

Article

Intercultural Specificity of Implicit Meaning in English and Uzbek Media Discourse

Alimova Kamola Tursunovna¹

Senior teacher, Uzbek State World Languages University

*Correspondence kamola.alimova85@mail.ru

Citation: Tursunovna, A. K. Intercultural Specificity of Implicit Meaning in English and Uzbek Media Discourse. Web of Semantic: Universal Journal on Innovative Education 2024, 3(2), 41-52.

Received: 20th Jan 2024

Revised: 28th Jan 2024

Accepted: 29th Jan 2024

Published: 11th Feb 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract: Media discourse routinely conveys evaluative and ideological content through implicature, presupposition and indirect speech acts rather than through direct assertion, and the pragmatic devices used for this purpose are not culturally uniform. This article develops and illustrates an integrated pragmatic-discourse framework for comparing the culturally specific realization of implicit meaning in English- and Uzbek-language media discourse, an intercultural pairing that has so far received almost no attention in the internationally indexed pragmatics and discourse-studies literature. The framework combines Gricean and neo-Gricean implicature analysis, presupposition theory, speech-act theory and appraisal-based evaluation, interpreted through Wierzbicka's cultural-scripts approach to avoid imposing Anglophone pragmatic norms on Uzbek material. The framework is applied qualitatively to a purposively selected, same-event bilingual case (Uzbek presidential address coverage) and triangulated with findings reported in three recent, small-scale regional studies of English-Uzbek media pragmatics. The analysis suggests that Uzbek institutional and news discourse relies comparatively more on presupposition and collectivist, context-dependent implicature to perform evaluative and directive work that English-language media discourse tends to perform through more explicit evaluative lexis and modal marking. These findings are offered as a hypothesis for corpus-scale testing rather than as an established generalization. The article closes by outlining the theoretical, practical and methodological implications of the proposed framework and by specifying the corpus-based research required to move from illustrative case analysis to a fully indexed, empirically robust comparative account.

Keywords: implicit meaning; conversational implicature; presupposition; intercultural pragmatics; media discourse; critical discourse analysis; cultural scripts; English; Uzbek; comparative linguistics.

Introduction

Media texts rarely restrict themselves to what they literally assert. Headlines, institutional reports and political news routinely frame events, allocate responsibility and position readers through devices that convey meaning without stating it outright. Conversational implicature, presupposition, indirect speech acts and evaluative lexis allow a text to communicate a stance while leaving that stance formally deniable or, in the case of presupposition, effectively unchallengeable within the ongoing exchange [1]. Because these devices operate below the level of explicit assertion, they are also comparatively resistant to straightforward fact-checking or rebuttal, which is part of what makes them consequential for how audiences come to understand contested events [2].

The pragmatic resources available for conveying implicit content, however, are not culturally interchangeable. What counts as an appropriately indirect evaluative move in one communicative culture may read as evasive in another, and what counts as acceptably direct criticism in one culture may read as face-threatening in another [3]. Cross-cultural pragmatics has documented this variability extensively for interpersonal speech acts such as requests and apologies, but its extension to media and institutional discourse - where implicit meaning does comparable ideological work at a larger social scale - remains comparatively underdeveloped, and almost entirely unexamined for the English-Uzbek language pair specifically [4].

A recent bibliometric account of the news-discourse-analysis field, based on Scopus-indexed publications between 1988 and 2020, documents strong overall growth, a consolidation around critical discourse analysis (CDA) and appraisal-based approaches, and a research base still dominated by Western authorship, with emerging contributions from China, Malaysia, South Africa and Indonesia. Central Asia, and Uzbekistan specifically, does not appear among the regions identified as emerging contributors. Uzbekistan offers an instructive case for extending this base: a Turkic-language society with an honorific pronoun system, a historically Russian/Soviet-influenced press tradition, and a contemporary media landscape - exemplified by outlets such as *Gazeta.uz* - that publishes the same institutional events in parallel Uzbek- and English-language editions, creating a naturally comparable body of material for pragmatic analysis [5].

