HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

READING LIKE A REGULATOR: IMPLIED CLAIMS AND LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION IN EDUCATION ADVERTISING IN THE UNITED KINGDOM AND UZBEKISTAN

Jurayev Sherali Zokir ugli
Master Student, Study Program Linguistik (S2), Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Email: sheralijurayev_97@upi.edu
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9724-9832
Supervisor: Professor **Dadang Sudana**
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Supervisor's email: dsudana@upi.edu
doi:**https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24154491**

Abstract: Advertisements for education and training seldom lie outright. Their most consequential claims (that a provider is the best, that a qualification is recognised everywhere, that a course leads to a job or to fluency in three months) are usually implied, packed into a single word or placed behind a disclaimer. This article compares how two advertising regulators read such claims: the UK Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) and Uzbekistan's Committee for the Development of Competition and Protection of Consumer Rights. Drawing on Gricean and neo-Gricean implicature, presupposition theory and Relevance Theory, it analyses ten ASA rulings (2022–2026) containing 31 challenged claims, and four public communications in which the Uzbek Committee addressed education advertising (2024–2026), read against the Law "On Advertising" (ZRU-776). In the UK data, five patterns emerged: unanchored superiority, status vocabulary, borrowed partners, frame misdirection and unconditional certainty. The ASA reasoned in every ruling from what consumers "would understand", and it never accepted that a qualification placed where readers are unlikely to see it could cancel a headline impression. The Uzbek Committee flagged expressions of certainty ("Kafolatlangan ta'lim", 'Guaranteed education'; "3 oyda til o'rganing", 'Learn a language in 3 months') and one of scarcity ("Joylar soni cheklangan", 'Places are limited'), a pattern absent from the UK sample. However, it labelled them "exaggerated" without reconstructing the reader's inference, and its enforcement ran mainly through licensing and complaints. The ASA reads inferentially; the Committee reads lexically. The article argues that Uzbekistan's definition of misleading advertising already covers implied meaning, but that published, reasoned decisions and a sector rule on guaranteed educational outcomes are needed to make it work, and it proposes ways to teach learners to "read like a regulator".

Keywords: linguistic manipulation; conversational implicature; presupposition; educational advertising; advertising regulation; Advertising Standards Authority; Uzbekistan; legal linguistics; misleading claims

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

1. Introduction

Few purchases are as uncertain as the purchase of education. A prospective student pays in advance for a service that cannot be inspected, whose quality is difficult to judge and whose outcome depends heavily on the student's own effort (Tran et al., 2026). The advertisement is often the first, and sometimes the only, evidence the buyer has. Unsurprisingly, advertisements for universities, schools and training courses have attracted the attention of regulators as well as researchers.

Linguists have long argued that advertising's most persuasive claims are often implied rather than stated (Grice, 1975; Olenyuk, 2016). Studies of educational marketing have documented deadline-based promises, pseudo-scientific method names and appeals to embarrassment (Derwing & Munro, 2009), along with slogans that take the place of price information (Wrycza-Bekier, 2026). Typologies of media manipulation supply names for such devices, among them glittering generalities and card stacking (Fedorov et al., 2022). Most of this work, however, rests on examples chosen by the analyst. It rarely asks how an institution with the power to act on advertisements actually reads them, and it almost never compares how institutions in different legal cultures do so.

Regulatory texts can answer that question. When the UK Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) decides a complaint, it publishes a ruling that records the advertisement, the claims challenged, the advertiser's response and the regulator's own reasoning about how consumers are likely to interpret the claims. Each ruling is, in effect, a written interpretation of advertising discourse by an authoritative reader. Uzbekistan's Committee for the Development of Competition and Protection of Consumer Rights (hereafter "the Committee") is the authorised body for advertising under the Law "On Advertising" (Law No. ZRU-776, 2022, Art. 8). It also reports on the advertisements it acts on, mostly through press releases, warnings and media statements, and it publishes no reasoned rulings. Comparing the two shows how far each regulator makes implied meaning visible, and what a regulator needs in order to act on it.

Education is a good domain in which to study this. Its products are named by words that carry institutional weight, such as school, degree, accredited and recognised; its outcomes, such as admission, qualification, fluency and employment, are the very outcomes no provider can guarantee; and its audience is often young (Buckingham et al., 2005). In Uzbekistan, private learning centres advertise heavily on social media, and complaints about non-state education have risen sharply: the Committee reported 2,070 education complaints over three years, 96% of them concerning non-state providers, with "unfulfilled promises in advertising" among the main grounds (Spot.uz, 2026). Uzbekistan's Law "On Advertising" defines misleading advertising broadly, but it offers little guidance on how implied claims should be interpreted (Law No. ZRU-776, 2022, Art. 5).

This article examines how the two regulators "read between the lines" of education and training advertising. It addresses four research questions:

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

RQ1. What types of implied claims are challenged in ASA rulings on education and training advertising, and through which pragmatic mechanisms are they communicated?

RQ2. How does the ASA reconstruct the meaning of these claims, and under what conditions does it accept that a qualification or disclaimer has cancelled an implied meaning?

RQ3. Which expressions in education advertising has the Uzbek Committee identified as problematic, and how does its published reasoning compare with that of the ASA?

RQ4. What do the similarities and differences imply for the regulation of educational advertising in Uzbekistan and for media literacy teaching?

Treating regulatory texts as interpretive data, the article contributes to legal linguistics, to the pragmatics of advertising and to the study of linguistic manipulation. It also makes practical recommendations for regulators, providers and teachers in Uzbekistan.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Gricean implicature

Grice (1975) proposed that conversation is governed by a Cooperative Principle: participants make their contribution such as is required by the accepted purpose of the exchange. He articulated the principle in four maxims:

1. Quantity: make your contribution as informative as is required, and no more.
2. Quality: say only what you believe to be true and have evidence for.
3. Relation: be relevant.
4. Manner: be clear, brief and orderly, and avoid ambiguity.

Implicatures arise when a hearer assumes that a speaker is cooperative and searches for the meaning that would make an utterance conform to the maxims. Two properties of implicature matter most for advertising. First, implicatures are cancellable, so a speaker can add a clause that denies them without contradiction. Second, because implicatures are not part of what is said, the speaker can disclaim responsibility for them (Grice, 1975; Levinson, 1983). An advertiser who writes "Leading UK Online Sixth Form" has not stated any ranking, yet many readers will infer one.

