

Article

Framing AI Through Implicit Meaning: Presupposition and Implicature in BBC and CNN Headlines

Abdullah Najim Abd Aliwie

The General Directorate of Education in Al-Qadisiyah Province, Ministry of Education, Baghdad 10001, Iraq | Abdullah.najim1980@gmail.com | <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3243-5223>

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become a prominent topic in international news, requiring journalists to report complex and rapidly evolving developments in concise and accessible forms. This study examines how implicature and presupposition contribute to implicit meaning in AI-related headlines from BBC News and CNN. Drawing on Grice's (1975) theory of conversational implicature and accounts of presupposition (Levinson, 1983; Stalnaker, 1974; Yule, 1996), and viewing headlines as relevance optimizers (Dor, 2003), the study uses a qualitative-descriptive comparative approach. Nine purposively selected headlines (five BBC, four CNN, February–November 2025) concerning AI reliability, employment, and technological competition are analyzed for what is said, what is presupposed, and what is implicated. Presupposition packages background assumptions through definite descriptions, change-of-state lexis, interrogative structures, and additive and focus constructions, while implicature extends specific events to broader frames of disruption, competition, risk, and employment change. The two mechanisms frequently co-occur: presupposed content provides the background on which further implicatures are built. In this sample, BBC headlines foreground evidential grounding and source attribution, whereas CNN headlines foreground disruption and competition through metaphorical lexis. Observations are limited to the sample and are not generalized to either outlet as a whole.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Implicature, Presupposition, News headlines, Artificial Intelligence, BBC, CNN

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has moved from specialist technology reporting to wider public debate. The education, work, privacy, misinformation and economic competition aspects of the advances of generative AI, large language models, AI-assisted search and conversational systems are now reported. Media language, in this sense, is not merely a means of reporting events, but also a means of giving readers clues through the language to understand the meaning of the events.

The role of headlines is very communicative. They are the initial linguistic cues between report and reader and determine whether or not an article is attended to. According to Dor (2003) headlines are not just a summary, but an "optimizer of relevance" that helps their reader create an interpretive context to make the story meaningful. This is a very information-condensing task, and often headline writers make use of background information and inferential abilities of the reader.

Pragmatics provides suitable instruments for the analysis of the relationship between "what is said" and "what is meant" in such condensed texts (Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996). There are two phenomena at hand. Implicature, following Grice (1975), relates to meanings that are inferred on the basis of the assumption that the communication is adequate (maxims of Quantity), truthful (maxim of Quality), relevant (maxim of Relation), and clear (maxim Manner). Pragmatic presupposition is related to tacit background assumptions that are assumed to be shared or uncontroversial in context (Stalnaker, 1974). Such assumptions

may be triggered by definite descriptions, possessive constructions, factive predicates, change-of-state predicates, temporal expressions, and certain syntactic structures, including clefts and additive and focus constructions (Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996).

AI reporting provides a productive site for examining these processes. Technological developments are often reported before their consequences are known, and reports invoke progression, competition, disruption, replacement, opportunity, and threat. These ideas may be stated explicitly or conveyed through metaphor, presupposition, lexical choice, and contextual inference. For example, verbs such as *disrupted* and *upended* in competition reporting invite inferences about instability and rivalry that go beyond the asserted proposition.

Although pragmatic approaches have been applied to political and general news discourse, the combined analysis of implicature and presupposition in current AI headlines from BBC News and CNN remains limited. Previous studies have examined pragmatic presupposition in headlines (Dong & Shao, 2016), pragmatic functions in BBC and CNN headlines on the Syrian conflict (Al-Hindawi & Ali, 2018), presupposition triggers in pandemic headlines (Al-Hindawi & Mohammed, 2023), and headline pragmatics more generally (Blom & Hansen, 2015; Finkbeiner, 2024). The present study addresses how selected BBC and CNN AI headlines activate presupposed information, invite implicatures, and frame AI in terms of technological change, competition, reliability, and employment.

