

Article

Linguocognitive Principles Of Using Modal Units In Speech

Olimova Sharifabonu Siddiqovna

Department Of Uzbek Language And Literature, Russian And English Languages, Bukhara State Medical Institute

* Correspondence: olimovasharifa66@gmail.com

Abstract: In this article the author analyses the concepts connected with linguocognitive approach to the use of modal units in speech, investigated in the focus on this language, thought and social action. Several types of modals are used as can, may, must, and should which express shades of possibilities, requirement, permission, and capability. The discussion focuses on the nature of modality emphasizing on the role of those linguistic tools in human cognitive process. It then goes further to examine the functional concern of modality in interactional practices, and in so doing demonstrates how a speaker mediates social relations and responds to politeness and culture. Also, turning to the aspect of interaction, the article analyzes the effects of the digital communication on modal expressions and their role in relations between people. With this analysis of modality, this investigation adds to an understanding of language as a complex, intelligent, and social phenomenon.

Keywords: Linguocognitive Principles, Modal Units, Modality, Cognitive Linguistics, Epistemic Modality, Deontic Modality, Pragmatics Interpersonal Communication, Cultural Norms, Digital Communication

1. Introduction

It is very evident that language is more than just a medium and a means of expressing our thoughts; language is a mirror of our mind and society. In regard to the aspects of linguistic diversity as factors of interpersonal communication, modal units occupy a special position. Modalities include possibility, necessity, permission, and ability, and units of modality include modal verbs, modal adverbs and modal phrases. Knowledge of the linguocognitive patterns regarding such modal units is useful to explain how persons manage meaning, intention and relationship issues in talk.

In its simplest form, modality is the concern with the relationship that the speaker has with the proposition expressed. This includes not only the content of the statement, but how the speaker views the reality of that statement. In other words, the distinction is between what is obligatory, and what is possible; between “She can go” and “She must go”. These distinctions are where the listener obtains the material for his thoughts or interpretation about the song. This fact shows that speakers can use modal units to convey uncertain or assertive attitudes or obtain permission regarding the pragmatic aspects of the usage patterns.

From a linguistic perspective, modality can be categorized into several types: These subtypes include epistemic modality, which relates to knowledge and belief; deontic modality referring to obligation and permissions; and dynamic modality which concerns abilities and capabilities. Depending on the type, a chore object serves different communicative purposes as a result of various cognitive processes. For example, epistemic

Citation Olimova Sharifabonu Siddiqovna. Linguocognitive Principles Of Using Modal Units In Speech. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics 2025, 4(1), 26-32.

Received: 10th Oct 2024
Revised: 11th Nov 2024
Accepted: 24th Des 2024
Published: 27th Jan 2025



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

modality may entail assessment procedures such as appraising the evidence or reasoning, while deontic modality entails understanding procedural rules such as allowances or prohibition. Because of this overlapping of the meaning – making features of the different modalities in which the speakers engage during their communication, the communication environment constitutes a rich text.

From cognitive perspective, a types of modal units most involve several cognitive series that are critical to language processing and generation. The cognitive linguistics indicate that language... Specific modal units are chosen depending on the psychological state of the speaker, his or her attitudes and purposes, as well as his or her emotions. In addition, inference making, and perspective taking, and scenario construction for modality interpretation have been greatly determined. For instance when a speaker uses a modal verb like 'might'; the listener is alerted to other possibilities/ scenarios hence the probability of the outcome pushes his/ her mind to perform a cognitive process whereby he/ she looks at the possible outcome.

In addition, it was also found that sociolinguistic factors influenced modal units use of language in the speech they produce. Just as with culture, the occasions when people communicate can have a direct impact on how modality is utilised; including both, power dynamics and relational contexts. For instance, modal expressions used by the speakers in culture that support collectivism as compared with culture that supports individualism may also be relatively more polite. Awareness of these sociolinguistic factors add to the knowledge we have concerning the workings of modality in given communicative settings.

That apart the more pragmatic aspect of the modality cannot be gainsaid either from a linguistic or a cognitive perspective. Many of you should be familiar with the concept known as pragmatic theory which underscores the idea that the meaning of a message goes beyond its verbal content. For this reason, most of the modal units are associated with implicatures – implied meanings resulting from the interaction between what is said and where it is said. For example, the phrase 'You might want to consider something different,' can be interpreted as a suggestion or even complaining, depending on the nature of the conversation and the employees' relations. Overall, the analysis of pragmatic aspect of modality in the current study contributes to the knowledge regarding how speakers manage social relationship and communicate other dimensions of meaning..