2.2 Scalar implicature and the strongest reading

Neo-Gricean accounts refine the maxim of Quantity into principles about informational scales. Horn (1984) distinguished Q-based implicatures, which limit what is said by implicating that a stronger term does not apply, from R-based implicatures, which enrich what is said towards a stereotypical or maximally informative interpretation. Levinson (2000) developed these principles into a theory of default inferences. In advertising, superlatives and ranking terms such as number 1 and leading sit at the top of evaluative scales, and readers are invited to enrich them towards the most informative reading available: a ranking of all comparable institutions, by an independent source, on a criterion that matters.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

2.3 Presupposition, accommodation and category words

A presupposition is a proposition that an utterance takes for granted rather than asserts. Presuppositions are associated with particular triggers, including definite descriptions, factive verbs and change-of-state verbs (Levinson, 1983). Karttunen (1974) showed that when a presupposition is not already part of the context, hearers often accommodate it, silently adding it to the common ground. Institutional nouns behave in a related way. Calling a provider a medical school or a course an MBA does not assert that the provider is regulated or that the course leads to a degree; the noun simply presents the provider as a member of a category whose regulated status the reader already knows. The claim is carried by the category, not by any sentence.

2.4 Relevance Theory and overall impression

Sperber and Wilson (1995) replaced Grice's maxims with a single cognitive principle: hearers seek the interpretation that yields the greatest cognitive effect for the least processing effort, and they stop at the first interpretation that satisfies their expectation of relevance. This account explains why the position and prominence of information matter. A headline is processed first and with the least effort, so its interpretation is likely to be accepted before the reader reaches a qualification further down the page. Relevance Theory thus offers a cognitive basis for the regulatory notion of "overall impression": what a reader takes from an advertisement depends on which parts of it are most accessible, as well as on what it contains.

2.5 Implicit communication as linguistic manipulation

The properties described above explain why implicit communication is attractive to advertisers, and why it can become manipulative. van Dijk (2006) defines manipulation as a form of illegitimate influence that serves the manipulator's interests against those of the manipulated, often by exploiting what recipients already know or believe. Maillat and Oswald (2009) give the notion a relevance-theoretic basis: manipulative discourse constrains the hearer's interpretation so that a convenient assumption is the most accessible one, while information that would challenge it is made costly to process or kept out of view. On this account, an implied claim is manipulative when the speaker relies on the hearer to supply a meaning the speaker could not defend if it were stated. A headline whose qualification sits in a footer is an obvious example. This article therefore treats the patterns identified below as mechanisms of linguistic manipulation, and asks how far each regulator is able to name them.

2.6 Legal linguistics and advertising regulation in the United Kingdom

Legal linguists have shown that disputes about meaning in civil law frequently turn on the difference between what a text says and what it can reasonably be taken to communicate (Shuy, 2008; Tiersma, 1999). Advertising regulation institutionalises this difference. In the United Kingdom, the CAP Code prohibits marketing communications that materially mislead or are likely to do so (r. 3.1), prohibits the omission of material information (r. 3.3) and requires marketers to hold documentary evidence for claims that consumers are likely to regard as objective (r. 3.7) (Committee of Advertising Practice, n.d.-a). The ASA's published advice on university advertising adds that claims should be read

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

as the average consumer would understand them, that rankings must state their source and date, and that broad or ambiguous terms require qualification (Committee of Advertising Practice, n.d.-b).

2.7 Advertising regulation in Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan's Law "On Advertising" of 7 June 2022 approaches the same problem from a different direction. Article 5 defines misleading (unfair, knowingly false) advertising as advertising that, through inaccuracy, ambiguity, exaggeration or silence, misleads or may mislead its users. The definition therefore recognises implied and omitted meaning in principle. Article 16 prohibits improper advertising, allows comparative advertising only where the advertiser can prove the comparison, and bans advertising goods that lack a required licence or certificate; Article 47 sets a fine of seventy base calculation units for improper advertising (Law No. ZRU-776, 2022). The law also contains sector-specific bans on guaranteed outcomes. Advertisements for medicines may not claim that their effect is guaranteed (Art. 34), advertisements for folk medicine may not guarantee a positive effect (Art. 45), and advertisements for securities may not guarantee income (Art. 42). No comparable rule addresses educational services.

Before the current law was adopted, Khodjaev (2020) argued that Uzbekistan's model for regulating misleading advertising could not deal with the problem effectively because its standards were undeveloped. The 2022 law extended the definition, but standards for interpreting a claim are developed through decisions, and the Committee does not publish its decisions in a form comparable to the ASA's rulings. Its public record consists of press releases, warnings and statistics, many of them circulated through its Telegram channel and reported by the news media (e.g., Gazeta.uz, 2025; Kun.uz, 2024).

2.8 Research gap

Research on advertising pragmatics has analysed implied claims in advertisements, and research on advertising law has analysed rules and enforcement. Few studies have connected the two by treating regulatory texts as records of interpretation. None located for this review has done so for education and training advertising, and none has compared a regulator that publishes reasoned rulings with one that does not. The analysis that follows addresses that gap by applying implicature, presupposition and relevance theory to the reasoning recorded by the ASA and to the public communications of the Uzbek Committee.

3. Method

3.1 Research design

The design is a comparative qualitative pragmatic document analysis. Document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing and evaluating documents in order to elicit meaning and develop understanding (Bowen, 2009). The two datasets are deliberately unequal. ASA rulings are publicly available, follow a consistent structure, quote the challenged claims and record the regulator's reasoning in its own words. The Uzbek Committee publishes shorter texts that report outcomes and flag expressions but rarely set out reasoning. The study compares this difference directly, asking how

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

much interpretive reasoning each regulator makes visible and of what kind. The approach is interpretive. It explains how implied meaning was reconstructed, or left unreconstructed, in the recorded texts and does not assess whether either regulator decided correctly.