The study addresses the following research questions:

- RQ1.** (1) What presupposition triggers activate background assumptions in the selected BBC and CNN AI headlines?
- RQ2.** (2) What implicatures are made available, what contextual knowledge do they require, and which Gricean maxims are relevant to their derivation?
- RQ3.** (3) How do the selected BBC and CNN headlines compare in using these resources to frame AI?

Literature Review

Headlines must be brief, informative, and engaging. This compression often results in meanings that are assumed rather than asserted. Dor's (2003) relevance-optimizer account is particularly relevant because it places inference at the center: readers combine linguistic material with background assumptions to derive a context in which the story matters. In digital distribution – search results, social feeds, aggregators, and push notifications – headlines are frequently encountered in isolation, which increases reliance on such inferencing (Finkbeiner, 2024).

Grice's (1975) framework remains a foundational tool for distinguishing what is said from what is implicated. In headline discourse, full specification of causes, evaluations, comparisons, and consequences is typically omitted. Readers reconstruct relevant enrichments by combining lexical cues with encyclopedic and situational knowledge. Metaphorical expressions such as *AI race*, *AI boom*, and *AI battle* do not spell out each component of competition or rapid growth, but they make

available inferences about speed, rivalry, stakes, and winners and losers when read against knowledge of technology markets.

Grice's maxims are context-dependent and apply to headlines. Apparent under-informativeness is conventional, and thus does not count as a violation of Quantity. More interesting from an analytical point of view are instances of metaphorical or hyperbolic use of lexis that violate Quality or Manner, or when reporting a specific failure or prediction violates Relation and prompts the reader to question why this information is relevant at this time. Such cases give rise to particularized implicatures, which can only be recovered with specific contextual knowledge; and more generalized implicatures, as with the use of *too*, *even* or *just*.

Pragmatic presupposition is about presuppositions that are viewed as co-textual common ground. Stalnaker (1974) and systematic relations between linguistic form and context (Levinson, 1983). (Following Yule 1996) the following 6 types are commonly distinguished: existential, factive, lexical, structural, non-factive, and counterfactual. Existential presuppositions are triggered by definite noun phrases and possessives (e.g., the company's AI model presupposes a company and a model). Factive verbs like *know*, *realize*, and *be aware* take a truth value on their complements for granted. Lexical predicates or change of state predicates (*stop*, *continue*, *replace*, *again*, *still*) make reference to a previous state or event. Structural presuppositions are those that come from the syntactic structure of *wh*-questions and clefts. Some predicates like *dream*, *imagine*, *pretend*, *claim* and *say* are non-factive and counterfactual conditionals take their antecedents as false. These devices are appropriate for headlines because they contain no sentences that could be used to describe the content.

Dong and Shao (2016) showed that presupposition in English news headlines supports economy, informativeness, and attractiveness: information density is increased by presenting content as assumed rather than newly asserted. Al-Hindawi and Ali (2018), comparing CNN and BBC headlines on the Syrian conflict, demonstrated that headline functions cannot be captured by surface grammar alone and that comparative pragmatic analysis of the two outlets is productive. Al-Hindawi and Mohammed (2023), comparing BBC News and Fox News headlines on COVID-19, documented the role of lexical and grammatical triggers in backgrounding information and foregrounding developments. Finkbeiner (2024) identified implicit meaning, affect, grammatical form, and pragmatic interpretation as priorities for headline research. Blom and Hansen (2015) further showed how forward-reference in online headlines creates curiosity gaps that rely on inference.

Taken together, prior work establishes presupposition as an economy device and supports BBC-CNN comparison, but simultaneous analysis of presupposition and implicature in current AI headlines remains limited. AI reporting presents distinctive uncertainty: journalists communicate technically complex developments with unclear trajectories to broad audiences. Analyzing both phenomena together makes it possible to examine backgrounded information and the further inferences readers are invited to draw about disruption, competition, reliability, and employment.

Method

This study has a qualitative-descriptive comparative pragmatic approach. The goal is to find out what language expressions in AI headlines invoke presuppositions and/or implicatures and how they are framed in different outlets.

