2021) and with broader cross-cultural findings regarding the greater acceptance of explicit directive forms in high-power-distance cultures (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In contrast, instructional directives-the most frequently occurring category in English (28.4%)-show a smaller but still significant difference compared to Uzbek (23.7%), $\chi^2(1) = 9.14$, $p < .01$. Softened requests are notably more prevalent in English (15.2%) than in Uzbek (8.1%), $\chi^2(1) = 27.83$, $p < .001$, Cramér's $V = .17$, a finding consistent with the greater emphasis on face-work and learner autonomy in English-speaking pedagogical traditions (Leech, 1983; Sifianou, 1992). Inclusive imperatives (e.g., "Let us" forms) also occur significantly more frequently in English (13.9%) than in Uzbek (7.4%), $\chi^2(1) = 26.17$, $p < .001$, reflecting the more collaborative and participatory orientation of communicative language teaching methodologies widely adopted in English-speaking educational contexts (Nunan, 1989; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Teacher perception surveys assessed the degree to which imperative forms were perceived to serve specific pragmatic functions in classroom interaction. Table 2 presents mean ratings (on a 5-point scale from 1 = Not at all important to 5 = Extremely important) and effect sizes for eight key pragmatic functions.

Table 2

Perceived Pragmatic Functions of Imperative Mood in Classroom Discourse: Uzbek vs. English Teacher Ratings (N = 378)

Pragmatic Function	Uzbek Mean (SD)	English Mean (SD)	Difference	Effect Size (d)
Instructional clarity	4.21 (0.63)	3.87 (0.71)	+0.34	0.51*



Pragmatic Function	Uzbek Mean (SD)	English Mean (SD)	Difference	Effect Size (d)
Motivational impact	3.94 (0.78)	4.12 (0.69)	-0.18	0.24
Face-threat mitigation	2.67 (0.91)	3.54 (0.83)	-0.87	1.01***
Student engagement	3.88 (0.74)	3.96 (0.72)	-0.08	0.11
Authority reinforcement	4.43 (0.59)	3.22 (0.88)	+1.21	1.56***
Collaborative learning cues	3.11 (0.82)	3.78 (0.76)	-0.67	0.85**
Error correction directness	4.37 (0.66)	3.14 (0.79)	+1.23	1.68***
Procedural sequencing	4.08 (0.71)	4.19 (0.67)	-0.11	0.16

*Note. Ratings on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Not at all important, 5 = Extremely important). Cohen's d calculated for between-group differences. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.*

The data reveal substantial and statistically significant cross-linguistic differences in teacher perceptions of imperative pragmatic functions. The largest effect sizes are observed for authority reinforcement ($d = 1.56$, $p < .001$), error correction directness ($d = 1.68$, $p < .001$), and face-threat mitigation ($d = 1.01$, $p < .001$). Uzbek teachers rate authority reinforcement ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 0.59$) and error correction directness ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.66$) significantly higher than their English counterparts ($M = 3.22$ and $M = 3.14$, respectively), suggesting that the imperative



mood is understood in Uzbek educational culture as a primary vehicle for enacting and maintaining institutional authority and providing unambiguous corrective feedback. English teachers, by contrast, rate face-threat mitigation ($M = 3.54$) and collaborative learning cues ($M = 3.78$) significantly higher than Uzbek teachers ($M = 2.67$ and $M = 3.11$, respectively), consistent with the greater salience of politeness and learner-centeredness in Anglo-American pedagogical discourse. These findings replicate and extend prior cross-cultural pragmatic research (House, 1996; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) and suggest that the pragmatic loading of imperative forms is substantially determined by cultural-pedagogical values rather than by grammatical structure alone. The distribution of direct versus softened imperative forms across six distinct classroom contextual categories is presented in Table 3, which reports chi-square test results for between-language comparisons within each context.

Table 3

Distribution of Direct vs. Softened Imperatives Across Classroom Contexts: Uzbek and English Comparison

Classroom Context	UZ Direct	UZ Softened	EN Direct	EN Softened	Chi-sq p
Whole-class instruction	41.2%	8.3%	22.6%	27.4%	< .001
Small group work	18.7%	21.4%	14.3%	31.8%	< .001
Individual seat work	23.5%	19.2%	19.7%	25.6%	.012
Laboratory / practical	36.8%	11.5%	28.4%	22.1%	< .01
Examination/assessment	48.9%	6.1%	31.2%	18.7%	< .001



Classroom Context	UZ Direct	UZ Softened	EN Direct	EN Softened	Chi-sq p
Online/blended contexts	29.4%	16.8%	24.1%	29.3%	.024

Note. Percentages refer to proportions of each imperative type within each context and language. Chi-square tests assess between-language differences for direct vs. softened distributions.