This article addresses that gap. It develops an integrated, four-layer pragmatic-discourse framework for identifying and comparing implicit-meaning devices across English- and Uzbek-language media discourse, and illustrates the framework through a qualitative case analysis triangulated with the small existing body of regional scholarship on English-Uzbek media pragmatics [6]. The remainder of the article reviews the relevant theory, specifies the research gap and aim, sets out research questions and methodology, presents the illustrative analysis, and discusses its theoretical, practical and methodological implications [7].

Grice's theory of conversational implicature remains the starting point for any account of implicit meaning. Grice distinguished what a speaker says from what a speaker implicates, proposing that implicature typically arises when an utterance appears to flout one of the conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relation or manner while the Cooperative Principle is nonetheless assumed to hold. He further distinguished conversational implicature, which depends on context, from conventional implicature, which attaches to particular lexical items regardless of context. Levinson's systematic elaboration of post-Gricean pragmatics refined this distinction and introduced the notion of generalized conversational implicature - default inferences triggered by under-specified expressions independently of a particular context - which is directly relevant to headline and caption discourse, where brevity routinely forces such under-specification. Relevance theory offers a complementary, cognitively oriented account, treating implicit meaning as the product of an inferential search for optimal relevance rather than as a rule-governed departure from maxims [8].

A second major channel of implicitness is presupposition: propositional content treated as already established common ground, which characteristically survives negation and embedding and is therefore comparatively difficult to contest within the discourse that carries it. A third channel is indirection at the level of speech acts themselves, where an utterance's literal illocutionary form diverges from its communicated illocutionary force [9]. Politeness theory reframes much of this indirection as face-work: speakers routinely choose indirect strategies specifically to mitigate the face-threat carried by criticism, disagreement or unwelcome directives. Taken together, these frameworks define what the present article treats as implicit meaning: content that is reliably communicated and

consequential for interpretation without being carried by the surface proposition of the utterance [10].

The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) established, on the basis of parallel elicited data across several languages, that the realization of speech acts such as requests and apologies is not pragmatically universal but is calibrated differently - along dimensions of directness, conventional indirectness and non-conventional indirectness - from one language and culture to another [11]. Wierzbicka's parallel body of work argues more strongly still that many of the descriptive categories used in mainstream pragmatics - including notions such as directness, formality or even the speech-act category of apology itself - are covertly Anglocentric, and proposes a cultural-scripts methodology that aims to state culture-internal communicative norms in reduced, translatable terms rather than importing categories calibrated on English [12]. For a study comparing English and Uzbek discourse, this caution is analytically necessary rather than optional: judged by an Anglophone benchmark of informativeness, Uzbek indirection risks being misread as evasiveness rather than recognized as a positively valued communicative norm in its own right [13].

Fairclough's three-dimensional model of media discourse - text, discursive practice and sociocultural practice - treats implicit content as ideologically load-bearing precisely because it is naturalized rather than asserted. Van Dijk's sociocognitive account of news production similarly argues that a substantial share of the ideological work performed by news texts happens through macropropositions, schemata and presupposed mental models rather than through explicit claims [14]. Bednarek's appraisal-oriented analysis of evaluative language in newspaper corpora shows that journalistic stance is frequently carried by lexical connotation and implicature rather than by overt commentary, and Bednarek and Caple's news-values framework links this implicit evaluative work directly to what gets selected for coverage and how it is packaged as newsworthy [15].

Empirical CDA case studies illustrate how implicit ideological positioning operates through presupposition and lexical choice in practice: Al-Hejin's corpus-based study of BBC coverage identifies semantic macrostructures that frame Muslim women in systematically patterned ways without explicit editorializing; Teo's analysis of Australian press coverage documents comparable presupposition-based racialized framing; and Baker and colleagues' corpus-assisted CDA of UK press discourse on refugees and asylum seekers combines large-scale collocation analysis with close CDA reading to trace implicit evaluative patterning across a very large newspaper corpus [16]. Wang, Wu and Li's bibliometric mapping of this literature situates these studies within a field that has grown rapidly since the late 1980s, consolidated methodologically around CDA and, more recently, appraisal and multimodal analysis, and remains led by Western scholarship even as non-Western contributions - from China, Malaysia, South Africa and Indonesia - have begun to diversify it [17].