3.2 UK data: ASA rulings

Ten rulings were selected through purposive sampling from the ASA's online rulings database. Each ruling met three criteria: (a) the advertiser offered education, training or accreditation services to prospective learners or institutions; (b) the ruling was published between 2022 and 2026; and (c) at least one challenged claim was communicated wholly or partly by implication rather than by explicit statement. The rulings vary in provider type (universities, schools, accreditation bodies, training academies and an education technology company), in medium (websites, paid search advertisements, social media posts and a job board) and in outcome reasoning (Table 1).

Table 1. ASA rulings analysed

No.	Advertiser (ruling date)	Medium	Provider type	Key challenged wording
R1	Centre for Medical Sciences & Research Ltd (31 Aug 2022)	Website	Clinical skills and aesthetics training	"LONDON MEDICAL SCHOOL"; "LONDON'S LEADING CLINICAL SKILLS AND AESTHETIC MEDICINE TRAINING PROVIDER"
R2	The University of Leicester (7 Sep 2022)	Social media post	University	"We're number 1!"; "number 1 in the UK for overall research quality (GPA) in #REF2021"
R3	Treat Assignment Help (19 Apr 2023)	Website	Essay and assignment service	"Assured Success with Customized Assignment Writing"; "100% plagiarism free"
R4	The Secret Diamond Academy (26 Apr 2023)	Social media posts	Aesthetics training academy	"Fully Accredited Course"; "Sclerotherapy training course available"
R5	London School of Planning and Management Ltd (28 Jun 2023)	Website	Private college	"Master of Business Administration (MBA)"; "Fully Accredited & Accepted Worldwide"

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

No.	Advertiser (ruling date)	Medium	Provider type	Key challenged wording
R6	IT Career Change Ltd (18 Dec 2024)	Job board listing	Training and placement provider	"Trainee Health & Safety Advisor"; "you will not need any previous experience"
R7	Thomas Keith Ltd (13 Aug 2025)	Paid search ad	Online sixth-form school	"#1 UK online Sixth Form School"; "Leading UK Online Sixth Form"
R8	LanguageNut Ltd (20 Aug 2025)	Blog on website	Education technology for schools	Comparative claims on content, ease of use and value
R9	Centre of CPD Excellence (18 Mar 2026)	Website	CPD accreditation body	Comparison table; "a panel of independent industry experts"
R10	Course Accreditation Ltd (13 May 2026)	Website and paid search ad	Course accreditation body	"globally recognised"; "UK Leading Accreditation Body"; insurer logos

Source: ASA rulings database (Advertising Standards Authority, 2022a–2026b). Wording is quoted as reported in the rulings.

3.3 Uzbek data: public communications of the Committee

Because the Committee does not maintain a database of reasoned decisions, the Uzbek data were collected from its website (raqobat.gov.uz; Committee for the Development of Competition and Protection of Consumer Rights [CDCPCR], 2025) and from national news outlets that report its press-service statements (Kun.uz, Gazeta.uz and Spot.uz). Searches were run in Uzbek, Russian and English, combining terms for learning centres, non-state education, study abroad and consulting with terms for advertising and misleading claims. The searches were conducted in October 2026. A text was included if (a) it reported action, findings or warnings by the Committee; (b) it was published after the 2022 law came into force; and (c) it concerned the advertising of education or education-related services. Four communications met the criteria (Table 2). A fifth text, a 2026 warning to advertisers of medical services, falls outside the education domain. It was kept as a comparator (M1) because it shows how the Committee treats similar wording in a sector where the law contains an explicit ban on guarantees.

Table 2. Uzbek Committee communications analysed

No.	Date and source	Type	Content	Advertising wording reported

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

No.	Date and source	Type	Content	Advertising wording reported
U1	18 Dec 2024; Kun.uz (2024), Spot.uz (2024)	Inspection report (press service)	Inspection of non-state education providers after more than 500 complaints; Newton Academy, Merit School, My Med Academy and MyTeacher named	"Joylar soni cheklangan" ('Places are limited'); "3 oyda til o'rganing" ('Learn a language in 3 months'); "Kafolatlangan ta'lim" ('Guaranteed education')
U2	19 Jun 2025; Committee website (CDCPCR, 2025)	Public warning	Consulting firms promising to send citizens abroad for work or study; most unlicensed	Promises of an "oson" ('easy') route abroad
U3	18 Dec 2025; Gazeta.uz (2025)	List of providers with most complaints	About 1,200 complaints on non-state education in 2024–2025; 13 providers and 3 instalment platforms named	None quoted; mismatch between advertised and delivered services reported
U4	5 Aug 2026; Spot.uz (2026)	Policy proposal	Voluntary certification of non-state education proposed; 2,070 education complaints in three years	None quoted; "unfulfilled promises in advertising" listed as a complaint category
M1	21 Sep 2026; Gazeta.uz (2026b)	Public warning (comparator, medical services)	Call to medical advertisers to comply with the advertising law	"uch kunda davolaymiz" ('we treat in three days'); "mutlaqo xavfsiz" ('absolutely safe')

Note: Uzbek wording is quoted as reported in the sources and given in standard Uzbek Latin spelling; English glosses are the author's.

3.4 Units of analysis and data preparation

For the UK data, the unit of analysis was the challenged claim: a word, phrase, visual element or combination that the complainant or the ASA identified as potentially misleading. Each ruling was read in full, and every challenged claim was extracted together with the ASA's statement of how consumers would interpret it and the rules applied. This produced 31 claims (R1, 2; R2, 2; R3, 5; R4,

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

2; R5, 4; R6, 2; R7, 2; R8, 3; R9, 3; R10, 6). Disclaimers and qualifications that the ASA discussed were recorded separately as features of the advertisement, not as claims.

For the Uzbek data, the unit of analysis was the flagged expression: a word or phrase from an advertisement that the Committee quoted or described as problematic. U1 and U2 yielded four flagged expressions; U3 and U4 reported advertising problems only in general terms. Each communication as a whole was also coded for the visibility of its reasoning (Section 3.5).

3.5 Analytical framework and procedure

Analysis followed two coding cycles. In the first cycle, each UK claim and each Uzbek flagged expression was coded deductively using the categories in Table 3. In the second cycle, codes were compared across claims, rulings and jurisdictions to identify recurrent patterns, which were grouped into themes. Patterns found in only one dataset were retained. To make the comparison of reasoning explicit, every regulatory text was also coded for five features: whether it quotes the advertising wording, states the reading attributed to consumers, cites a specific legal provision, reports an outcome tied to the particular claim, and addresses any qualification or disclaimer.