The pilot corpus comprises of nine purposively selected headlines (H1–H9): five of which were taken from BBC. News and four CNN/CNN Business February - November 2025 (see Appendix for full texts, dates, and URLs, accessed 1 October 2026). Headlines were selected to represent three recurrent AI news themes – (a) reliability and trust, (b) employment consequences, and (c) technological disruption and competition – and to contain clear presuppositional or inferential cues (definite NPs, change-of-state verbs, factive-like and reportive predicates, interrogatives, additive/focus particles, and competition/disruption metaphors). The sample is illustrative, not representative: it demonstrates the analytical procedure and supplies initial evidence for the Discussion, while a larger systematically collected corpus with defined search terms, inclusion criteria, and archiving is required for general claims.

The headline is the unit of analysis. Lead paragraphs were consulted to clarify reference where needed, but inferences attributed to the headline are those available from headline wording plus generally accessible public knowledge at the time of publication. Analysis proceeded in four steps: (a) identification of candidate triggers using Yule's (1996) typology and of metaphorical or evaluative lexis; (b) application of constancy-under-negation as a diagnostic for presupposition; (c) formulation of candidate implicatures, the background knowledge they require, and the relevant Gricean maxim(s); and (d) thematic coding for technological change, competition, reliability and risk, and employment, followed by cross-outlet comparison. Semantic entailment is distinguished from pragmatic implicature: lexical meaning (e.g., *disrupt* encodes *disturbance*) is not labelled as implicature; only context-dependent extensions (e.g., reordering of a technological hierarchy) are treated as implicatures. Interpretations are presented as contextually available inferences, not as claims about actual uptake by all readers, since implicatures are defeasible and reader-dependent.

Presupposition in the Selected BBC Headlines

In the BBC subsample (H1–H5), presupposition is carried primarily by existential descriptions and lexical change-of-state items, with reportive predicates and interrogative structures managing evidential stance and reader positioning.

H1 [BBC, 11 February 2025]: "AI chatbots unable to accurately summarise news, BBC finds" – H3 [BBC, 18 November 2025]: "Don't blindly trust what AI tells you, Google boss tells BBC" – H4 [BBC, 2 November 2025]: "Will AI mean the end of call centres?"

H1 presupposes (existential) a class identifiable as AI chatbots; BBC finds functions as a reportive-evidential marker presenting the proposition as investigation-backed rather than speculative, presupposing an investigative process detailed in the article. H3 combines an imperative with a factive-like reportive (tells BBC): it presupposes that AI says things that may be trusted and that a Google executive is a relevant authority, while the negative imperative backgrounds unreliability as the problem to be addressed. H4 is a structural presupposition case: the polar interrogative *Will AI*

mean the end of call centres? presupposes AI as a candidate cause and call centres as an existing institution at risk, while leaving the outcome open and inviting the reader to treat the article as the answer (cf. Blom & Hansen, 2015, on forward-reference). In each case, negation or denial would still presuppose the existence of chatbots, AI claims, and call centres, confirming presuppositional status.

H2 [BBC, 17 June 2025]: "Amazon boss says AI will replace jobs at tech giant" – H5 [BBC, 29 September 2025]: "A million jobs in London could be changed by AI"

H2 presupposes (existential) a role-holder (Amazon boss) and an entity (the tech giant, recoverable as Amazon); replace lexically presupposes human-held jobs, while says (non-factive) attributes the modalized forecast will replace to the source rather than asserting it editorially. H5 presupposes (existential, numeral) a million London jobs as affected entities; changed is a change-of-state predicate presupposing a prior state, while could modalizes the scope without asserting universal replacement. Both headlines thus compress employment relevance while calibrating commitment through attribution and modality.

Implicature in the Selected BBC Headlines

The same headlines make available implicatures that require contextual knowledge and go beyond presupposition.

H1 literally reports a performance limitation; against growing reliance on generative AI for news, it implicates (Relation) that AI summaries should not substitute for human-produced reporting and that caution is warranted. H3 upgrades this to an "advice": the "imperative" plus the "authority attribution" implies a general norm of skepticism towards the outputs of AI, but not that every output is false. H4 suggests urgency related to automation in customer service: When the question asks whether call centers will end, it indicates that this is a possibility worth considering, but doesn't claim that it will. Each only infers a limitation or risk: it does not imply universal falsity, or disappearance.