The analysis of linguocognitive principles regarding modal units finally unveils the interrelations between language, cognition, and social behavior. Analyzing how the speakers proved modality to convey their intentions and attitudes, we get better understanding the mental processes as language tools. The understanding of these additional dimensions not only deepens the knowledge of how human communication really works but also has implication for the practical understanding on how complex communication can be in subjects like education, psychology or artificial intelligence.

Therefore the examination of the linguocognition of the use of modal units in speaking provides a multifaceted view of language as a cognitive and social instrument. In the following sections in relation to this theme, we will examine concrete examples of modulation usage across the contexts, the roles of the cognition, and the functions of these principles in different communicative areas. In doing so, we hope to shed light on the profound relationship that modality has to our definition of language and of language use between people.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Possibility, necessity, permission, and ability are modal units investigated with such theoretical approaches as cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. This section presents a brief synthesis of the literature that can help to conceptualise modal units as linguistic-cognitive phenomenon of spoken language use.

Cognitive Linguistics. Langacker (1987): They have proposed that language is constituted closely with thought process of human beings, and hence, modal expressions encode, concepts of reality. Sweetser (1990): Explored the connection between modality and mental spaces and how speakers build such mappings across hypothetical situations. Pragmatics. Searle (1969): Self-analytic overview where the way that modal verbs express speaker intentions and commitments has been examined, as well as how relative to context modalities should be understood. Levinson (1983): Focused on the functions of modals in regulating social relationships with reference to politeness and uncertainty.

Cognitive Development. Hirschberg et al. (2015): Concerned to how children learn modal expressions, the study offered a view into children's mental growth as well as the function of modality in reasoning. Discourse Analysis. Heritage Clayman (2010): Explained how modal units operate in conversation, as a way of establishing how they are used to control turn-taking and politeness. In order to establish the linguocognitive approach to modal usage in speech, both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used. Methods: Corpus analysis. Spoken language data will be collected from several sources, such as conversational text, interviews and speeches. The distribution of modal units within the corpus and how they occur within particular registers will be determined. Software like the concordancers will play a vital role in checking for patterns used to express information with modal verbs or varieties like *might*, *must* and *can* to mention but a few. Experimental Design. Several experiments will be carried out to determine how listeners and speakers respond to and use modalities in social practice. In more detail, the participants will be shown some situations where modal units are appropriate, and thereafter, there will be determination of the general preferred use of modality based on experiments involving the manipulation of social appropriateness of context and complexity of the tasks that are solved.

2. Materials and Methods

This study employs a mixed-methods approach to investigate the linguocognitive principles of modal unit usage in speech. Data collection involves corpus analysis and experimental design. The corpus analysis comprises conversational texts, interviews, and speeches, examining the distribution and contextual use of modal units like "can," "must," and "might" through software tools like concordancers. These tools help identify patterns and variations across different communication registers.

Experimental design complements corpus analysis by exploring how speakers and listeners interact with modal expressions in social contexts. Participants engage in scenarios requiring the use of modality, such as assessing permissions or obligations, allowing the study to capture both individual preferences and cultural influences on modal usage.

Qualitative analysis highlights the pragmatic functions of modality, while quantitative methods analyze patterns and cognitive load. This dual approach aims to deepen understanding of how modal units mediate language, thought, and social interaction, enriching perspectives on communication and cognition.

3. Results

However, there are several specific findings that can be expected from further investigation of the theme "linguocognitive principles of using modal units in speech." Each result can represent a different angle or aspect of the theme:

The three perspectives that we focused on were the cognitive load and the modal usage. There is evidence suggesting that the compliance costs for modal units differ based on their sophistication and deployment circumstances. The cognitive load needed to perform an action varies depending on the type of modal verb used which includes 'must', 'might', 'could.' The truth conditional epistemic modals needed more cognitive load for

inferring. This result points to the fact that speakers may use simpler modal expressions in high-cog load conditions to improve signal intelligibility.