Table 3. Coding framework

Dimension	Categories
Linguistic form	Superlative or ranking term; comparative; institutional or credential noun; recognition phrase; certainty phrase; time-bound outcome phrase; scarcity phrase; headline or genre label; logo or image
Pragmatic mechanism	Scalar implicature (R-based enrichment); category inference or presupposition; frame-based inference; implied relationship; implicature allegedly cancelled by a qualification
Maxim at issue (Grice, 1975)	Quantity, Quality, Relation, Manner
Regulator's reconstructed reading	The interpretation attributed to consumers ("consumers would understand ..."), or none stated
Role of qualification	None; qualification present but judged insufficient (position, prominence, contradiction)
Rules applied	CAP Code rules (e.g. 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 3.9, 3.33–3.35); Law No. ZRU-776 articles; other legislation (e.g. licensing)
Visibility of reasoning	Wording quoted; consumer reading stated; provision cited; claim-specific outcome; qualification addressed (each yes/no)

3.6 Trustworthiness

All coding decisions were recorded with the text number, the quoted wording and the reconstructed reading, so that each judgement can be traced to the source. Interpretations were checked against the full text of each ruling or communication. The author, a native speaker of Uzbek who also reads Russian, translated the Uzbek and Russian sources, and where both versions of a report

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

existed (U1), they were compared. The coding was repeated after two weeks, and the few changes made were recorded in an audit trail.

3.7 Ethical considerations

The study uses only texts that the regulators or the news media have published. Advertisers are named because the texts are public regulatory communications and the analysis concerns the reasoning they record; no individual complainants or consumers are identified.

4. Results

Sections 4.1 to 4.6 report the UK data. Sections 4.7 to 4.9 report the Uzbek data and compare the two.

4.1 UK patterns: overview

The 31 UK claims grouped into five recurrent patterns of implied meaning. Table 4 shows how often each pattern occurred in each ruling; where a claim showed more than one feature, it was assigned to its dominant pattern. All ten rulings were upheld.

Table 4. Distribution of patterns by ASA ruling

Pattern	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	Total
A. Unanchored superiority	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	10
B. Status vocabulary	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	9
C. Borrowed partners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
D. Frame misdirection and omission	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
E. Unconditional certainty	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total	2	2	5	2	4	2	2	3	3	6	31

4.2 Pattern A: Unanchored superiority (R1, R2, R7, R8, R9, R10)

The most frequent pattern consisted of superlatives and ranking terms that did not state their basis. In R2, a university posted on social media: "We're number 1!", followed by the statement that its arts and humanities research was "number 1 in the UK for overall research quality (GPA) in #REF2021". The ASA considered that consumers would read the claim as meaning that the national research assessment had ranked the university as the top UK institution for arts and humanities research. In fact, the assessment did not rank institutions overall or by subject group; the position was the result of the university's own analysis of a subset of subjects using a third party's methodology, and the post did not disclose this (Advertising Standards Authority, 2022b).

In neo-Gricean terms, the claim relied on R-based enrichment. "Number 1" is the strongest term on an evaluative scale, and the hashtag naming the assessment made the most informative reading the

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

most relevant one: an official ranking by the named exercise. The university's own calculation was a weaker basis than the reading the claim invited, and the post supplied nothing that would have limited the enrichment.

R7 shows the same mechanism with no basis stated at all. A paid search advertisement described an online school as the "#1 UK online Sixth Form School" and the "Leading UK Online Sixth Form". The ASA noted that the basis of the claims was unclear, since they could refer to examination results, course range or an independent ranking, and that consumers were also likely to understand the school to be based in the UK (Advertising Standards Authority, 2025a). The claim is ambiguous in Manner, and that openness helps the advertiser, because each reader can supply whichever criterion matters most to them. For the ASA, the same indeterminacy meant that the claim needed substantiation on every plausible reading.

The remaining cases follow the same logic. In R1, "LONDON'S LEADING CLINICAL SKILLS AND AESTHETIC MEDICINE TRAINING PROVIDER" was read as a claim to lead all London providers on student numbers or independently assessed quality, and the evidence supplied, which included no comparison with other providers, did not support it (Advertising Standards Authority, 2022a). In R8, R9 and R10, comparative and leadership claims about content, ease of use, price and service were read as objective statements about both the advertiser and its competitors, and were found misleading or unverifiable (Advertising Standards Authority, 2025b, 2026a, 2026b).

4.3 Pattern B: Status vocabulary (R1, R4, R5, R10)

The second pattern concerned words that name institutional categories or credentials. In R1, a clinical skills and aesthetics training company called itself "LONDON MEDICAL SCHOOL". The ASA considered that consumers would associate a medical school with an institution that trains people for a medical career, including qualification as a doctor, and that such schools are regulated by the medical regulator. Because the company was not registered with that regulator and did not offer such training, the name was misleading (Advertising Standards Authority, 2022a).

No sentence in the advertisement made this claim. The noun phrase medical school presents the company as a member of a category whose regulated status readers already know, and readers accommodate the associated propositions without being told them (Karttunen, 1974). The mechanism is closer to presupposition than to implicature. Nothing is inferred from an apparent breach of a maxim; the meaning arrives with the category word itself.

R5 shows how such vocabulary accumulates. A private college listed a course titled "Master of Business Administration (MBA)" and described it as "Fully Accredited & Accepted Worldwide", adding "Your qualification is recognised and accepted world over!" and "We are accredited". The ASA considered that consumers would read the advertisement as describing a Masters-level degree from an accredited higher education institution. The course was in fact a Level 7 diploma, and an MBA could be obtained only by applying and paying separately for a one-year top-up at a partner university (Advertising Standards Authority, 2023c). Each phrase strengthened the inference created

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

by the course title: MBA named the category, accredited suggested institutional approval, and worldwide extended that approval without limit. In R4 and R10, Fully Accredited Course, "globally recognised" and "worldwide approval" worked in the same way, inviting readers to supply an accrediting authority and a scope of recognition that the advertisements never specified (Advertising Standards Authority, 2023b, 2026b).