While H2 make only a sourced, Amazon forecast, they seem to indicate that certain jobs would be reduced or even changed, but not all jobs would be eliminated. H5 quantifies potential scope (a million jobs; changed, not lost) and thereby implicates significant labour-market transformation in London but is vague about what kind of change this is – is it about task redefinition, augmentation, or displacement – and invites readers to seek specification in the article. Together, H2 and H5 illustrate how modalization (will as attributed prediction; could as possibility) plus lexical choice (replace vs. changed) modulates the strength of employment implicatures.

Lexical Choice, Presupposition, and Information Economy

Both outlets involve inference that is prompted by lexical choice. Competition or disruption vocabulary – race, boom, battle, disrupt, shake up, upend, doldrums, blame – has frames abstract change by disrupting, moving, and competing. No unnecessary explanation is provided for the one verb that describes a prior stability, disturbance and reordering. It is important to distinguish between the encoded sense, such as "disrupt" = "disturb order" and the context-dependent implicature, such as "sectoral decline" = "AI-caused and systemically relevant" (this relies on knowledge of rivalries and markets) and "hierarchies must respond" = "must be relevant to the system" (this relies on knowledge of hierarchies).

Presupposition is one way of achieving pragmatic compression. The DeepSeek headline (H6 below) contextualizes the OpenAI impact as part of the "given" for interpreting the extension to Chinese companies, provides asserted, backgrounded, and inferable layers in a few words. Likewise, H7 places an ongoing AI race in the background to highlight Europe's lag and H8 places software-sector weakness to foreground AI as its attributed cause. This is consistent with prior findings on headline information density (Dong & Shao, 2016).

The Interaction of Presupposition and Implicature: A CNN Illustration

H6 [CNN Business, 11 February 2025]: "DeepSeek hasn't just disrupted OpenAI. Chinese tech giants are being upended too" — H7 [CNN, 9 February 2025]: "Europe 'not in the AI race today,' French President Macron says" — H8 [CNN Business, 25

August 2025]: "Software shares are in the doldrums. Blame AI" — H9 [CNN Business, 23 June 2025]: "Do you think AI changing or threatening to take your job? Tell us about it here"

H6: the focus particle just with negation (hasn't just disrupted) entails OpenAI disruption while signalling more; too presupposes that disruption as background for the second clause; Chinese tech giants existentially presupposes identifiable firms. Said: DeepSeek disrupted OpenAI and Chinese giants are also disrupted. Implicated (Relation, Quantity): an isolated rivalry is recast as a potentially system-wide shift, requiring knowledge of OpenAI's prominence, DeepSeek's emergence, and United States-China competition. H7: the AI race existentially presupposes an ongoing contest; not in the race presupposes European participation as expected yet lacking; says attributes the assessment to Macron, distancing the outlet while borrowing authority. It implicates that Europe risks becoming an AI consumer unless regulation and investment change. H8: two short sentences perform causal attribution — doldrums presupposes prolonged weakness; Blame AI (imperative) presupposes AI as a candidate cause and implicates that AI code-writing and agentic tools are eroding the SaaS model, inviting investors to read sectoral decline through AI disruption. H9: the interrogative structurally presupposes AI as affecting work and changing versus threatening as alternative framings; the callout Tell us presupposes reader experience as evidence, implicating that job impact is already widespread enough to warrant crowdsourcing, without asserting uniform displacement.

The layered structure is clearest in H6: (a) presupposed/entailed background — DeepSeek affected OpenAI; (b) assertion — Chinese firms are also affected; and (c) implicature — the competitive order may be reshaped. H7–H9 show the same layering with different foregrounding: backgrounded contest or strain plus asserted lag, blame, or question, plus an implicature that extends the event to policy, market, or workplace relevance. Analyzing presupposition or implicature alone captures only part of this meaning.