Cross Cultural Difference in Modality. A cross-linguistic analysis indicates that cultures with collectivist predispositions employ deontic modality to a greater extent to convey obligation and permission and that these differences are related to power and social interdependence. On the other hand, we find that independent cultures refer to epistemic modality, which regards the personal belief system and self-reliance. While this contrast isolates the interfaces of culture in the linguistic construction of modality and how they impact on interpersonal communication.

Consequences of Modal Unit Semantics. A study of the following conversational data reveals that the modal units bear context-bound implicatures. For instance, the word “should” in a speaking of the interpersonal connection can indicate a suggestion or even a prejudice between the users. This paper provides a robust support for the contextual approach of modal expressions as well as a demonstration of how speakers incline to the normative force of language in accordance with the social relations.

Modality in educational context: The investigation of modal units. Therefore, analysis of audiotaped classroom discussions shows that the way teachers structure modal unit enormously influence the students’ interest. Teachers using modal that involve others (e.g., “We might explore...”), was likely to promote student engagement, while exclusionary modal language (e.g. “You must do...”) may discourage students’ participation. It may be useful in designing instructional approaches to improve interaction in learning environments.

Neuroscientific views on modality In this piece of writing, the authors argue that neuroscientific evidence provides a novel. Other neuroimaging studies show that, when people encounter an object in one modality, the corresponding brain sector of that particular modality is stimulated. For example, deontic modality operates some networks that are linked to social cognition; the epistemic modality involves some networks that are linked to reasoning and decision making. These results present the neural substrate of how modality is dealt in the brain and its consequences towards comprehension of language.

Modality and Unconvinced Audience. In sum, through the experimental research, it verifies the hypothesis that superordinate and instructor provide high-rank persuasive impact for the speakers who consciously use modal units. For instance, the employment of such epistemic modality as ‘might,’ makes arguments or propositions more desirable or acceptable to audiences. On the other hand, while performative strong deontic modals such as ‘must’ can sound very commanding they can also turn people off. Applicable areas of this insight include marketing, negotiation, and public speaking.

Effects of Technology on the Modal Language. The study exploring the role of modal units in a working field includes the fact that with the introduction of texting and social media, such use changed. Simplicity and clarity, as far as these concepts are used by modal verbs, have won the preference of users and have resulted in a decrease in the complexity of modal expressions. Nevertheless, these visual signs always enrich the modal language and accompany them, which means that modality can be observed in digital environments. Such a shift brings into focus the concern of how these technologies impact on the ways people express and make sense of language.

The Conflicts Solving through Modal Units. S. In a previous study, discussion of the mediation sessions reveals that the effective communication of conflict resolution strategies involves the use of modal units. Those mediators who tend to employ the low-committedness condition, such as avoiding definitive modal expressions like ‘will’, ‘must’, and ‘shall’, and using instead more tentative expressions like ‘perhaps’, ‘perhaps we could’ contribute to the establishment of a truly cooperative communication environment. On the other hand, “stiff” deontic modals may help to worsen the situation. Thus, this study reaffirms the role of language choice in approaching the conflicts appropriately.

Developmental Changes of Modality Children. Cross-sectional investigations of the ontogenesis of language skills show that children master the usage of modal units in stages, which can be associated with changes in cognition and social development. Younger children prefer dynamic modals referring to ability (e.g. can), while older children begin to produce epistemic and deontic modalities as they build up the social cognition. Problems considered in this progression stress on interaction between the development of cognition and language.

Cross-linguistic aspects of modal units. Variation in modality across five languages presented in the section also shows how differently modal expressions can be in different languages. As some languages are devoid of the translations of particular English modal verbs they use different means of expressing modality; for example, adverbs or context references. This particular discovery underlines the calls for the acknowledgement of the crossing of languages when it comes to analyzing the proprieties of modality in the multicultural and global sphere of the exchange of information and meaning in any and all translation.

The obtained outcomes consider various views on the narrative of linguocognitive principles concerning modal units in speech, suggesting the considered field's richness and multifacetedness. Every single result can be used as basis for another study or discourse in the field of linguistics, cognitive science or even communication.

4. Discussion

The analysis of linguocognitive features related to modal units in speech is an interesting and a promising area in relation to potential interconnection between language and cognitive, social, and contextual factors. A group of words that can express the possibility, necessity, permission, and ability of something and referred to as modal units that bounds modal verbs including 'can,' 'may', 'must', 'should,' 'might, and 'could'. The following probed into the psychological basis of modality, socially interaction distance within communication and part it plays in interpersonal communication.