4.4 Pattern C: Borrowed partners (R9, R10)

The third pattern borrowed credibility from third parties whose involvement was implied but not established. In R10, an accreditation body stated that it could "better your chances of getting insured by our trusted insurance partners" and displayed insurers' logos under the heading "Explore Insurance Providers". The ASA considered that consumers would take the claims and logos as showing established arrangements with insurers that would make it easier to obtain cover. The company had no such arrangements (Advertising Standards Authority, 2026b). In R9, references to "a panel of independent industry experts" and a list of insurers led consumers to believe that the advertiser had genuine expert backing and formal insurer relationships, which it could not evidence (Advertising Standards Authority, 2026a).

In relevance-theoretic terms, a logo placed beside a claim about insurance is relevant only if the reader infers a connection between the advertiser and the company the logo represents. The reader performs the inference; the advertiser asserts nothing that could be shown to be false. The ASA nonetheless attributed the inferred relationship to the advertisement, treating the juxtaposition of image and text as a claim in its own right.

4.5 Pattern D: Frame misdirection and omission (R4, R6)

The fourth pattern used a headline or genre label that set up the wrong interpretive frame. In R6, a listing on a job website was headed "Trainee Health & Safety Advisor" and opened with "The best part is you will not need any previous experience". Only in the body of the text did it state, "Please note that this is a training course and fees apply." The ASA considered that people browsing a job site would take the headline and opening text as an offer of a paid trainee role, that the fuller description of the course and fees appeared only after clicking through, and that the body text contradicted the headline rather than clarifying it (Advertising Standards Authority, 2024).

The genre of the platform and the form of the headline together created a frame, this is a job, within which every later sentence was interpreted. The disclaimer could not qualify that frame, because it contradicted it. R4 shows a related case of omission. Two social media posts announced a "Fully Accredited Course" and "Sclerotherapy training course available". The ASA considered that prospective students would understand that completing the course would equip them to perform the procedure professionally, so that information about entry requirements, the qualification gained, the nature and duration of the course and professional registration was material; neither post provided it (Advertising Standards Authority, 2023b). Here the misleading frame came from silence rather than

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

from a label. This is a breach of Quantity in the strict sense: the posts said less than the situation required.

4.6 Pattern E: Unconditional certainty (R3) and the failure of buried cancellations

The fifth pattern excluded risk through categorical wording. In R3, an essay-writing service promised "Assured Success with Customized Assignment Writing" and described its work as "100% plagiarism free", with "Credible and up to date references" and "Error-free citation and referencing". The ASA considered that consumers would take the advertisement to mean that they could submit a purchased essay as their own work without risk. A footer stating that the services were only for help and should be used as guide papers was in small, faint grey text, separated from the main copy and likely to be missed (Advertising Standards Authority, 2023a). The categorical expressions assured, 100% and error-free occupy the end points of their scales, and together they implicate the proposition the reader most needed to evaluate, namely that the purchased work could be submitted safely. In Gricean terms, the footer was an attempt to cancel that implicature. It failed, on the ASA's reasoning, because it was placed where readers were unlikely to process it.

Three rulings involved qualifications that the advertiser presented as correcting the impression created by the main claims (R3, R5 and R6). In each case the ASA held that the qualification was insufficient: in R3 because it was small, faint and separated from the main copy; in R5 because it was buried at the foot of the page; and in R6 because it appeared only after clicking through and contradicted the headline (Advertising Standards Authority, 2023a, 2023c, 2024). In none of the ten rulings did the ASA accept that a qualification had cancelled an implied meaning.

4.7 Uzbek data: flagged expressions

The four Uzbek communications yielded four flagged expressions (Table 5). In U1, the Committee reported that some education providers, "with the intention of attracting consumers in various ways", had used "exaggerated expressions" (bo'rttirilgan iboralar) such as "Joylar soni cheklangan" ('Places are limited'), "3 oyda til o'rganing" ('Learn a language in 3 months') and "Kafolatlangan ta'lim" ('Guaranteed education') (Kun.uz, 2024). In U2, it warned against consulting firms that promised citizens an "oson" ('easy') route to work or study abroad, gaining their trust through social media (CDCPCR, 2025).

Table 5. Uzbek flagged expressions coded against the framework

Expression (gloss)	Linguistic form	Implied proposition and mechanism	Pattern
"Kafolatlangan ta'lim" ('Guaranteed education') (U1)	Certainty phrase	The outcome of study is assured; end-of-scale term invites R-based enrichment (Quality)	E. Unconditional certainty

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Expression (gloss)	Linguistic form	Implied proposition and mechanism	Pattern
"3 oyda til o'rganing" ('Learn a language in 3 months') (U1)	Imperative with time-bound outcome	The directive presupposes that the outcome is achievable for the addressee within three months (Quality)	E. Unconditional certainty
"oson" ('easy') route abroad (U2)	Evaluative adjective	Admission or placement abroad requires little effort and carries little risk (Quality, Quantity)	E. Unconditional certainty
"Joylar soni cheklangan" ('Places are limited') (U1)	Scarcity phrase	Relevant only if it implicates urgency: enrol now or lose the chance (Relation; Quality if unverifiable)	F. Manufactured scarcity (new)

Three of the four expressions belong to Pattern E. They share the semantic profile of the UK certainty claims: they remove the conditions on which the outcome depends. "3 oyda til o'rganing" makes its promise through an imperative. Urging the reader to learn a language in three months presupposes that the task can be done, and a directive, unlike a statement, has no truth value that a reader could check. The fourth expression, "Joylar soni cheklangan", is an instance of manufactured scarcity, a pattern that does not occur in the UK sample. Every course has a limited number of places, so the literal content is uninformative. It becomes relevant only as a signal of urgency: enrol now or lose the chance.

Three of the five UK patterns did not appear in the Uzbek data: unanchored superiority, borrowed partners and frame misdirection. Given the small number of quoted expressions, their absence shows only that the Committee did not quote such wording. It cannot be taken as evidence that these patterns are absent from Uzbek education advertising.