A Pragmatic Comparison of the Selected BBC and CNN Headlines

Both outlets layer presupposition and implicature rather than relying on fully explicit propositions. In this nine-headline sample, BBC headlines (H1–H5) foreground

reliability, institutional response, and employment through evidential management (finds as investigation-backed endorsement vs. says/tells as distanced attribution), interrogative engagement (H4), and quantified scope (H5). CNN headlines (H6–H9) foreground disruption and competition through metaphorical intensity (disrupted, upended, race, doldrums), causal attribution (Blame AI), and participatory interrogation (H9). Additive and quotative devices (hasn't just... too; 'not in the AI race today') background prior developments to highlight spread or lag. Differences are tendencies in this pilot sample; overlapping resources are used throughout.

Table 1 summarizes the features analyzed. Overlapping resources are used in both outlets; any differences are tendencies in this sample, not fixed organizational styles.

Table 1

Pragmatic Features in the Illustrative BBC and CNN AI Headlines

Headline (source)	Pragmatic device	Backgrounded/ inferred meaning	Framing function
H1 BBC 11 Feb 2025 BBC finds	Reportive- evidential; existential NP	Investigation presupposed; caution about AI summaries implicated	Evidential grounding; reliability framing
H2 BBC 17 Jun 2025 will replace; says	Lexical (replace); non- factive + modal will	Human jobs presupposed; forecast attributed; reduction implicated	Attribution; employment framing
H3 BBC 18 Nov 2025 Don't trust; tells BBC	Imperative + reportive; factive- like	Fallibility presupposed; scepticism norm implicated	Advisory; trust framing
H4 BBC 2 Nov 2025 Will ...? end	Structural (polar interrogative); change-of-state (end)	Call centres exist; displacement posed as open question	Engagement; risk framing
H5 BBC 29 Sep 2025 million jobs; changed; could	Existential + numeral; change- of-state + modal	Jobs presupposed; large- scale change implicated, scope hedged	Quantification; labour-market framing
H6 CNN 11 Feb 2025 hasn't just ... too; upended	Focus + additive; metaphorical lexis	OpenAI impact given; spread asserted; systemic shift implicated	Backgrounding; disruption framing

H7 CNN 9 Feb 2025 AI race; says	Existential (race); quotative attribution	Contest presupposed; European lag asserted; consumer- risk implicated	Competition; policy framing
H8 CNN 25 Aug 2025 doldrums; Blame AI	Lexical + causal imperative	Weakness presupposed; AI as cause asserted/implicated	Causal attribution; market framing
H9 CNN 23 Jun 2025 changing or threatening ...? Tell us	Structural (alternative interrogative + callout)	Work impact presupposed; widespread effect implicated	Participation; employment framing

Note. H = headline. Full texts, dates, and URLs are given in the Appendix. Interpretations are contextually available inferences, not claims about uniform reader uptake.

General Discussion

The findings confirm that AI news headlines are concise pragmatic texts containing asserted, backgrounded and inferred meanings that work together. The reader needs to discern the statements that are new, those that are assumed as known, and the rationale for the event's relevance at this time. This lends credence to Dor's (2003) description of headlines as relevance optimizers, as opposed to neutral summaries: headlines provide clues that readers use to build a context that makes a story relevant. Digital distribution involves seeing headlines on a single screen as it appears in search results, feeds and push notifications, and this inferential load is much greater (Finkbeiner, 2024). Headlines of less than 15 words can thus be used to delegate a lot of work to presupposition and implicature..

This compression is made possible by presupposing premises and focusing the foreground on the update. Definite descriptions, like AI chatbots, Amazon boss and Chinese tech giants, suggest a set of referents as given. Change-of-state items that require presupposing: replace and disrupted too and just handle the given–new boundary. This validates that Dong and Shao (2016) have previously noted that there is a headline economy, while Al-Hindawi and Mohammed (2023) have found the same with pandemic headlines. The nine AI headlines go all the way to technological uncertainty, where what is backgrounded is not always a fact but is rather a context that is still developing.

Implicature complements presupposition, acts as a bridge between the proposition and larger contexts, and does not spell out each step. The summary headline (H1) sets a restriction but carries a greater general warning on the use of AI information. Both BBC employment headlines (H2, 17 June 2025 and H5, 29 September 2025) state a sourced estimate from Amazon, but suggest that there is lower demand for some positions. CNN DeepSeek headline (H6, 11 February 2025) cautions disruption of OpenAI and Chinese companies, but with the U.S.-China rivalry and OpenAI's position, suggests a reordering of the competition for AI overall. These are specific

implicatures of Relation and Quantity: readers deduce why the event is being reported at this time, and they use knowledge that is not provided in the headline.

