

Cognitive-Pragmatic Mechanisms of Negative Emotion Framing in English and Uzbek Media Discourse

Bakhramova Zamira Rahimovna

Lecturer, Department of Uzbek and Foreign Languages, Bukhara State Technical University, Uzbekistan

Annotation *This article investigates negative-emotion framing in selected English and Uzbek television interviews, podcasts and social-media utterances documented in Bakhramova's dissertation. A qualitative contrastive analysis examines mitigation, intensification, figurative conceptualization and pragmatic reframing. English examples from Jimmy Fallon and Dr. Phil include "kind of", "I guess" and parallel negative self-evaluations; Uzbek examples from Yor-yor and Ayol qalbi illustrate comparative attenuation, culturally situated consolation and embodied metaphors. The results suggest that both languages employ overlapping pragmatic resources, whose effects depend on local interaction and genre. The article proposes a five-stage model linking emotional situation, conceptualization, linguistic verbalization, pragmatic modification and discursive outcome. This purposive sample does not support population-level claims or statistical estimates.*

Keywords: *cognitive pragmatics; negative emotions; media discourse; framing; evaluative language; English; Uzbek; contrastive analysis*

Introduction

News language presents events as meaningful social situations rather than as isolated facts. A report about an economic setback, public-health concern, or institutional disagreement may foreground risk, uncertainty, blame, or collective resilience. These choices matter for the study of negative emotions because expressions of fear, anger, grief, and disappointment may contribute to the interpretive perspective from which an event is understood. Yet an emotion word alone cannot establish the intention of a journalist or the response of an audience. The surrounding proposition, the attributed source, the genre, and the relationship between claims and evidence all shape interpretation.[1]

The comparison of English and Uzbek is especially useful because both languages provide rich lexical and figurative resources for emotional evaluation while differing in grammatical organization and some conventional patterns of expression. A literal translation may preserve an emotional label but shift the force of agency, certainty, or social evaluation. This article therefore asks three questions: which textual mechanisms can foreground negative emotion in media discourse; how can their pragmatic functions be distinguished from their lexical meanings; and which aspects of cross-language comparison require context rather than word-for-word equivalence?

The central argument is that negative emotion framing is a layered interpretive process. A lexical item makes an emotional category accessible; a conceptual frame organizes what is at stake; pragmatic choices distribute responsibility and certainty; and the discourse context makes particular inferences more or less plausible. The article develops this account as an analytical model rather than presenting an unverified quantitative survey.[2]

Framing research emphasizes that communication can make certain aspects of perceived reality more salient, thereby promoting particular definitions of a problem, causal interpretations, moral evaluations, or proposed responses [3]. This does not imply that all audiences will draw the same conclusions. Rather, textual salience offers a way to describe the interpretive opportunities made

available by a message. In news discourse, such opportunities are linked to the selection of events, sources, and evaluative formulations.

Cognitive metaphor theory explains how relatively abstract experiences can be understood through more concrete conceptual domains [4]. Emotional language frequently invokes heat, pressure, movement, weight, or bodily disturbance [5]. Thus, anger may be conceptualized as rising heat, while anxiety may be represented as physical constriction or instability. These patterns are useful analytical starting points, but a metaphor does not automatically carry the same social implication in every setting.

Pragmatics draws attention to what is communicated beyond conventional sentence meaning. Relevance-oriented approaches distinguish decoded linguistic content from context-dependent inference [6]. Appraisal theory, meanwhile, offers a systematic account of evaluation, including attitude, engagement, and graduation. The present framework brings these perspectives together: framing identifies the highlighted problem; metaphor identifies the conceptual mapping; appraisal identifies evaluation and degree; and pragmatic analysis considers the inferences licensed by context.

The analysis also adopts a cautious view of cultural difference. English-language and Uzbek-language media are not internally homogeneous systems. Newspaper headlines, institutional announcements, television interviews, and social-media posts differ in conventions even within a single language. Cultural claims therefore require a clearly sampled corpus, genre controls, and evidence of repeated patterns. In the absence of such data, cross-language examples can illustrate possibilities, not establish population-wide preferences.[7]

Materials and Methods

The material comprises selected authentic-media excerpts as transcribed in the dissertation notably examples 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.6, 3.1.11, 3.1.12, 3.1.15, 3.1.17, 3.1.8 and 3.2.12. English examples are drawn from The Tonight Show, Dr. Phil and Steve Harvey; Uzbek examples come from Yor-yor, Ayol qalbi and Asoschilar. The excerpts were purposively selected for observable linguistic features, not sampled randomly. The analysis identifies emotional situation, conceptual category, lexical and grammatical realization, pragmatic modification and local discourse function. The source transcripts have not been independently rechecked against audio; consequently, this study does not claim transcript verification, corpus representativeness or quantitative results.[8]

For each selected excerpt, the analytical procedure identifies (1) the propositional content; (2) the emotional conceptual domain (fear, anger, sadness or anxiety); (3) lexical, metaphorical and grammatical cues; (4) pragmatic functions, including intensification, mitigation and responsibility attribution; and (5) the evidentiary status of the example. This separation prevents a plausible interpretation from being presented as an observed fact. The dissertation report's H/B/S/R/M layer labels are retained as project terminology, but their full operational definitions must be checked against the complete dissertation before they are used as reproducible coding categories.