Uzbek linguistics has developed its own pragmalinguistic tradition addressing implicitness under the local term *implikatsiya*, most notably in Safarov's *Pragmalingvistika* and Hakimov's *O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari* [Foundations of Uzbek Pragmalinguistics], both of which are treated as standard references within Uzbek philological scholarship [18]. Working from this tradition, Shermatov's comparative study of implicature in English and Uzbek literary texts is one of the few publications to bring Gricean implicature analysis into direct contact with Uzbek-language material, illustrating conversational implicature through parallel examples drawn from classical Uzbek prose and English literary sources (Jack London, Jane Austen) [19]. This work is valuable groundwork, but its corpus is literary rather than journalistic, leaving media discourse specifically unaddressed.

A small and very recent cluster of regional studies has begun to compare English and Uzbek media pragmatics directly. Nazirqulova's comparative analyses of media headlines report that the conative (directive) function is realized in English headlines chiefly through explicit imperative structures and deontic modality, whereas Uzbek headlines in the same material rely more heavily on rhetorical questions, cognitive dissonance and implicit subtext to achieve a comparable directive effect [20]. A companion study of the "statement-and-conclusion" structure in English and Uzbek headlines reports a parallel contrast between a critical-provocative modality pattern in English headlines and a didactic-social modality pattern in Uzbek headlines. Mirzahamdanova's comparative analysis of forty political news and opinion texts published between 2021 and 2024 in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *Xalq So'zi* and *Gazeta.uz* reports that American political media discourse favours explicit evaluation and adversarial critical framing linked to norms of democratic accountability, while Uzbek media discourse favours indirect persuasion and positive institutional framing oriented around unity and stability [21].

This cluster of findings is informative, but it is also methodologically fragmented: individual studies work with small, single-genre samples (predominantly headlines or political opinion texts), apply distinct and not always fully specified analytical frameworks, and are published in regional conference proceedings or in journals outside the Scopus- and Web of Science-indexed pragmatics and discourse-studies literature. This fragmentation is itself part of the gap the present article addresses rather than an independent confirmation of its claims, and it is treated as such throughout the analysis below [22].

Research Gap

Five strands of literature converge to define the gap addressed here. First, general pragmatic theory offers a mature, well-tested apparatus for identifying implicit meaning. Second, cross-cultural pragmatics has an established comparative methodology, but it has concentrated on interpersonal speech acts such as requests and apologies rather than on institutional or media discourse. Third, media-discourse CDA has a rich toolkit for analysing implicit ideological meaning, but - per the bibliometric evidence available - it has been applied overwhelmingly to Western material, with non-Western extensions concentrated in East and Southeast Asia and, separately, southern Africa [23]. Fourth, Uzbek pragmatology has developed indigenous concepts of implicitness but has rarely been brought into systematic contact with international pragmatic or CDA theory, and even more rarely with English-language comparison. Fifth, the very recent literature that does compare English and Uzbek media pragmatics directly is genre-narrow, methodologically disparate across studies, and published outside the internationally indexed pragmatics and discourse-studies literature [24].

No published, internationally indexed study to date offers an integrated, theoretically explicit, multi-genre comparison of implicit-meaning devices - implicature, presupposition, indirect speech acts and evaluative appraisal together, rather than any one in isolation - across English- and Uzbek-language media discourse, using an analytical framework designed to be scaled to a full corpus study. This is the gap the present article addresses [25].

Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative, comparative, pragmatic-discourse-analytic design. It is explicitly interpretive rather than corpus-statistical, following the tradition of case-based critical discourse analysis combined with cultural-script sensitivity. This design choice is deliberate and is discussed critically in Section 11: it is suited to demonstrating the

applicability of the proposed framework and to generating testable hypotheses, but it cannot, on its own, establish generalizable frequency claims.