Two resources are in the center. First, metaphorical lexis: disrupted, upended, race, boom, and battle are lexically connotative of disturbance or contest, but also call for the reader to envision abstract change in terms of upheaval, speed, and winners and losers. This is consistent with the account of inference-driven online headlines (Blom and Hansen, 2015) that relevance gaps are drivers towards further reading. Second, evidential management: BBC presents the summary claim as investigation based, while Amazon boss says the forecast comes from the source and doesn't endorse it using the non-factive reportive plus modal will. The contrast sets up the level of responsibility and credibility: if the contrast is there, it implies that the reader is asked to consider the content as reliable or to take it as a form of a claim from the source.

Commonality displays resources in common with tendency-level differences. Comparative analysis and surface grammar analysis is useful, as discovered by Al-Hindawi and Ali (2018) for the headlines of conflict, for BBC and CNN functions here. Both outlets involve presupposition and implicature instead of explicit propositions. Within this small sample, the BBC illustrations foreground reliability, institutional response, and employment through evidential contrast/compression, with no aspect of the CNN illustration foregrounded: the prior impact is treated as a simple fact, the damage as metaphorical, and the "disruption" and "competition" as additive syntax – as provided to emphasise its dispersion. These are patterns, and should not be confused with house styles since there are different AI coverages throughout subtopic, timings and function, etc., as well as outlet. There is another layer to the coverage of the AI race (H7, 9 February 2025), software-sector blame (H8, 25 August 2025), and the participatory jobs callout (H9, 23 June 2025), which is the DeepSeek case.

Finally, presuppositional triggers are knowledge independent and defeasible, and extensions to systemic risk, rivalry, job loss are defeasible and knowledge dependent. If the readers are not acquainted with the firms, or with the scope of generative-AI, they might only get back the stated proposition. These readings, with their nine headlines, continue to be inferences, rather than predictions of a uniform uptake. Media literacy must require readers to make discrimination between find and say – between backgrounded premise and asserted news – between lexical entailment (disturbance) and wider implicature (reordering). Further studies would benefit by studying these tendencies in a more extensive and stable collection of URLs, as well as by performing an audience and a multimodal analysis, and from the use of pragmatic coding..

Conclusion

The study in this paper was designed to examine the multiple meaning of news headlines in the field of AI by means of implicature and presupposition. The concept of conversational implicature is discussed in Grice (1975) and that of presupposition in Stalnaker (1974), Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996); headlines are used as It analysed nine purposely selected headlines (H1-H9: Three recurring themes – reliability and trust, employment implications, and technological disruption and competition – were covered in five BBC and four CNN reports between February and November 2025. All headlines

were coded in terms of what is said, what is presupposed (can be tested by constancy under negation), what is implicated (with background knowledge and Gricean maxim), and finally, a comparison of the cross-outlets.

In answer to the research questions, presupposition packaged background assumptions through definite descriptions (AI chatbots, Amazon boss, Chinese tech giants), change-of-state items (replace, changed, disrupted, upended), interrogatives (H4, H9), and additive and focus constructions (just, too, AI race). Implicature extended specific propositions to broader frames: limits (H1) to caution about AI information; forecasts and quantified scope (H2, H5) to workforce change; advice and questions (H3–H4) to scepticism and urgency; and disruption claims (H6–H8) to system-wide competitive or market reordering. Presupposed background (for instance, OpenAI disruption in H6, an ongoing contest in H7) scaffolded further particularized implicatures of Relation and Quantity.

Comparison showed shared resources with tendency-level divergence. Both outlets layered asserted, backgrounded, and inferred meanings rather than relying on explicit propositions. In this sample, BBC headlines (H1–H5) foregrounded reliability and employment through evidential management – finds as endorsement versus says and tells as distanced attribution – with interrogative engagement and modalized scope (will versus could). CNN headlines (H6–H9) foregrounded disruption and competition through metaphor (disrupted, upended, race, doldrums), causal attribution (Blame AI), and participatory interrogation (Tell us). These differences are tendencies in nine cases, not fixed organizational styles. Quotative and additive devices background prior developments to highlight lag or spread across markets and policy.