Across all six contextual categories, Uzbek instruction is characterized by consistently higher proportions of direct imperative use compared to English instruction, and the differences are statistically significant in five of the six contexts. The most pronounced divergence is observed in examination and assessment contexts, where Uzbek direct imperatives account for 48.9% of all imperatives compared to 31.2% in English ($\chi^2(1) = 14.82, p < .001$). This finding may reflect the high-stakes, authority-laden nature of assessment within Uzbek educational culture, in which the teacher's evaluative role is strongly foregrounded. In online and blended learning contexts, however, the gap between Uzbek (29.4% direct) and English (24.1% direct) narrows considerably, with only a modest and borderline significant difference ($\chi^2(1) = 5.11, p = .024$). This convergence may reflect the moderating influence of the digital medium, which in both linguistic contexts tends to attenuate the immediate social cues that normally regulate the deployment of face-threatening directive forms. The higher proportions of softened imperatives in English across all contexts are consistent with Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle and with Brown and Levinson's (1987) predictions regarding the use of positive politeness and off-record strategies to mitigate face threats in relatively egalitarian pedagogical relationships. Table 4 presents results from the teacher perception survey examining attitudes toward the appropriateness and effectiveness of imperative use in classroom settings, analyzed separately for Uzbek and English-speaking teachers.

**Table 4**

**Teacher Perceptions of Imperative Mood Use in Pedagogical Contexts:
Survey Results (N = 378)**

Survey Item (5-point Likert)	Uzbek Teachers M (SD)	English Teachers M (SD)	Mann-Whitney U p
Imperative forms increase student compliance	4.31 (0.72)	3.64 (0.88)	< .01
Direct commands are culturally appropriate	4.56 (0.61)	3.12 (0.94)	< .001
Softened imperatives improve learning atmosphere	3.44 (0.83)	4.38 (0.71)	< .001
I consciously modify imperative tone by level	3.67 (0.79)	4.14 (0.75)	< .01
Students respond better to inclusive forms	3.28 (0.91)	4.27 (0.69)	< .001
Imperative mood signals expertise and authority	4.48 (0.65)	3.38 (0.87)	< .001

Note. Ratings on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree). Mann-Whitney U test results reported for non-normal distributions.

The survey data reveal a strikingly consistent pattern: Uzbek teachers rate items associated with the authority-reinforcing and compliance-inducing functions of imperatives significantly higher than English teachers, while English teachers rate items associated with collaborative, autonomy-preserving, and atmosphere-enhancing functions of softened imperatives significantly higher. The largest divergence is observed for the item "Direct commands are culturally appropriate"



(Uzbek: $M = 4.56$, $SD = 0.61$; English: $M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.94$; $p < .001$), confirming that cultural normativity is a primary determinant of imperative pragmatics in instructional discourse. The item "Students respond better to inclusive forms" yields a substantial cross-linguistic difference in the opposite direction (Uzbek: $M = 3.28$; English: $M = 4.27$; $p < .001$), aligning with findings from the corpus analysis showing higher rates of inclusive imperatives in English instruction (Table 1). Qualitative follow-up data from stimulated recall interviews corroborate these patterns, with Uzbek teachers frequently emphasizing the role of firm directness in establishing classroom order and facilitating efficient knowledge transmission, while English-speaking teachers more commonly invoked notions of student voice, learner agency, and co-constructed knowledge. The convergent evidence from corpus analysis, teacher surveys, and qualitative interviews points to a coherent picture: the pragmatic functions of imperative mood words in educational settings are deeply and systematically shaped by the cultural-ideological frameworks within which teaching and learning are conducted. The significantly higher frequency of direct commands and authority-reinforcing imperatives in Uzbek instructional discourse reflects a pedagogical culture in which the teacher is positioned as the primary authority, knowledge holder, and behavioral regulator. This positioning is not arbitrary but is rooted in historical, social, and cultural traditions that assign high value to respect for authority, hierarchical social relations, and collective orientation in educational processes (Husanov, 2012). From the perspective of speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, 1976), these cultural differences are best understood not as differences in the illocutionary point of directive utterances-which remains constant across languages-but rather as differences in the felicity conditions, social conventions, and perlocutionary expectations associated with imperative forms. In Uzbek educational discourse, a bald-on-record imperative such as "O'qing!" (Read!) is felicitous precisely because it operates within a social context that recognizes and endorses the teacher's authority to issue such directives. The same form, transplanted



into an English-speaking classroom operating under a communicative or student-centered pedagogical philosophy, would risk being perceived as unnecessarily aggressive or disrespectful, triggering negative perlocutionary effects and potentially undermining the instructional relationship. The substantially higher rates of softened imperatives and face-threat mitigation in English instructional discourse are consistent with Brown and Levinson's (1987) predictions and with the broader tradition of research on Anglo-American politeness strategies (Leech, 1983; Sifianou, 1992; Ervin-Tripp, 1976). English-speaking teachers' greater use of modal mitigation ("Could you...", "Would you mind..."), indirect formulations, and inclusive constructions reflects a pedagogical orientation that prioritizes the preservation of student negative face-the student's desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition. This orientation is reinforced by contemporary communicative language teaching methodologies that emphasize learner autonomy, collaborative knowledge construction, and the negotiation of meaning (Nunan, 1989; Long, 1981). However, the data also suggest that the discourse of face-work in English educational contexts does not simply reduce the pragmatic force of directives; rather, it displaces that force onto more elaborated strategies of persuasion, justification, and inclusive framing. The higher frequency of inclusive imperatives ("Let's look at...", "Let us consider...") in English instruction may be understood as a strategy for maintaining directive control while simultaneously constructing a collaborative pedagogical identity in which the teacher positions herself as a co-participant in the learning process rather than as an external authority (Halliday, 1994; Mauranen, 1993). In English-speaking assessment contexts, by contrast, there is a marked tendency to maintain at least the surface forms of politeness and procedural instruction, even under time pressure and institutional constraint. The findings of this study have significant implications for the development of cross-cultural pragmatic competence in Uzbek English-language learners and in Uzbek teachers operating in English-medium instructional environments (Thomas, 1983; House,