For future empirical validation, each real excerpt must be accompanied by its exact source URL, publisher and date, media genre, original-language transcript, start/end timestamps, surrounding context, and an independent transcript check. The eight incompletely identified excerpts must not be included as verified quotations until their sources are recovered. An annotated bilingual dataset could then support inter-coder agreement checks and frequency comparisons; neither procedure has been carried out for this article.[9]

Results and Discussion

The Tonight Show question "Are you, kind of, bittersweet sad that 'Euphoria' is over?" (dissertation example 3.1.1, 0:16) uses "kind of" to soften an attributed emotional assessment. "Bittersweet" also brings together positive and negative affect, allowing the interviewee to qualify the suggested feeling. In a Dr. Phil exchange, a participant replies "I don't like them. I just I guess I have a grudge against

them” (example 3.1.6). “Don’t like” attenuates the interviewer’s stronger “hate”, while “I guess” marks uncertainty. Yet “have a grudge” simultaneously invokes sustained resentment. The utterance thus illustrates layered, not uniformly weakened, negative evaluation.[10]

This contrast reveals why fear framing should not be coded only by searching for the word fear or qo‘rquv. A statement can construct an atmosphere of threat through references to uncertainty, anticipated harm, or vulnerability without naming an emotion. Conversely, an explicit reference to fear may simply report an interviewee’s documented feeling. Analysts must distinguish the representation of an emotional state from the journalist’s own evaluative stance.

Responsibility attribution and anger

The Uzbek response “Jahlim tezroq” (“I tend to lose my temper rather quickly”; Yor-yor, dissertation example 3.1.11, 15:15) offers a useful comparison with English stance mitigation. The comparative suffix -roq softens the categorical force of a negative self-description in this context. In Dr. Phil, “I don’t feel safe, I don’t feel secure, I don’t feel valued” (example 3.1.4, 8:25) repeats a syntactic frame three times, foregrounding unmet emotional needs. These instances demonstrate that grammatical form can manage emotional stance without requiring a direct lexical label for anger or sadness.[11]

Table 1. Responsibility may also be implied by grammatical subject selection. A headline that names an institution as agent invites a different interpretation from one that describes an event without identifying its cause. Such effects remain context-dependent: grammatical agency is not equivalent to legal or moral responsibility. A robust analysis therefore needs to check whether responsibility is explicitly asserted, quoted from a source, presupposed, or only inferred by the reader.

Comparative coding of documented media examples

Table 1. The following matrix identifies analytical categories in selected excerpts documented in the dissertation; no frequency claim is intended.[12]

Mechanism	English illustration	Uzbek illustration
Mitigation	kind of; I guess	jahlim tezroq
Intensification	very nervous; I don’t feel...	zerikdim judayam
Metaphor	failure is a wonderful teacher	muammosiga qovurilib yuribdi
Consolation	negative feeling in interview	Sadqai ko‘z yoshlariz ketsin

A coding scheme should treat these categories as potentially overlapping. An expression may combine a threat frame, an embodied metaphor, and a high-intensity evaluation. For example, a figurative description of an impending crisis could invite concern even without naming a feeling. Coding only surface emotion words would miss such cases; coding every negative event as an emotion would overstate them. The operational distinction between emotional attribution and emotional affordance is therefore essential.[13]

Implications and Limitations

The analysis connects the dissertation’s semantic-field and media-discourse findings to an internationally readable procedure for coding emotional stance. Its main contribution is to separate lexical negativity, conceptual framing, pragmatic modification and locally inferable communicative function. The full dissertation provides the underlying qualitative cases, while this article focuses on a small, explicitly selected subset.[14]

The present study uses the full dissertation’s media examples, but its quotations are dependent on the dissertation’s transcriptions, not independently checked audio. The selected extracts are not a balanced bilingual corpus and cannot justify percentages, population-level language differences or claims of experimentally observed audience reactions. Some source identifiers and transcriptions in the dissertation require confirmation before journal submission. All cross-language observations in this paper are qualitative and context-specific.[15]

Conclusion

Selected English and Uzbek media utterances show that negative emotion is shaped by lexical meaning, degree marking, grammatical parallelism, conceptual metaphor and interactional stance. English “kind of” and “I guess” and Uzbek -roq demonstrate context-sensitive attenuation; repetition and degree modification intensify evaluation in both languages. Figurative framing can either heighten perceived danger or reinterpret adversity constructively. A five-stage model—emotional situation, conceptualization, verbalization, pragmatic modification and discursive outcome—offers a transparent method for comparative analysis. Further work should verify recordings and examine a balanced bilingual corpus before making distributional or general cultural claims.

References

- [1] R. M. Entman, “Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm,” *Journal of Communication*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 51–58, 1993, doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x.
- [2] Z. Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [3] G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- [4] J. R. Martin and P. R. R. White, *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- [5] D. Sperber and D. Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, 2nd ed. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 1995.
- [6] A. Wierzbicka, *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [7] Z. R. Bakhramova, “Ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida salbiy his-tuyg‘ularni ifodalovchi leksik birliklarning kognitiv-pragmatik xususiyatlari (OAV materiallari asosida),” unpublished Ph.D. dissertation manuscript, Bukhara State Technical University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan, 2026.
- [8] G. Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- [9] G. Lakoff, *The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics*. New York, NY, USA: Penguin Books, 2008.
- [10] P. Chilton, *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2004.
- [11] T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [12] T. A. van Dijk, “Principles of critical discourse analysis,” *Discourse & Society*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 249–283, 1993.
- [13] P. R. R. White, “An introductory tour through appraisal theory,” *Appraisal Website*, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, U.K., 2001.
- [14] J. Charteris-Black, *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- [15] A. Musolff, *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London, U.K.: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.