For media literacy, the study underscores three distinctions readers need: sourced prediction (says plus will, as in H2) versus validated finding (finds, as in H1); lexical entailment (disturbance in disrupt) versus wider implicature (hierarchical reordering); and backgrounded premise versus asserted news. Limitations are clear: the sample is small and purposive, inference rests on analyst judgement without audience data, and online headlines are mutable. Future research should test these patterns in a larger systematically archived corpus with stable URLs, track framing diachronically (notably OpenAI–DeepSeek coverage), and combine pragmatic coding with reader-interpretation experiments and multimodal headline–image analysis.

References

- Al-Hindawi, F. H., & Ali, A. H. (2018). A pragmatic study of CNN and BBC news headlines covering the Syrian conflict. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(3), 43–51.
- Al-Hindawi, F. H., & Mohammed, Z. S. (2023). A pragmatic analysis of presupposition riggers in coronavirus news headlines. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 11(6), 30–57.
- Aliwie, A. N. A. (2024). A pragmatic study of irony in Dickens' A Tale of Two Cities. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(6), 147–161.
<https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i6.7056>
- Aliwie, A. N. A. (2025a). A pragmatic analysis of persuasive arguments in the 2011–2020 US presidential campaign speeches. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(1), 480–494.
<https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i1.7243>

- Aliwie, A. N. A. (2025b). Conversational silence in Harold Pinter's *The Birthday Party*: A pragmatic perspective. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 25(2), 115–144. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes.v25i2.860>
- Blom, J. N., & Hansen, K. R. (2015). Click bait: Forward-reference as lure in online news headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 76, 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.11.009>
- Dor, D. (2003). On newspaper headlines as relevance optimizers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(5), 695–721. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00157-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00157-9)
- Dong, T., & Shao, P. (2016, May). The analysis of pragmatic presupposition in English news headlines. In *2nd International Symposium on Social Science 2016 (ISSS 2016)* (pp. 323–326). Atlantis Press.
- Finkbeiner, R. (2024). The pragmatics of headlines: Central issues and future research avenues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 222, 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.03.010>
- 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. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1974). Pragmatic presuppositions. In M. K. Munitz & P. K. Unger (Eds.), *Semantics and philosophy* (pp. 197–213). New York University Press. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Appendix: Illustrative Headlines Analyzed

- H1. BBC News. "AI chatbots unable to accurately summarise news, BBC finds." 11 February 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c0m17d8827ko> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H2. BBC News. "Amazon boss says AI will replace jobs at tech giant." 17 June 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cn0q2v851k9o> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H3. BBC News. "Don't blindly trust what AI tells you, Google boss tells BBC." 18 November 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c8drzv37z4jo> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H4. BBC News. "Will AI mean the end of call centres?" 2 November 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cz913ylq3k3o> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H5. BBC News. "A million jobs in London could be changed by AI." 29 September 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c07vmlz38jo> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H6. CNN Business. "DeepSeek hasn't just disrupted OpenAI. Chinese tech giants are being upended too." 11 February 2025. CNN sitemap for February 2025: <https://www.cnn.com/sitemap/article/business/2025/02> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H7. CNN. "Europe 'not in the AI race today,' French President Macron says." 9 February 2025. <https://www.cnn.com/2025/02/09/europe/france-macron-europe-ai-race-intl> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H8. CNN Business. "Software shares are in the doldrums. Blame AI." 25 August 2025. <https://www.cnn.com/2025/08/25/markets/software-shares-ai-stock> [Accessed 1 October 2026].
- H9. CNN Business. "Do you think AI changing or threatening to take your job? Tell us about it here." 23 June 2025. <https://www.cnn.com/2025/06/23/tech/ai-impact-on-jobs-callout> [Accessed 1 October 2026; wording as published].

Publisher's Note/Disclaimer: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of NJH. NJH disclaims responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.