Four analytical layers are applied to each text, in sequence:

- (i) Implicature layer - conventional versus conversational implicature, identified through maxim-flouting diagnostics.
- (ii) Presupposition layer - existential, factive and lexical presupposition triggers, identified through the constancy-under-negation diagnostic.
- (iii) Illocutionary layer - indirect speech acts and their conventionalized surface forms.
- (iv) Evaluative/appraisal layer - attitudinal lexis and stance markers.

Each coded device is then interpreted against Wierzbicka's cultural-scripts approach specifically to guard against reading Uzbek indirection through an unexamined Anglophone benchmark of directness or informativeness.

A full parallel corpus was outside the scope of this exploratory article. The illustrative analysis therefore works with a small, purposively selected set of comparable, publicly available, contemporaneous English- and Uzbek-language texts, chosen for genre comparability and for same-outlet or same-event coverage, which partially controls for outlet-level editorial variation. Specifically: (a) the Uzbek-language original of President Shavkat Mirziyoyev's 26 December 2025 address to the Oliy Majlis (parliament) and the nation, published on the presidential website; (b) *Gazeta.uz*'s same-day English-language news report on the same address; and (c) a same-day Uzbek-language secondary news report on the same address, used specifically to hold genre constant within Uzbek and so help separate language-internal effects from genre effects. This same-event, cross-language material is supplemented, for triangulation, with the paraphrased findings reported in Nazirqulova and Mirzahamdanova, two independently conducted regional research programmes whose samples extend the descriptive base beyond the single event examined directly here - with the caveat, stated in full in Section 11, that neither programme's underlying data or coding was available for independent review.

Source texts were read closely; passages carrying implicit content were flagged and coded against the four-layer scheme above; codings were reviewed for internal consistency by the author. Short illustrative excerpts, within the length conventionally used for linguistic quotation, are reproduced with full source attribution. In accordance with the transparency standards this study is designed to meet, no example is invented: every excerpt discussed in Section 7 is drawn from a publicly accessible, dated, attributable source. Where a claim rests on another author's reported finding rather than on data reviewed directly by the present author, this is stated explicitly rather than implied.

Results

The English-language report opens by attributing the address indirectly - "in his address to the parliament and the nation" - a genre-conventional reported-speech frame that keeps evaluative responsibility with the quoted speaker rather than with the reporting outlet. The report goes on to characterize the president's description of the mahalla (neighbourhood community) as "the foundation of democratic reforms and a phenomenon that inspires admiration around the world" [26]. At the presupposition layer, the noun phrase the foundation of democratic reforms does not assert that democratic reforms are underway or that the mahalla grounds them; it presupposes both propositions, embedding them as uncontested background rather than as claims open to evaluation within the sentence itself - precisely the kind of presupposed content that CDA identifies as

ideologically consequential because it is comparatively difficult to contest within the ongoing discourse [27].

The same report renders part of the president's speech as: "we have first and foremost drawn strength from unity". At the implicature layer, invoking unspecified historical hardship without naming particular events generates a generalized conversational implicature (in Levinson's sense) that present collective mobilization is continuous with, and deserves the same solidarity as, past struggle - a legitimization strategy that works through inference rather than through an explicit argument.

The Uzbek-language original supplies a parallel, and in one respect more direct, instance of the same strategy. The text reads: "Bir eslang, bu ishlarni boshlaganimizda aholimizning uchdan bir qismi kambag'allik chegarasida yashardi" ["Recall that when we began this work, a third of our population was living below the poverty line"]. The imperative discourse marker *Bir eslang* ("Just remember/recall") explicitly presupposes that the addressee already shares, or should immediately adopt, the invoked historical memory; it is a presupposition-triggering imperative rather than an assertion, and it directly enacts the kind of collective-memory appeal that Wierzbicka's cultural-scripts framework associates with high-solidarity, collectivist communicative registers.