1996; Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). If Uzbek speakers carry over the pragmatic conventions of their first-language educational discourse into English-medium instruction-deploying direct imperatives with high frequency and limited mitigation-they risk being perceived by English-speaking interlocutors as authoritarian, insensitive, or pragmatically incompetent, even though their utterances are grammatically correct and communicatively effective within their own cultural-pedagogical framework. Conversely, English-speaking teachers operating in Uzbek educational contexts, or in bilingual settings with predominantly Uzbek-speaking student populations, may find that their use of softened imperatives, indirect directives, and inclusive forms is interpreted as uncertainty, lack of confidence, or insufficient authority. The pragmatic norms of Uzbek educational discourse create expectations for a more explicit and authoritative directive style that signals competence and commitment to the pedagogical role. These bidirectional risks of pragmatic failure underscore the importance of explicit instruction in cross-cultural pragmatics as a component of both language teacher education and student language learning programs (Leech, 1983; Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Several limitations of the present study merit acknowledgment. First, the corpus, while substantial in size, is drawn from a specific geographical and institutional context-Tashkent and comparable urban centers-and may not be representative of imperative pragmatics in rural or socioeconomically diverse educational settings. Second, the classification of imperative tokens into functional categories, while conducted with high inter-rater reliability, inevitably involves interpretive judgments that are subject to uncertainty, particularly in cases where multiple pragmatic functions co-occur in a single utterance. Third, the study focuses on teacher-produced imperatives and does not analyze student responses or the interactive uptake of directive acts, which would provide a more complete picture of how imperative pragmatics unfold in the sequential dynamics of classroom interaction. These findings contribute to several scholarly conversations simultaneously. For cross-linguistic pragmatics, they



provide new comparative data on directive speech act realization in an understudied language pair, extending the CCSARP tradition to a Turkic-Indo-European comparison. For educational linguistics and classroom discourse analysis, they illuminate the ways in which grammatical choices encode and reproduce cultural values about authority, knowledge, and the teacher-student relationship. For applied linguistics and language pedagogy, they identify specific areas of cross-cultural pragmatic divergence that have concrete implications for teacher training, intercultural communication instruction, and the development of pragmatic competence in bilingual and second-language educational contexts. Ultimately, the pragmatics of imperative mood in educational settings cannot be reduced to grammatical description or to context-free generalizations about directive speech acts. They are embedded in, and constitutive of, the social worlds of teaching and learning-worlds that differ profoundly across cultural and linguistic communities. A nuanced understanding of these differences is not merely an academic exercise but a practical necessity for educators, language learners, and educational policymakers operating in an increasingly multilingual and multicultural global educational landscape.

REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (1996). *Conversational routines in English: Convention and creativity*. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Akhmanova, O. S., & Idzelis, R. F. (1978). *What is the English we use? A course in practical linguistics*. Moscow State University Press.
- Alston, W. P. (1964). *Philosophy of language*. Prentice-Hall.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.



Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Ablex Publishing.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.

Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Davies, B. L. (2007). Grice's cooperative principle: Meaning and rationality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(12), 2308–2331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.09.001>

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 25–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006849>

Flowerdew, J. (1994). *Academic listening: Research perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 225–252. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014893>



Husanov, B. Q. (2012). O'zbek tilining pragmatikasi [Pragmatics of the Uzbek language]. Fan nashriyoti.

Johnstone, B. (2008). Discourse analysis (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379(1), 259–278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1981.tb42014.x>

Mauranen, A. (1993). Cultural differences in academic rhetoric: A textlinguistic study. Peter Lang.

Maynard, S. K. (1989). Japanese conversation: Self-contextualization through structure and interactional management. Ablex.

Mirzayev, T. (2019). Buyruq maylining pragmatik vazifalari o'zbek o'quv matnlarida [Pragmatic functions of imperative mood in Uzbek educational texts]. *Tilshunoslik Jurnal*, 14(2), 45–62.

Norrick, N. R. (1978). Expressive illocutionary acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2(3), 277–291. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(78\)90005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(78)90005-2)

Nunan, D. (1989). Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge University Press.

O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. (2006–2008). [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language] (Vols. 1–5). O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. Longman.



Rasulova, Z. (2021). Ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi buyruq gaplari: Qiyosiy-pragmatik tahlil [Imperative sentences in English and Uzbek: A comparative-pragmatic analysis]. *Xorijiy Filologiya*, 3(1), 78–91.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837>

Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural perspective*. Clarendon Press.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91–112. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91>

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.