

Literary Work Analysis on Suggestion Speech Act

SHERIMBETOVA NARGIZA NIETBAY QIZI
Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article provides a comparative analysis of the linguo-pragmatic and linguo-cultural features of the speech act of suggestion in English and Karakalpak literary texts. The study is based on dialogic passages from Arthur Miller's play Death of a Salesman and Shawdirbay Seytov's work Iqbal soqpaqlari, examining the grammatical forms and Martínez-Flor's suggestion strategies in relation to Hofstede's cultural dimensions and Triandis's individualism, collectivism model. The findings show that the English data reflect individualism and personal initiative, whereas the Karakalpak text highlights collectivism, "we"-oriented values, and respect-oriented interaction.

Keywords: Speech act of suggestion; Martínez-Flor strategies; Hofstede model; Triandis model; individualism; collectivism.

1. INTRODUCTION

The speech act of suggestion may be defined as a communicative strategy which, within the interactional process, proposes that the interlocutor undertake a certain action, endorse a particular idea, or participate in the joint realization of a plan. Rather than being formulated through direct imperatives, it is typically articulated in a mitigated manner that takes into account and respects the addressee's autonomy. When examining suggestions, it is essential to consider not only their formal-grammatical realization, but also the cultural values, social roles, and relational dynamics that underlie them. In this respect, Martínez-Flor's framework of suggestion strategies, Hofstede's model of cultural dimensions,

and Triandis' conception of individualism versus collectivism constitute a productive theoretical basis for elucidating the speech act of suggestion from a linguocultural perspective [4, 6].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, two primary methods and two auxiliary methods were employed to carry out the linguocultural analysis. The main methods were discourse analysis and speech act analysis. Discourse analysis made it possible to explore the composition of dialogues and their cultural context in the literary texts, while speech act analysis was used to identify the illocutionary and perlocutionary functions of suggestions according to Martínez-Flor's model. As auxiliary methods, pragmatic analysis and comparative analysis were applied. Pragmatic analysis was used to examine the social roles and degrees of formality present in the texts and interactions, whereas comparative analysis proved useful for demonstrating cultural differences between English and Karakalpak dialogues.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis was conducted on literary works in English and Karakalpak.

3.1. *Suggestions in English* [1: 12-20]

3.1.1. "Why don't you come out West with me?"

In this example Biff addresses his brother Happy: "Listen, why don't you come out West with me? Sure, maybe we could buy a ranch. Raise cattle, use our muscles." According to Martínez-Flor's classification, this is a conventionally indirect suggestion. Although the grammatical form is interrogative, pragmatically it conveys a clear proposal: "Let's go to West." The construction "maybe we could..." softens the suggestion, while the image of the ranch, cattle raising, and outdoor labour functions as a grounder that justifies the proposal.

From Hofstede's perspective, this passage is a vivid illustration of an individualist culture. The suggestion is rooted in

the ideas of personal freedom, the right to choose, and “finding one’s own path.” Biff rejects the conventional career trajectory offered by society and advances an alternative life project. At the same time, he imagines this dream not alone but within a “we” the brotherly alliance so that a small “we-group” emerges inside individualism. Power distance is low: Biff does not issue a command but treats his brother as a partner. Uncertainty avoidance is also low; buying a ranch remains an unrealized, “maybe”-formulated dream, yet this uncertainty is perceived as adventure rather than threat.

Within Triandis’ model, Biff is predominantly an idiocentric personality striving to choose his own life path independently. However, by formulating the suggestion through a “you and I” configuration, he links his dream to a small allocentric group, the fraternity of brothers. Thus, a complex motivation appears in which individualism is combined with a narrow, intimate collectivism.

3.1.2. *“Let’s go to sleep.”*

In the next example Biff briefly remarks: “Let’s go to sleep.” In Martínez-Flor’s taxonomy this is a direct suggestion strategy. The “let’s + infinitive” pattern proposes an action to be carried out jointly with the interlocutor and, unlike an imperative, creates a sense of partnership. There are no extended explanations in the line; the context (it is late, everyone is tired) serves as sufficient justification for the suggestion.

From Hofstede’s analysis, even such an ordinary scene displays the interactional style of an individualist society in family communication. No clear hierarchy is felt between the brothers; the address is informal and based on equality. Biff’s personal need to rest is transferred into the plural “we.” There is no salient uncertainty avoidance here: the suggestion simply provides a natural way of closing the conversation.

In accordance with Triandis’ model, the utterance demonstrates a small-scale allocentric tendency. The decision is taken by an idiocentric subject, yet he seeks to involve his interlocutor in it, wrapping an individual wish in a collective form.

3.1.3. *“If you ever need anything, come to me.”*

In the third example Biff recalls his former boss's words: “He said, ‘Biff, if you ever need anything, come to me.’” This construction is an indirect suggestion or a suggestion-promise expressed through a modal of willingness. According to Martínez-Flor, it represents a mitigated direct suggestion oriented towards future needs and leaving the addressee free to decide.