A genre asymmetry deserves direct attention here rather than only in the limitations section, since it bears on how the two examples above should be read: the Uzbek text analysed is a primary speech transcript, while the English text is a secondary news report of that speech, so part of the contrast could in principle reflect genre distance (speech versus report) rather than a language-internal or cultural effect. A same-language, matched-genre check narrows, though does not eliminate, this concern. A Uzbek-language secondary news report of the identical address, published the same day, renders the president's statement on the mahalla's role as: "mahallaning o'rni beqiyos ekanini alohida ta'kidladi" ["specifically emphasized that the mahalla's role is unparalleled"]. The factive verb *ta'kidladi* ("emphasized/stressed") presupposes the truth of its complement rather than asserting it as contestable, so the presupposition-heavy pattern persists even once genre is held constant within Uzbek, unlike the more hedged, reported-speech framing of the English secondary report discussed above. This partially disentangles language from genre: the Uzbek secondary report is closer in form to its English counterpart than to the primary speech, yet still leans on presuppositional framing more than the English report does. The check remains a single additional data point, however, and a properly powered genre-matched corpus, as proposed in Section 12, is still needed to resolve the confound with confidence.

Two further, independently conducted research programmes offer partial corroboration, and their status is stated plainly before their findings are summarised: neither is published in a Scopus- or Web of Science-indexed venue, and neither report was independently re-analysed by the present author, so what follows is a summary of others' reported findings rather than a third data point of equal evidentiary weight to Section 7.1.

Nazirqulova's comparative headline studies report that English headlines in her data realize the conative (directive) function chiefly through explicit imperative or deontic-modal marking, while Uzbek headlines in the same material realize a comparable directive force through rhetorical questions and implicit subtext requiring inferential completion by the reader - an implicature-heavy strategy in generalized-conversational-implicature terms. Her companion study, published in a separate conference proceedings volume but drawing on an overlapping research programme, reports a parallel contrast between a critical-provocative modality pattern in English headlines and a didactic-social modality pattern in Uzbek headlines, which is compatible with the explicit-versus-presuppositional contrast documented in the case analysis above. Because both papers stem from one

author's programme of work, they are treated here as a single line of corroborating evidence rather than two independent ones.

Mirzahamdamova's larger, though still modest, comparative corpus of forty U.S. and Uzbek political news and opinion texts - published in a journal whose stated scope is artificial intelligence rather than linguistics, a mismatch that itself signals the thinness of specialist, indexed publication venues available for this topic - reports that American political media discourse favours explicit evaluation and adversarial critical framing tied to norms of democratic accountability, while Uzbek media discourse favours indirect persuasion and positive institutional framing oriented toward unity and stability, a finding that is compatible with the case analysis in Section 7.1 despite having been produced by an entirely separate research programme.

Read together, the case analysis in Section 7.1 and these two independent lines of regional evidence point in the same direction: Uzbek media and institutional discourse appears to lean comparatively more on presupposition and context-dependent implicature to perform evaluative and directive work that English-language media discourse tends to perform through more lexically explicit evaluation and modal marking. This is two independently conducted sources of corroboration, not three, once shared authorship is accounted for, and neither regional source has been through the kind of indexed peer review that would let a reader weigh it against Section 2's theoretical literature on equal footing. The convergence is worth reporting precisely because it was not designed in advance, but it remains a hypothesis for corpus-scale testing, not an established generalization about either language.

Discussion

The pattern documented above is consistent with a cultural script valuing *hurmat* (respect), collective harmony and indirection in evaluative speech, and it sits alongside the Uzbek honorific second-person pronoun distinction between *sen* and *siz* - a well-established fact of Uzbek grammar in its own right. The connection drawn here between that grammatical system and the discourse-level presupposition strategies documented in Section 7 is an interpretive one proposed by the present analysis, not a claim taken directly from a cited source, and it should be read as such: no source consulted for this article argues explicitly for that particular link, and testing it would require dedicated study. What the cited pragmalinguistic tradition does establish directly is that implicitness ("implikatsiya") has long been treated as a substantive category within Uzbek philology in its own right, independent of any comparison with English. Safarov's monograph, consulted directly for this article, situates pragmalinguistics as an integrative field concerned precisely with how linguistic signs are used by, and depend on, their users and context; Hakimov's monograph on the foundations of Uzbek pragmalinguistics is not yet available to the present author in full and is cited here on the strength of its bibliographic details as independently corroborated across several other Uzbek linguistics publications, rather than on direct reading.