4.8 How the Committee frames the problem

Three features distinguish the Committee's treatment of these expressions from the ASA's. First, the Committee classifies expressions without reconstructing their meaning. It labels the expressions "exaggerated", echoing the "exaggeration" ground in Article 5 of the law, but it does not state what a consumer would understand from them or why that understanding is false. The problem is located in the phrase itself, and the inference a reader would draw is left unstated.

Second, enforcement runs mainly through licensing, contracts and complaints. The outcomes reported in U1 were refunds of more than 1.2 billion soum to consumers and the referral of about 50 files on licensing, sanitary and tax violations to other authorities (Kun.uz, 2024). In U2, the decisive

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

fact was that most firms lacked the licence required to place citizens abroad, and two firms were fined by the Migration Agency (CDCPCR, 2025). A licence is a matter of record that can be checked. It requires no reconstruction of what an advertisement communicates. In the UK data, status is a matter of meaning: the ASA asks what "medical school" or "MBA" leads a reader to assume. In the Uzbek data, the closest counterpart is whether the provider holds a licence at all.

Third, advertising appears in aggregate. U3 and U4 report complaint volumes and categories, among them a mismatch between advertised and delivered services and "unfulfilled promises in advertising", but they quote no advertisement and assess no claim (Gazeta.uz, 2025; Spot.uz, 2026). The medical comparator shows that the Committee can analyse wording when the law gives it a sector rule. In M1, the Committee listed specific phrases such as "uch kunda davolaymiz" ('we treat in three days') and "mutlaqo xavfsiz" ('absolutely safe'), explained that they guarantee results or absolute safety, and cited the advertising law and its fine (Gazeta.uz, 2026b). "Uch kunda davolaymiz" and "3 oyda til o'rganing" share the same structure, a time adverbial attached to an outcome verb. Yet medicine has a statutory ban on guarantees (Art. 34) and education does not.

4.9 Visibility of reasoning compared

Table 6 summarises the comparison of reasoning. Every ASA ruling quoted the wording, stated the consumer reading, cited the relevant code rules and reported an outcome specific to the claim. None of the Uzbek education communications stated a consumer reading, cited an article of law or reported a claim-specific outcome, and none addressed a qualification or disclaimer. RQ2's question of when a qualification cancels an implied meaning therefore cannot be answered for Uzbekistan from the published record.

Table 6. Visibility of interpretive reasoning

Feature of the text	ASA rulings (n = 10)	Committee, education (n = 4)	Committee, medical comparator (M1)
Quotes the advertising wording	10	2 (U1, U2)	Yes
States the reading attributed to consumers	10	0	Partly (lists what the phrases guarantee)
Cites a specific legal provision	10	0 (two name a law)	Yes (advertising law, Art. 16)
Reports an outcome tied to the claim	10	0	No (general warning)
Addresses a qualification or disclaimer	3 of 3 where present	0	No

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

5. Discussion

5.1 The ASA as a model pragmatic hearer

The first research question asked what types of implied claims are challenged and through which mechanisms. The UK findings show that the claims challenged in education and training advertising are overwhelmingly implicit. Superiority is implicated through scalar enrichment, status through category words, relationships through juxtaposition, frames through headlines and genres, and safety through categorical wording. Not one of the 31 claims was challenged because it stated a plain falsehood in so many words.

The second research question asked how the ASA reconstructs meaning. Across all ten rulings, the ASA reasoned from a single interpretive formula: what consumers "would understand" or were "likely to" take from the advertisement. This formula is, in pragmatic terms, a reconstruction of the most accessible interpretation for an ordinary reader in context. It treats implicatures and accommodated presuppositions as part of the advertisement's meaning and holds the advertiser responsible for them. In doing so, the regulator removes the deniability that implicit communication normally affords, which is the deniability on which manipulative discourse depends (Maillat & Oswald, 2009). An advertiser who has not literally claimed to be the top-ranked university, or to have partnerships with insurers, is nonetheless held to the claim that ordinary readers would infer. The findings also give empirical content to the legal-linguistic observation that disputes turn on what a text can reasonably be taken to communicate (Shuy, 2008; Tiersma, 1999).

5.2 Cancellability in theory and in practice

In Gricean theory, implicatures are cancellable: adding "but not ..." removes the inference without contradiction (Grice, 1975). The rulings show that an implicature that can be cancelled in theory is often not cancelled in practice. A cancellation succeeds only if the hearer processes it, and processing depends on position and prominence. Relevance Theory predicts this outcome (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). The headline is processed first and with the least effort; its interpretation is accepted as soon as it satisfies the reader's expectation of relevance; and many readers never reach a qualification at the foot of the page or behind a click. The ASA's insistence on prominence can therefore be read as a cognitively grounded rule: a cancellation that the reader is unlikely to process does not cancel. This matters more for education than for most products, because the information that disclaimers typically carry, such as fees, the true nature of a qualification or the absence of a job, is the information on which an educational decision depends.

5.3 Two ways of reading: inferential and lexical

The third research question compared the two regulators. Both object to some of the same language. The Committee's "Kafolatlangan ta'lim" and the ASA's "Assured Success" belong to one pattern. Where the two regulators differ is in where they locate the meaning. The ASA reads inferentially: it reconstructs the proposition a reader would draw and tests that proposition against the

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

evidence. The Committee, in its published texts, reads lexically: it identifies an expression as exaggerated and treats the label as sufficient.

Lexical reading is quick, and it suits monitoring at scale (the Committee reported reviewing more than 18,000 advertising materials in the first half of 2026 alone; Gazeta.uz, 2026a). It also works for expressions whose problem is visible in the words, such as "guaranteed" or "absolutely safe". Much manipulative wording, though, contains nothing of the kind. "Number 1" with a hashtag, "medical school", an insurer's logo or a job-board headline contains no exaggerated word. Each misleads only through the inference it invites. A regulator that reads lexically will catch Pattern E and perhaps Pattern F, but it is poorly placed to catch Patterns A to D, which together made up 26 of the 31 claims in the UK data. Article 5 of the Uzbek law already names ambiguity and silence alongside exaggeration. What is missing is a practice of interpretation that would apply those grounds to particular claims and record the result.