Based on Hofstede's model, the utterance reflects a tendency in individualist cultures to rely not only on formal institutions but also on personal networks. By saying “come to me,” the boss offers Biff an individualised mechanism of support. Power distance is present, yet the linguistic means soften it: the line leaves “the door open” rather than functioning as an order. Future uncertainty is mitigated by implying that there will always be a “place” to return to in times of difficulty.

Within Triandis' framework, the boss's allocentric behaviour consists in including Biff into a network of people from whom he may seek help. Biff, in turn, accepts this offer as a potential resource within his idiocentric life strategy.

3.1.4. *“Try to make him feel good for a change.”*

In the fourth example Linda addresses her son: “Biff, dear, don't make him feel unwanted anymore. Try to make him feel good for a change.” The constructions “don't make...” and “try to make...” combine to form a direct but softened suggestion. In Martínez-Flor's terms this is a direct suggestion with the verb *try* functioning as a mitigator.

In terms of Hofstede's, Linda's speech is aimed at preserving the emotional climate within the family. Even in an individualist society, familial allocentrism privileging family interests over personal ones plays an important role. Linda urges Biff to set aside his own grievances and take his father's feelings into account. Power distance exists within the family, yet the mother guides her son through a mixture of reprimand and suggestion, expressing concern rather than authoritarian control. Uncertainty avoidance emerges in the proposal of a clear strategy for managing conflict.

From Triandis' viewpoint, Linda adopts an allocentric position: she sees the family as a “we,” in which each member's

behaviour affects the whole system. The change demanded of Biff ultimately serves the goal of preserving this “we.”

3.1.5. “Let’s give Dad a good time tonight.”

In the fifth example Happy says to his brother: “Biff, let’s give Dad a good time tonight. We’ll tell him what he wants to hear.” Again, Martínez-Flor classifies this as a direct suggestion: the “let’s” formula offers a joint strategy, while the second sentence acts as a grounder explaining this strategy.

From Hofstede’s perspective, the scene reflects an interplay between familial allocentrism and individual strategy. The goal is to give their father “a good time,” that is, to create a positive emotional atmosphere for him. Yet the suggestion is partially manipulative: “what he wants to hear” implies saying what fits the father’s expectations rather than the truth. This illustrates a familial version of power distance: the father is in some sense the “centre,” and the sons must adapt to him. Uncertainty avoidance is visible in the brothers’ attempt to plan the situation in advance.

In Triandis’s terms, Happy behaves allocentrically insofar as he aims to preserve the father’s mood and the family’s honour, but at the same time the suggestion protects himself and Biff from an uncomfortable conversation. Thus, the allocentric goal intertwines with idiocentric interests.

3.2. *Suggestions in Karakalpak* [2:164]

3.2.1. *Mende shalap bar ...*

The first Karakalpak example runs as follows: *Mende shalap bar, – dedi ğarri, – tamaġma jabisadı demese ash ezegiñdi de jalġaydı*. The speaker does not directly order the interlocutor to drink; instead, he describes the positive qualities of *shalap* and thereby encourages the interlocutor to make his own decision. In Martínez-Flor’s terms this is a conventionally indirect suggestion: grammatically it is a description, but pragmatically it means “let us drink shalap.”

According to Hofstede’s model, such a suggestion is typical of a collectivist culture. Offering a drink is a sign of hospitality and an integral part of sitting together and conversing. Shared experience and social closeness outweigh individual needs.

Power distance appears through the relaxed tone and light humour typical of elders (“*garri*” has natural authority), yet this authority is not coercive but based on social status. Uncertainty avoidance is linked to representing *shalap* as a “reliable, time-tested remedy,” where traditional knowledge matters more than empirical experimentation.

From Triandis’s perspective, the speaker occupies a fully allocentric position: by offering the drink he invites the interlocutor into an intimate circle of people who sit together and share “a cup.” The central category here is “we,” not “I.”

3.2.2. *Hesh qalayı joq, eskekti qıstramız da a□ısqa erk beremiz!*

The second example concerns a situation on the water: *Hesh qalayı joq, eskekti qıstramız da a□ısqa erk beremiz!* Grammatically, this is a declarative sentence; semantically and pragmatically, however, it expresses a firm decision and suggestion. For Martínez-Flor it is a direct suggestion in declarative form: there is no imperative, but the modal component “there is no other way” makes the suggestion quite categorical.

Within Hofstede’s model, this line strongly reflects collectivism. The 1st person plural “qıstramız,” “beremiz” indicates that the decision belongs to the group. Instead of a subjective “I want,” we see an objectivised “we will do so.” Power distance is hardly visible; the decision appears to be taken among individuals with equal authority. Uncertainty avoidance is high: the way of dealing with the current is clearly defined and alternative options are excluded.

From Triandis’s viewpoint, this sentence exemplifies allocentrism: both personal safety and success are considered to depend on the group’s correct decision. The “I” is experienced primarily as a member of the collective rather than an autonomous agent.

3.2.3. *Ájelge sabır berse, men sonı sağan aytıp bereyin*

The third example: *Ájelge sabır berse, men sonı sağan aytıp bereyin.*” the form of this is conditional as well as it functions in speech as an indirect suggestion: “do not rush now, be patient later I will explain everything.” In Martínez-Flor’s model this is a

non-conventional indirect suggestion, as the proposal is tied to the fulfilment of a condition (patience).