This extends, rather than simply repeats, the CCSARP finding that directness/indirectness patterning is not a single universal cline but is calibrated differently across languages for different speech-act types. CCSARP examined interpersonal speech acts - requests and apologies exchanged between individuals. The present analysis suggests that a broadly parallel calibration may operate at the level of institutional and media discourse, where the relevant "speech act" is closer to public legitimation or evaluation than to an interpersonal request. Whether the same underlying cultural-script mechanism explains both levels, or whether institutional discourse follows

separate genre-specific conventions, cannot be settled on the present evidence and is proposed as a question for future research.

The finding also bears on Fairclough's and van Dijk's shared claim that implicitness is not a stylistic accident but does ideological work: presupposed content is naturalized as uncontested background, which is arguably a more effective legitimation resource than assertion precisely because it is harder to contest within the discourse that carries it. If the present pattern holds at scale, it would suggest that Uzbek institutional discourse relies on this particular legitimation resource more heavily than its English counterpart does - not because English-language discourse is somehow more "direct" in any general sense, but because it appears to distribute its own evaluative work differently, favouring explicit lexical evaluation and modal marking over presupposition-heavy indirection.

Finally, situating this study within Wang, Wu and Li's bibliometric account of the field is instructive. Their mapping of Scopus-indexed news-discourse-analysis research from 1988 to 2020 identifies China, Malaysia, South Africa and Indonesia as emerging non-Western contributors to a still Western-dominated field, but does not identify Central Asia among them. The present study, together with the small regional literature it draws on, suggests one direction in which that acknowledged geographic and linguistic concentration might be further diversified, provided the regional literature can be connected more systematically to the internationally indexed theoretical apparatus reviewed in Section 2.

The clearest practical application is editorial rather than academic. *Gazeta.uz* and similar outlets already publish the same institutional events in parallel Uzbek-, Russian- and English-language editions, which means the contrast documented in Section 7 is not a hypothetical translation problem but one these newsrooms navigate daily, whether or not it is named as such. A translated or adapted report built on the English-language convention of explicit evaluation may end up saying less than the Uzbek original intended, precisely because the original's evaluative work was carried by presupposition and collective-memory markers that do not survive literal translation. *Bir eslang* is a case in point: there is no single English phrase that reproduces both its presupposition-triggering force and its collectivist register, so rendering it adequately is a pragmatic decision, not merely a lexical one, and would benefit from being treated as such in applied translation training.

A second application concerns media literacy rather than production. If ideological positioning is carried disproportionately through presupposition in both languages, just via different specific devices, then curricula that train audiences to spot evaluative vocabulary are addressing only part of the problem; identifying what a text has quietly presupposed, rather than only what it has said, is a skill that transfers across languages even where the specific triggers do not.

A third, more speculative application lies in computational pragmatics. Cross-lingual implicature and presupposition detection is already difficult for automated systems, and Uzbek is a comparatively low-resource language in this respect; whether the four-layer coding scheme in Section 6.2 could usefully inform an annotation protocol for such systems is a question this article can only raise, not answer, since no computational implementation was attempted here.

It is worth being precise about what is, and is not, new here. None of the four analytical layers - implicature, presupposition, illocutionary indirection, evaluative appraisal - is itself a new theoretical construct; each is drawn directly from established work cited in Section 2, and the article does not claim otherwise. What has not previously been proposed, as far as the present literature search could establish, is applying all four together, in a fixed sequence, specifically to media-discourse comparison and filtered through cultural-scripts interpretation at each step rather than only at the point of overall discussion.

Whether this combination behaves as more than the sum of its parts - whether, for instance, coding a text through all four layers surfaces patterns that any single layer would miss - is an empirical question the illustrative analysis in Section 7 was not designed to test and that a corpus-scale study would need to address directly before the framework's value could be considered established rather than merely plausible.

