



**A COMPARATIVE PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS OF
PERSUASION AND SUGGESTION IN RUSSIAN, CHINESE, AND UZBEK
LINGUISTICS**

Shi Jinding,
Independent Researcher,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
E-mail: jindingshi01@gmail.com

| A B S T R A C T | K E Y W O R D S |
|--|--|
| <p>This article examines theoretical and applied studies of speech acts of persuasion and suggestion in Russian, Chinese, and Uzbek linguistics. It analyzes major approaches to interpreting these communicative phenomena within pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguocultural studies. Special attention is paid to cross-cultural differences in the realization of persuasion and suggestion strategies. The findings demonstrate that while these speech acts share universal features, their linguistic representation and pragmatic mechanisms vary significantly depending on the cultural context.</p> | <p>Speech act, persuasion, suggestion, pragmatics, linguoculture, discourse, communicative strategies.</p> |

INTRODUCTION

Speech acts of persuasion and suggestion constitute a fundamental domain of human communication, as they directly relate to the speaker’s intention to influence the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral states of the interlocutor. Within the framework of classical speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), such acts are typically associated with directive and commissive illocutions; however, their functional scope extends far beyond these categories, encompassing subtle pragmatic mechanisms, implicit meanings, and culturally embedded communicative norms.

In contemporary linguistics, persuasion is generally understood as a rational and argumentatively grounded form of influence, relying on logical reasoning, evidence, and explicit communicative strategies. Suggestion, by contrast, tends to operate through implicit, often emotionally charged or subconsciously processed means, involving presupposition, implication, and contextual inference (Leech, 1983; Wierzbicka, 1991). Despite this distinction, the boundary between persuasion and suggestion remains fluid, as both phenomena frequently co-occur within discourse and jointly contribute to achieving communicative goals.

The growing interest in these speech acts is closely linked to the expansion of pragmatics, discourse analysis, and cognitive linguistics, which emphasize the role of context, intention, and interpretation in meaning construction. In particular, modern approaches highlight that persuasive and suggestive effects are not solely determined by linguistic form but emerge from the interaction between language,

cognition, and culture. This perspective necessitates a cross-cultural examination of how such speech acts are conceptualized and realized in different linguistic traditions.

Russian linguistics has developed a robust tradition of studying persuasion and suggestion within communicative-pragmatic and discourse-oriented frameworks. Scholars focus on speech strategies, tactics, and genres, as well as the emotional and evaluative dimensions of language use (Karasik, 2002; Issers, 2008). Persuasion is often analyzed through argumentation theory and rhetorical structures, while suggestion is associated with implicit influence, manipulation, and the emotive function of language (Shakhovsky, 2008).

In Chinese linguistics, the study of persuasion and suggestion is deeply intertwined with traditional philosophical and ethical principles, particularly those derived from Confucianism. Communication is guided by the ideals of harmony, hierarchy, and face-saving, which favor indirectness and contextual sensitivity (Gu, 1990). As a result, persuasive and suggestive acts are frequently realized through implicit strategies, allusion, and situational cues rather than explicit verbalization.

Uzbek linguistics, situated at the intersection of Turkic linguistic heritage and broader Eurasian scholarly traditions, approaches persuasion and suggestion primarily through the lenses of speech culture, politeness, and linguocultural norms. Particular attention is paid to the role of national values, social hierarchy, and traditional forms of expression, such as proverbs and metaphorical language, in shaping communicative behavior (Mahmudov, 2012). In this context, suggestion often takes the form of indirect advice or culturally encoded guidance, while persuasion integrates ethical and communal considerations.

Despite the existence of substantial research within each of these traditions, comparative studies that systematically examine persuasion and suggestion across Russian, Chinese, and Uzbek linguistics remain relatively limited. Addressing this gap is essential for advancing our understanding of the universal and culture-specific aspects of speech acts.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of how speech acts of persuasion and suggestion are conceptualized, classified, and linguistically realized in these three linguistic traditions. The study seeks to identify common theoretical foundations, reveal culturally specific communicative patterns, and contribute to the development of an integrative cross-cultural model of persuasive and suggestive discourse.

2. Methods. The study employs a comparative-analytical method combining:

- **Literature review** of key works in Russian, Chinese, and Uzbek linguistics;
 - **Discourse analysis** to identify typical linguistic markers of persuasion and suggestion;
 - **Linguocultural comparison** to reveal culturally specific features.
- The data include theoretical studies, discourse examples from academic sources, and illustrative linguistic constructions typical of each tradition.

3. Results

3.1. Russian Linguistics. In Russian linguistics, persuasion is often studied within communicative-pragmatic and rhetorical frameworks. Scholars emphasize speech strategies, argumentation, and evaluative language (Issers, 2008). Suggestion is frequently linked with implicit influence, emotional appeal, and manipulation in discourse (Shakhovsky, 2008).

Typical features include:

- explicit argumentation;
- evaluative vocabulary;
- rhetorical questions and modal constructions.

3.2. Chinese Linguistics. Chinese studies of persuasion and suggestion are deeply rooted in Confucian communicative ethics, where indirectness and harmony are central (Gu, 1990). Persuasion often relies on:

- indirect speech acts;
- contextual inference;
- politeness strategies aimed at maintaining social balance.