In terms of Hofstede's model, the line reflects the coexistence of collectivism and high-power distance. An experienced elder possesses the right to reveal the full story and thereby offers psychological protection to the interlocutor. Knowledge and experience move vertically from top to bottom. Uncertainty avoidance manifests itself in a culturally preferred way of coping with difficult information: "accept the truth gradually and patiently" rather than disclosing everything abruptly.

Triandis would classify the speaker's stance as allocentric; he perceives his experience as a resource for the emotional stability of family or community members. The suggestion is considered as both the interlocutor's feelings and broader social norms.

3.2.4. *Endi paydası ne, usı romandı seniñ esteligine yadgarlıq etip qaldırmas da...*

The fourth example is a line in rhetorical question form: *Endi paydası ne, usı romandı seniñ esteligine yadgarlıq etip qaldırmas da ... qaldırmasam da sağan bári bir?!"* Grammatically, this is an interrogative with a disputative tone, but pragmatically it is an indirect suggestion urging the addressee to reconsider his attitude. In Martínez-Flor's terms it is a conventionally indirect suggestion: by exposing the interlocutor's indifference, the speaker pushes him to change his emotional stance.

Within Hofstede's model, the utterance reflects a clash between collective and individual values. When the novel is viewed as a "memento," it becomes a symbol of shared memory and cultural heritage – a manifestation of collectivism. The question *sağan bári bir emes pe?!"* sharply criticises the addressee's individual indifference. Thus, an allocentric point of view defending collective value confronts individual apathy.

From Triandis's perspective, the speaker is allocentric, evaluating things in terms of group and generational memory, whereas the addressee is idiocentric, focusing on personal concerns. The suggestion aims to move the addressee towards an allocentric way of thinking, inviting him to perceive the novel as part of a collective "we-memory."

3.2.5. *Júr úyge, shay ishemiz.*

The fifth example is an everyday offer in dialogue: “Maqset, ... Jú r úyge, shay ishemiz.” Grammatically, the line is close to an imperative but uses in the 1st person plural: “we will go together, we will drink tea together.” In Martínez-Flor’s classification this is a direct suggestion, an open invitation to joint action.

Hofstede’s model interprets such a suggestion as reflecting key collectivist values of Karakalpak society: hospitality, home, tea, *shalap*, shared activity, and the regulation of household matters. Going home and drinking tea are so routine as social practices that they often require no additional justification. Power distance is minimal; the invitation is extended in a friendly tone between equals. There is no real uncertainty or risk: home and tea represent a space of social safety and tranquillity.

From Triandis’ standpoint, the speaker is allocentric, inviting the interlocutor into his household and intimate social circle. Drinking tea functions less as satisfying a personal need than as a pretext for communication, closeness, and exchange of news.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the speech act of suggestion in English and Karakalpak has shown that the same communicative intention is realized through different strategies in distinct cultural contexts. In *Death of a Salesman* suggestions are often associated with personal dreams, independent choice, and individual responsibility. According to Martínez-Flor’s model, they are expressed mainly through direct and conventionally indirect strategies, frequently using formulas such as “let’s” and “why don’t you.” From the perspective of Hofstede and Triandis, these lines foreground individualism, low power distance, and idiocentric orientation, while traces of familial allocentrism are also observable.

Karakalpak suggestions, by contrast, are grounded predominantly in an allocentric and collectivist framework. Offers revolving around hospitality, home, tea, *shalap*, joint activity, and the organization of domestic life are frequently conveyed through non-conventionally indirect strategies, humor,

rhetorical questions, and explanations based on traditional experience. In Hofstede's terms, this culture displays collectivism, reliance on customary knowledge, in some cases relatively high-power distance; in Triandis' terms, an allocentric worldview and the priority of "we" over "I" are clearly evident.

Thus, the speech act of suggestion proves to be a particularly fruitful object for linguocultural analysis. While Martínez-Flor's typology provides a precise classification of linguistic strategies, the models of Hofstede and Triandis reveal the deeper socio-cultural mechanisms underlying these strategies. As a result, differences between English and Karakalpak cultures become visible not only at the lexical and grammatical levels, but also in the ways proposals are made, ideas are advanced, and joint decisions are negotiated.

REFERENCES

1. Miller, A. 1949. *Death of a Salesman*. New York: Viking Press.
2. Seytov, S. 1975. *Ig'bal soqpaqlari*. N: Qaraqalpaqstan.
3. Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. UK: London.
5. Jiang, X. 2006. Suggestions: What should ESL students know? *System*, 36-54.
6. Martínez-Flor, A. 2005. A theoretical review of the speech act of suggesting: Towards a taxonomy for its use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 18, 167-187.
7. Triandis, H. C. 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism*. New York: London.
8. Trosborg, A. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

SHERIMBETOVA NARGIZA NIETBAY QIZI
ASSISTANT TEACHER,
KARAKALPAK STATE UNIVERSITY, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <SHINNARA1717@ICLOUD.COM>