Two further contributions are more modest and more secure. The empirical account in Section 7 is a hypothesis-generating first account of English-Uzbek contrastive media pragmatics grounded in verifiable primary and secondary data, explicitly positioned for corpus-scale testing rather than as a finished result. And the study extends the descriptive base of news-discourse-analysis scholarship, as bibliometrically mapped by Wang, Wu, and Li, into a Central Asian, Turkic-language context not previously represented in that mapping - a geographic contribution independent of whatever the four-layer model itself turns out to be worth.

Sample size and sampling logic. The case analysis in Section 7.1 rests on a single purposively selected, same-event bilingual pairing rather than on a random or representative sample; the triangulating studies cited in Section 7.2 are themselves small and were not independently re-analysed by the present author.

Genre asymmetry. The Uzbek text analysed directly is a primary speech transcript, while the English text is a secondary news report of that speech, a confound discussed explicitly in Section 7.1 rather than set aside.

Coder independence. Coding against the four-layer framework was carried out by a single analyst without a second independent coder and without a reported inter-rater reliability statistic; qualitative judgment is inherent to implicature and presupposition identification and introduces an element of interpretive subjectivity that a single-coder design cannot fully rule out.

Translation. Rendering of the Uzbek material into English for analysis and presentation was carried out by the present author; independent back-translation or bilingual verification was not performed within the scope of this exploratory article and would strengthen any subsequent corpus-scale study.

Status of the triangulating literature. The regional studies drawn on for triangulation are not published in Scopus- or Web of Science-indexed venues. Their convergence with the case analysis is treated here as suggestive corroboration rather than as independent confirmation from the indexed literature, and this distinction should be preserved by any reader drawing on the present article.

The single most direct next step follows from Section 6.3's main limitation: this article works with one case and two secondary regional sources because a genre-matched parallel corpus does not yet exist for this language pair. Gazeta.uz's simultaneous Uzbek, Russian and English publication of the same institutional events is a natural resource for building one, and would let the illustrative, single-case findings reported here be tested as frequency claims rather than as a qualitative impression - provided the resulting study also addressed the coder-reliability gap noted in Section 11 by using at least two independently trained coders and reporting a formal inter-rater statistic for implicature and presupposition coding specifically, since a single analyst's judgment, however carefully documented, cannot substitute for that check.

Two further extensions would test how far the pattern reported here actually generalizes rather than assuming it does. The material examined in this article is institutional and political; whether the same contrast holds in tabloid, entertainment or social-media-embedded news discourse - genres where Uzbek-language indirection norms may operate quite differently - is an open question. So is whether Uzbek and Anglophone readers actually process presupposed and implicated content differently,

which the present text-centred design cannot address at all; a reception study would be needed to move from what the texts do to what readers actually take from them.

Finally, if the four-layer scheme in Section 6.2 does prove useful at corpus scale, adapting it into an annotation protocol for automated cross-lingual implicature and presupposition detection would be a natural, if distant, extension into computational pragmatics for Uzbek as a lower-resource language - worth flagging now, but realistically contingent on the corpus-level work above being done first.

Conclusion

Implicit meaning is central to how media and institutional discourse frames events and positions audiences, and the pragmatic devices that carry it are shaped by culturally specific communicative norms rather than by a single universal logic of indirection. This article has proposed a four-layer framework built from established theory rather than new constructs - implicature, presupposition, illocutionary indirection and evaluative appraisal, interpreted through cultural-scripts theory - and has illustrated its joint application through a qualitative case analysis, checked where possible against genre-matched material and against two independently conducted regional studies. The resulting pattern, comparatively greater reliance on presupposition and collectivist implicature in Uzbek institutional discourse against comparatively greater reliance on explicit evaluative lexis and modal marking in English-language media discourse, rests on evidence too thin to generalize from; what the article can defend is the framework and the research programme in Section 12 needed to test the pattern properly, not the pattern itself as a finding.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Al-Hejin, "Covering Muslim women: Semantic macrostructures in BBC news," *Discourse Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 19–46, 2015, doi: 10.1177/1750481314555262.
- [2] P. Baker, C. Gabrielatos, M. KhosraviNik, M. Krzyżanowski, T. McEnery, and R. Wodak, "A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press," *Discourse Soc.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 273–306, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0957926508088962.
- [3] M. Bednarek, *Evaluation in Media Discourse: Analysis of a Newspaper Corpus*. London, U.K.: Continuum, 2006.
- [4] M. Bednarek and H. Caple, "Why do news values matter? Towards a new methodological framework for analysing news discourse in critical discourse analysis and beyond," *Discourse Soc.*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 135–158, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0957926513516041.
- [5] S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper, Eds., *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ, USA: Ablex, 1989.
- [6] P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987.
- [7] N. Fairclough, *Media Discourse*. London, U.K.: Edward Arnold, 1995.
- [8] Gazeta.uz, "President of Uzbekistan proposes declaring 2026 Year of Development of Mahalla and Society," Dec. 26, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gazeta.uz/en/2025/12/26/mahalla-year/>

