

## GENDER, TONE, AND INTERTEXTUALITY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP DIRECTIVES

Kuchkarova Maftuna Dilmurod qizi

[aisha1991@gmail.com](mailto:aisha1991@gmail.com)

Independent researcher

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15730306>

### Abstract

This study looks at directive speech acts employed by university administrators in Uzbekistan and English-speaking countries, going deeper into contextual, gendered, and strategic elements beyond syntactic and lexical realization. While directives fulfil institutional functions, their structure and wording reflect subtle sociocultural norms, leadership ethos, and institutional expectations. This paper uses speech act theory, politeness theory, and leadership discourse frameworks to examine not just modality and directness, but also prosodic signals, intertextuality, genre sensitivity, and leadership positioning in written and spoken academic communication. The findings point to modest distinctions in communicative authority, rhetorical style, and interpersonal dynamics that influence how rectors, deans, and chairs lead through language. It also takes into account gender patterns and emotional tone while issuing orders. The findings have implications for intercultural competency, leadership development, and applied discourse pedagogy in higher education.

**Keywords:** directive speech acts, academic discourse, leadership communication, gender pragmatics, prosody, intercultural rhetoric, Uzbek, English.

### Introduction

Language is a significant tool of leadership, especially in academic settings where directions must balance institutional responsibilities with collegiality. Directive speech acts are more than just directives; they establish institutional positions, assert authority, and facilitate workplace relationships. This study builds on earlier research by investigating not only how university administrators in Uzbekistan and English-speaking nations employ directions, but also how their pragmatic decisions reflect broader sociolinguistic and cultural ideologies. It broadens the focus to include intertextuality, gendered displays of authority, and prosodic clues in speech, trying to answer:

1. How do Uzbek and English academic leaders differ in their rhetorical strategies when issuing directives across oral and written genres?
2. How do leadership roles and institutional contexts influence directive framing beyond directness and politeness?
3. What pragmatic effects do gender and emotional tone have on directive performance in academic settings?

### Methodology

The corpus features some examples of leadership discourse (both in Uzbek and in English), sourced from speeches, faculty meeting recordings, institutional emails, memos, and directives issued by rectors, deans, and academic department heads. Each dataset is balanced based on gender, institution type (research vs. teaching university), and manner of communication (spoken vs. written).

Analytical tools:

- ✓ **Speech act analysis** (Searle, 1976): classifying directive types.
- ✓ **Politeness and face theory** (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Spencer-Oatey, 2008): identifying redressive strategies.
- ✓ **Prosodic analysis** (for oral data): using Praat to examine stress, pitch, and intensity when giving directives (Wodak, 1996).
- ✓ **Intertextual and genre analysis** (Fairclough, 1992; Sarangi & Roberts, 1999): assessing how institutional texts embed or reproduce directive norms.

NVivo was used to tag directive patterns such as mitigation devices, policy references, emotional tone (evaluative adjectives, exclamation), and authority index markers (titles, hierarchical references).

## Results

### *Gendered directive practices*

Female leaders in both settings used more inclusive and mitigating language. Examples of modal layering in English include “might want to consider” and “perhaps you could...” (Tannen, 1994; Holmes, 2006), Uzbek female leaders frequently utilized double politeness forms (“iltimos qilib” and “marhamat qilib”) or inserted directives in praise. Male leaders tended to utilize unambiguous modals (“must”, “kerak”) and elliptical imperatives, especially in spoken discourse (Coates, 2015; Ervin-Tripp, 1976).

### *Intertextual and genre shifts*

Leaders in English-speaking countries commonly invoked external policies or strategic plans when issuing directions (e.g., “As per the Quality Assurance Framework...”). (Fairclough, 1992). Uzbek academic leaders frequently employed hierarchical standards or formulaic language like “Rahbariyat topshirig’iga binoan...” (according to the leadership’s instructions...). Memos tended to employ more established imperative words, whereas speeches depended on metaphors and collective appeals (Wodak, 1996; House, 2005).

### *Emotional tone and authority*

Emotional modulation was culturally specific. English leaders frequently combined toughness and encouragement (“Let’s aim to finalise this by Friday, so we’re all set for launch”). Watts (2003); Locher and Watts (2005). Uzbek leaders used expressions like “hurmatli hamkasblar” (dear comrades) to express affection before giving a request, but written commands were more detached. Some Uzbek guidelines used religious or moral appeals to ensure compliance (Hofstede, 2001).

## Discussion

This study identifies further layers of directive formulation in academic leadership. According to gendered pragmatics, female leaders are more likely to align with relational and indirect techniques, which is consistent with worldwide tendencies. Intertextuality strengthens legitimacy, and prosody gives subtle indicators of authority, especially in spoken Uzbek, where loudness and rhythm are important (Wodak 1996). This is consistent with Ervin-Tripp’s (1976) discoveries that social context strongly influences directive formulation.

The rhetorical flexibility of English institutional discourse allows for more differentiation between task-oriented and relational modes. In contrast, Uzbek directive speech is more rooted in group identity, hierarchy, and formal ritual (Spencer-Oatey, 2008; Sarangi & Roberts, 1999).

This not only influences expectations for communicating behavior, but it also reflects different concepts of leadership itself. (Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris, 1997).

These insights are critical for international collaboration, teacher exchange, and multilingual university settings. Misinterpreting instruction firmness or tone might result in perceived disrespect or inefficiency. For example, what is seen as efficient clarity in an English email may appear unduly abrupt to an Uzbek receiver used to layered politeness and status acknowledgment (Scollon & Scollon, 2001).

### Conclusion

In addition to being straightforward and polite, directions in academic leadership indicate sociocultural concepts of power, gender identity, and institutional hierarchy. This comparative study demonstrates how leaders construct institutional discourse using strategic linguistic, rhetorical, and paralinguistic choices. The findings are relevant to leadership training, intercultural pragmatics, and discourse-sensitive curriculum creation.

Further research should look into long-term shifts in directing methods as a result of internationalization demands, as well as multilingual directive practices in international academic settings.

### References:

#### Используемая литература: Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar:

1. Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Harris, S. (1997). *Managing Language: The Discourse of Corporate Meetings*. John Benjamins.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Coates, J. (2015). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. Routledge.
4. Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil There? The Structure of Some American English Directives. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 25–66.
5. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.
6. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage.
7. Holmes, J. (2006). *Gendered Talk at Work: Constructing Gender Identity through Workplace Discourse*. Wiley-Blackwell.
8. House, J. (2005). *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Mouton de Gruyter.
9. Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness Theory and Relational Work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 9–33.
10. Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (1999). *Talk, Work and Institutional Order: Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings*. Mouton de Gruyter.
11. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Blackwell.
12. Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23.
13. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. Continuum.

14. Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
15. Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
16. Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse*. Longman.