Licensing turns a question of meaning into a question of record, which is easier to enforce. But it cannot reach a licensed provider whose advertisement misleads, and it cannot tell learners what was wrong with a claim. The Committee's August 2026 proposal for voluntary certification of non-state education (Spot.uz, 2026) would also certify providers and leave their advertising uninterpreted.

5.4 Why education invites status, certainty and scarcity

Three patterns appear to be particularly characteristic of education. Status vocabulary works because the sector is built on regulated categories, such as degrees, schools and accreditation, whose names readers trust but whose criteria they rarely know. Unconditional certainty works because the outcomes learners most want, such as admission, qualification, employment, fluency or a score, are those that no provider can guarantee. Research on test preparation, for example, has found no clear advantage for courses focused on a test over broader courses in gains on that test (Green, 2007). An advertisement that implies certainty therefore misrepresents both the provider and the nature of learning. Scarcity, the pattern found only in the Uzbek data, exploits the fixed intake of a course and the fear of losing a year. It turns a learner's decision into a race against time and cuts short the comparison that education purchases most need.

5.5 Implications for regulation in Uzbekistan and for teaching

The fourth research question concerned practical implications. Six recommendations follow from the findings.

1. Publish reasoned decisions. The single most useful step would be for the Committee to publish, for each upheld case, the wording challenged, the reading attributed to consumers, the provision applied and the outcome. Such a record would build the standards whose absence Khodjaev (2020) identified, and would give advertisers and teachers concrete examples.

2. Adopt the ordinary-reader formula. Guidance from the Committee could state explicitly that claims are interpreted as an ordinary prospective learner would understand them, so that implied

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

meaning is treated as part of the claim under the existing grounds of ambiguity, exaggeration and silence in Article 5.

3. Add an education rule on guaranteed outcomes. The law already bans guarantees in advertising for medicines, folk medicine and securities (Arts. 34, 42 and 45). A parallel rule could prohibit unconditional promises of admission, grants, test scores, fluency or employment, and require the conditions of any outcome claim to be stated.

4. Require the basis of rankings, status terms and scarcity claims. Claims such as "the best centre", "No. 1" or "internationally recognised certificate" should name their source, criterion and date; terms such as certificate, accredited and international should identify who certifies, accredits or recognises; and claims that places are limited should be true and verifiable at the time they are made.

5. Set a prominence standard for conditions. Conditions of guarantees, prices and the nature of a qualification should appear with the claim they qualify, not in comments, footers or private messages.

6. Teach learners to read like a regulator. In the classroom, the ASA's formula can be turned into a single question for any course advertisement: "What would an ordinary reader understand from this, and could the provider prove it?" Rulings such as R5 and R6, set beside Uzbek expressions such as "3 oyda til o'rganing", provide authentic, short texts for bilingual critical language awareness activities (Janks, 2010).

5.6 Limitations and future research

The study has several limitations. First, the two datasets differ in kind as well as size. The UK data are ten reasoned rulings, all upheld; the Uzbek data are four communications, mostly reported through the news media, with only four quoted expressions. The comparison of reasoning (Table 6) is therefore a comparison of what each regulator publishes, not of how each deliberates in private. The Committee may reason inferentially in decisions it does not release. Second, the patterns describe what regulators act on rather than the full range of educational advertising in either country. Third, the Uzbek texts were translated by the author, and nuances of the Uzbek and Russian originals may be lost. Future research could apply the coding framework to a corpus of Uzbek course advertisements collected directly from Instagram and Telegram, obtain decision texts from the Committee through formal request, and test with readers whether the interpretations attributed to "consumers" match what prospective learners in both countries actually infer.

6. Conclusion

This article compared how two regulators read the implied claims of education and training advertising. In the UK, the ASA's rulings revealed five recurrent patterns: unanchored superiority, status vocabulary, borrowed partners, frame misdirection and unconditional certainty. Across all of them, the ASA reasoned from what ordinary consumers would understand, not from the literal wording, and it refused to accept that a qualification placed where readers were unlikely to see it could cancel the impression created by the headline. In Uzbekistan, the Committee flagged expressions of certainty and scarcity that overlap with, and extend, the UK patterns. In its published texts, however, it

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

labelled those expressions as exaggerated without saying what they communicate, and its enforcement relied on licensing and complaints.

The main theoretical contribution is to distinguish two ways in which a regulator can read advertising. Inferential reading, as practised by the ASA, makes the regulator a model pragmatic hearer: it attributes to advertisers the meanings that ordinary readers infer and so removes the deniability on which linguistic manipulation depends. Lexical reading catches manipulation only where it surfaces in a word. Uzbekistan's law already names the grounds an inferential reading needs. The missing elements are published, reasoned decisions and a rule for education that matches the rules for medicine and finance. Until then, teachers can give learners the question proposed in Section 5.5, which applies to course advertisements in any language: what would an ordinary reader understand from this, and could the provider prove it?

Declaration on the use of AI tools. Generative AI tools (Claude, Anthropic) were used to assist with retrieving literature and data, drafting and language editing. The author designed the study, checked all data, quotations, translations and sources against the originals, and takes full responsibility for the content of this article.

References:

1. Advertising Standards Authority. (2022a, August 31). ASA ruling on Centre for Medical Sciences & Research Ltd. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/centre-for-medical-sciences---research-ltd-a22-1149847-centre-for-medical-sciences--research-ltd.html
2. Advertising Standards Authority. (2022b, September 7). ASA ruling on The University of Leicester. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/the-university-of-leicester-a22-1155370-the-university-of-leicester.html
3. Advertising Standards Authority. (2023a, April 19). ASA ruling on Treat Assignment Help. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/treat-assignment-help-a23-1188075-treat-assignment-help.html
4. Advertising Standards Authority. (2023b, April 26). ASA ruling on The Secret Diamond Academy. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/the-secret-diamond-academy-a22-1175445-the-secret-diamond-academy.html
5. Advertising Standards Authority. (2023c, June 28). ASA ruling on London School of Planning and Management Ltd. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/london-school-of-planning-and-management-ltd-a23-1181271-london-school-of-planning-and-management-ltd.html
6. Advertising Standards Authority. (2024, December 18). ASA ruling on IT Career Change Ltd. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/it-career-change-ltd-a24-1258686-it-career-change-ltd.html
7. Advertising Standards Authority. (2025a, August 13). ASA ruling on Thomas Keith Ltd. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/thomas-keith-ltd-a25-1287177-thomas-keith-ltd.html
8. Advertising Standards Authority. (2025b, August 20). ASA ruling on LanguageNut Ltd. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/languagenut-ltd.html