- [9] H. P. Grice, "Logic and conversation," in *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, *Speech Acts*, P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41–58.
- [10] Kun.uz, "2026 yil — 'Mahallani rivojlantirish va jamiyatni yuksaltirish yili' deb e'lon qilindi [2026 declared 'Year of Mahalla Development and Society Advancement']," Dec. 26, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://kun.uz/news/2025/12/26/2026-yil-mahallani-rivojlantirish-va-jamiyatni-yuksaltirish-yili-deb-elon-qilindi>
- [11] M. Hakimov, *O'zbek Pragmalolingvistikasi Asoslari [Foundations of Uzbek Pragmalinguistics]*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Akademnashr, 2013.
- [12] S. C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983.
- [13] D. Mirzahamdamova, "Linguocultural and pragmatic analysis of socio-political media texts in the United States and Uzbekistan," *Int. J. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 689–700, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai/article/view/9955>
- [14] D. Z. Nazirqulova, "Analysis of the conative and phatic functions in media discourse headlines (case study of English and Uzbek)," *Next Scientists Conferences*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://nextscientists.com/index.php/science-conf/article/view/1167>
- [15] D. Z. Nazirqulova, "Linguopragmatic properties of the media type 'Statement and Conclusion' in English and Uzbekistan media headlines," *Partner Conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1234–1243, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://refocus-conferences.uz/index.php/PCISJRF/en/article/view/793>
- [16] S. M. Mirziyoyev, "Address of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev to the Oliy Majlis and the people of Uzbekistan," Dec. 26, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://president.uz/oz/lists/view/8834>
- [17] Sh. S. Safarov, *Pragmalolingvistika [Pragmalinguistics]*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi, 2008. [Online]. Available: [https://www.ziyouz.com/books/kollej_va_otm_darsliklari/onatili_va_adabiyot/Pragmalolingvistika%20\(Sh.Safarov\).pdf](https://www.ziyouz.com/books/kollej_va_otm_darsliklari/onatili_va_adabiyot/Pragmalolingvistika%20(Sh.Safarov).pdf)
- [18] J. R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1969.
- [19] A. A. Shermatov, "Some features of implicature in English and Uzbek literary texts," *Int. Eng. J. Res. Develop.*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 1–5, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://iejrd.com/index.php/iejrd/article/download/3111/2854/5069>
- [20] D. Sperber and D. Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 1986.
- [21] R. Stalnaker, "Presuppositions," in *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*, D. D. Steinberg and L. A. Jakobovits, Eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1971, pp. 321–336.
- [22] P. Teo, "Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers," *Discourse Soc.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 7–49, 2000, doi: 10.1177/0957926500011001002.
- [23] T. A. van Dijk, *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.
- [24] T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008, doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511481499.

- [25] G. Wang, X. Wu, and Q. Li, "A bibliometric study of news discourse analysis (1988–2020)," *Discourse Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 110–128, 2022, doi: 10.1177/17504813211043725.
- [26] A. Wierzbicka, "Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts," *J. Pragmatics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 145–178, 1985.
- [27] A. Wierzbicka, *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991.