Suggestion, in particular, is frequently realized through implicit cues and culturally encoded expressions rather than direct statements.

3.3. Uzbek Linguistics. Uzbek linguistics examines persuasion and suggestion through the lens of speech etiquette, respect, and national communicative norms (Mahmudov, 2012). Key features include:

- honorifics and politeness markers;
- culturally specific metaphors and proverbs;
- emphasis on moral and social values.

Suggestion is often conveyed through indirect advice, proverbs, or culturally meaningful expressions.

3.4. Comparative Findings. Across all three traditions, persuasion and suggestion share universal pragmatic goals – namely, influencing the interlocutor. However:

- Russian discourse tends toward **explicit persuasion**;
- Chinese discourse emphasizes **implicit suggestion and harmony**;
- Uzbek discourse integrates **cultural values and ethical norms** into persuasive strategies.

4. Discussion

The comparative analysis undertaken in this study demonstrates that speech acts of persuasion and suggestion, while grounded in universal communicative intentions, are profoundly shaped by culturally specific norms, values, and patterns of interaction. This finding aligns with the broader assumptions of cross-cultural pragmatics, which emphasize that meaning is not inherent in linguistic forms alone but emerges through culturally mediated processes of interpretation (Wierzbicka, 1991). One of the key insights of this research is the differing balance between explicitness and implicitness in the realization of persuasive and suggestive acts. Russian discourse tends to privilege explicit argumentation, evaluative language, and rhetorical structuring, reflecting a communicative style in which clarity, logical coherence, and emotional expressiveness are highly valued. This orientation can be linked to the strong tradition of rhetorical education and the influence of literary discourse on communicative norms.

In contrast, Chinese discourse exhibits a pronounced preference for indirectness and contextualization. Persuasion and suggestion are often embedded within broader interactional frameworks that prioritize

social harmony, relational maintenance, and face-saving. As a result, the effectiveness of persuasive communication depends not only on linguistic form but also on the interlocutors' ability to interpret contextual cues and shared cultural knowledge. This observation supports the notion that high-context cultures rely more heavily on implicit communication strategies.

Uzbek discourse presents an intermediate model in which both explicit and implicit strategies are employed, but always within the constraints of cultural norms related to respect, hierarchy, and communal values. The frequent use of proverbs, metaphorical expressions, and culturally salient references illustrates how persuasion and suggestion are integrated into a broader system of moral and social guidance. In this sense, persuasive communication is not merely a means of influencing others but also a way of reinforcing shared cultural values and ethical principles.

Another important aspect revealed by the analysis is the role of emotional and cognitive factors in shaping persuasive and suggestive effects. While persuasion is often associated with rational argumentation, and suggestion with emotional or subconscious influence, the data indicate that both dimensions are present in all three linguistic traditions. The difference lies in their relative prominence and modes of expression. For instance, Russian discourse may combine logical reasoning with эмоционально-оценочная лексика, whereas Chinese discourse may achieve persuasive effects through subtle emotional resonance and contextual implication.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings suggest that classical speech act theory, while providing a useful foundation, is insufficient to fully account for the complexity of persuasion and suggestion across cultures. A more comprehensive framework should integrate insights from pragmatics, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, and linguocultural studies. Such an approach would allow for a more nuanced understanding of how linguistic forms, cognitive processes, and cultural norms interact in the construction of meaning.

Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of adopting a dynamic view of speech acts, recognizing that persuasion and suggestion are not fixed categories but flexible communicative practices that adapt to context, genre, and interlocutor relationships. This perspective is particularly relevant in the context of globalization and digital communication, where traditional cultural boundaries are increasingly intersecting and evolving.

At the same time, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations of the present study. The analysis is primarily based on theoretical sources and illustrative examples rather than large-scale empirical data. Future research could benefit from corpus-based approaches, experimental methods, and the analysis of authentic discourse in various communicative settings, including media, political communication, and online interaction.

In conclusion, the discussion underscores that the study of persuasion and suggestion requires a multidimensional and cross-cultural approach. By comparing Russian, Chinese, and Uzbek linguistic traditions, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of the interplay between language, culture, and communication, and opens new avenues for further interdisciplinary investigation.

5. Conclusion

Speech acts of persuasion and suggestion represent complex communicative phenomena shaped by linguistic, cultural, and cognitive factors. Although they share universal characteristics, their realization varies significantly across Russian, Chinese, and Uzbek linguistic traditions.

Future research may focus on empirical discourse data, multimodal communication, and the role of digital media in shaping new forms of persuasive and suggestive speech.

References

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 237–257.
3. Issers, O. S. (2008). *Kommunikativnye strategii i taktiki russkoy rechi*. KomKniga.
4. Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs*. Gnozis.
5. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
6. Mahmudov, N. M. (2012). *Nutq madaniyati va uslubiyat asoslari*. O'zbekiston.
7. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Shakhovskiy, V. I. (2008). *Emotsii: lingvisticheskiy aspekt*. Librokom.
9. Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter.
10. Zhang, Y. (2012). Persuasion strategies in Chinese discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), 321–339.