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

9. Advertising Standards Authority. (2026a, March 18). ASA ruling on Centre of CPD Excellence. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/centre-of-cpd-excellence-a25-1314465-centre-of-cpd-excellence.html
10. Advertising Standards Authority. (2026b, May 13). ASA ruling on Course Accreditation Ltd. https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/course-accreditation-ltd-a25-1322901-course-accreditation-ltd.html
11. Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027
12. Buckingham, D., Banaji, S., Burn, A., Carr, D., Cranmer, S., & Willett, R. (2005). The media literacy of children and young people: A review of the research literature on behalf of Ofcom. Centre for the Study of Children, Youth and Media, Institute of Education, University of London.
13. Committee for the Development of Competition and Protection of Consumer Rights of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2025, June 19). Xorijda ishlash va o'qish uchun "oson" borishni va'da qilayotgan konsalting firmalardan ogoh bo'ling! [Beware of consulting firms promising an "easy" route to work and study abroad!]. https://raqobat.gov.uz/uz/xorijda-ishlash-va-oqish-uchun-oson-borishni-vada-qilayotgan-konsalting-firmalardan-ogoh-boling/
14. Committee of Advertising Practice. (n.d.-a). The UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing (CAP Code) (12th ed.), Section 3: Misleading advertising. Advertising Standards Authority. https://www.asa.org.uk/type/non_broadcast/code_section/03.html
15. Committee of Advertising Practice. (n.d.-b). Comparisons: Universities [Advice online]. Advertising Standards Authority. https://www.asa.org.uk/advice-online/universities-comparative-claims.html
16. Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2009). Putting accent in its place: Rethinking obstacles to communication. Language Teaching, 42(4), 476–490. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480800551X
17. Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Tselykh, M., & Novikov, A. (2022). Media manipulations and media literacy education. SM "Information for All".
18. Gazeta.uz. (2025, December 18). Raqobat qo'mitasi eng ko'p e'tirozlarga sabab bo'layotgan nodavlat ta'lim xizmatlari ro'yxatini tuzdi [The Competition Committee compiled a list of non-state education services causing the most complaints]. https://www.gazeta.uz/oz/2025/12/18/nno/
19. Gazeta.uz. (2026a, August 26). Raqobat qo'mitasi yarim yilda reklama to'g'risidagi qonunchilik buzilgan 6000 ta holatni aniqladi [The Competition Committee identified 6,000 violations of advertising legislation in six months]. https://www.gazeta.uz/oz/2026/08/26/advertising/
20. Gazeta.uz. (2026b, September 21). "Uch kunda davolaymiz". Raqobat qo'mitasi tibbiy xizmatlar reklamasida oshirib yuborilgan va'dalardan foydalanmaslikka chaqirdi ["We treat in three days":

The Competition Committee urged medical advertisers not to use exaggerated promises]. https://www.gazeta.uz/oz/2026/09/21/reklama/

21. Green, A. (2007). Washback to learning outcomes: A comparative study of IELTS preparation and university pre-sessional language courses. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 14(1), 75–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940701272880
22. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
23. Horn, L. R. (1984). Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications (pp. 11–42). Georgetown University Press.
24. Janks, H. (2010). Language, power and pedagogies. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), Sociolinguistics and language education (pp. 40–61). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692849
25. Karttunen, L. (1974). Presupposition and linguistic context. Theoretical Linguistics, 1(1–3), 181–194.
26. Khodjaev, B. K. (2020). Perekhodnaya model' konkurentsii dlya regulirovaniya vvodyashchey v zabluzhdenie reklamy v Uzbekistane: Al'ternativnyy podkhod [A transitional competition model for regulating misleading advertising in Uzbekistan: An alternative approach]. Review of Law Sciences, (1), 130–139.
27. Kun.uz. (2024, December 18). Bir qator nodavlat ta'lim muassasalarida qonunbuzarliklar aniqlandi [Violations found in a number of non-state educational institutions]. https://kun.uz/news/2024/12/18/bir-qator-nodavlat-talim-muassasalarida-qonunbuzarliklar-aniqlandi
28. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. ZRU-776 "On Advertising". (2022, June 7). https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-6052631
29. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
30. Levinson, S. C. (2000). Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature. MIT Press.
31. Maillat, D., & Oswald, S. (2009). Defining manipulative discourse: The pragmatics of cognitive illusions. International Review of Pragmatics, 1(2), 348–370.
32. Olenyuk, O. (2016). How advertising shapes our minds: Pragmatic and cognitive perspective. Journal of Languages for Specific Purposes, 3(1), 41–50.
33. Shuy, R. W. (2008). Fighting over words: Language and civil law cases. Oxford University Press.
34. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance: Communication and cognition (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
35. Spot.uz. (2024, December 18). Za god Komitet po konkurentsii prinyal boleye 500 zhalob na uchebnyye tsentry [Over the year the Competition Committee received more than 500 complaints about learning centres]. https://www.spot.uz/ru/2024/12/18/learning-centres

36. Spot.uz. (2026, August 5). Komitet po konkurentsii predlozhil vvesti dlya chastnykh uchebnykh tsentrov sertifikatsiyu [The Competition Committee proposed certification for private learning centres]. https://www.spot.uz/ru/2026/08/05/private-education
37. Tiersma, P. M. (1999). Legal language. University of Chicago Press.
38. Tran, H.-A., Evanschitzky, H., Ludwig, S., Nguyen, B., Grewal, D., Farrell, A. M., & Ackfeldt, A.-L. (2026). How universities can use social media for student acquisition. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 54, 539–556. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-025-01131-3
39. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. Discourse & Society, 17(3), 359–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250
40. Wrycza-Bekier, J. (2026). They Ask, You Answer (TAYA) in copywriting education: An exploratory analysis of blog article topic formulation. Edukacja, 3(178), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.24131/3724.260304