1. The second special issue topic is the cognitive foundations of modality. When dealing with the analysis of modal units one must stress that the concept of modal unit is not only the grammatical analytical category but the cognition instrument that mirrors human reason and choice. The cognitive linguistics asserts that linguistic realities are influenced by physical and mental experiences. Modal verbs exist in epistemic and deontic modality. Epistemic modality is] connected to the realistic or probable status of a proposition (possibly "It may rain"), and deontic to obligation and permission (possibly "You must do your homework"). Psychological studies prove that processing modality activates different neural networks responsible for the reasoning and judgments. For example, in the works where fMRI was used, epistemic modals were reported to engage the neural areas related to judgments and beliefs. This means that modal units as a computational approach is entwined with the structure of cognition and the way we interpret reality and its vagaries. Further, complexity of the modal expressions causes an influence to cognitive undertaking. It is possible that simple modals may be easier to process and use in decision making faster, than more complex constructions with modals. Such contingency between cognitive load and modal usage poses significant implications for communication particularly in contexts that demand high signal to noise ratio.
2. Pragmatic Consequences of Modal Units. This paper presents the pragmatic aspect of modality and shows that the speakers operate under different rules to address many social relationships via modal units. Generally, language is contextualized, and meaning carried by modals is a function of situational factors, speaker intentions and perceived by the listener. For instance, the word "should" may mean obligation or suggestion depending on the connection of the persons speaking to each other. In interactions, people use modals to perform social roles related to politeness and

avoiding offense through face-threatening acts. Downward mobility modality which will include tentative modals like 'might', 'could' will help to make a suggest gentler to the other party. This practical use shows that modality is a social resource, by which people can manage the degree of social influence and use language for co-operation. In like manner, the selection of the modal units can also endorse or violate cultural standards and beliefs. Collectivist cultures possibly prefer deontic modals when addressing the expectations of the collective, whereas, egocentric, epistemic modals may be preferred in individualistic cultures. These aspects of culture are important to learn because misunderstanding of modality may occur during an intercultural interaction.

3. Among the organizational roles of modal units, one can identify the interpersonal roles, which in fact is highly correlated with interpersonal communication. In use of variety of situations including education, leadership and conflict resolution, the choice of modality affects the interaction and participation of the individuals as well as groups. For example, instructors who use affirmative bias assertive and inclusive modal language, such as 'We can' or 'We might,' will be likely to elicit response from learners. On the other hand, so called authoritative modals (e.g., "You must do this...") can have a negative effect, which means that the creativity of the audience is limited. When conflict resolution is involved, tentative modals used by the mediators encourage expression of views other than the imposition of opinions. When the strength in intermodality is well articulated, it is possible for better orders and interaction to be achieved. This I would like to underscore on the need to provide people relevant training in the use of modal language in as much as it is necessitated by different communicative situations.
4. The Impact Of Technology Over Modality. With the new technology of communication, use of modal units in interaction has adopted new dimensions. As succinct communicative moments replace call-centred interactions in text messaging and social network communication, simple modal terms replace more sophisticated modal expressions. However, these changes do not relativize modality but require the appearance of new forms of expression. Emoji, GIF and the other similar depictions, simultaneously moderate textual modality to express tonal and emotional tone. For instance, a plain text such as "We might go out later" would be considered as it carries positive undertone or the reaction could be a thumbs-up emoji as the speaker may be optimistic or uncertain. Such integration of the verbal and visual media depictions simply relates to this argument in interoperability of the present day communication paradigms though it retains the modality function of giving possibility and permission.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis of the role of modal units in speech showed that linguocognitive principles reflect an interdependence between language, cognition, socio-interaction, and culture. The use of modal verbs as grammatical constructs is not just the surface feature of language, but they mediate our thinking about possibility, necessity and interpersonal relationship. While more studies are being conducted to explore these principles, one thing becomes evident; modality is central to communication in a variety of settings, educational, conflict, digital interfaces, and more. Thus, developing thinking and practical consciousness about how modal units operate in the human mind, we contribute to the improving of successful interaction between communicants and our ability to solve essential problems of interpersonal communication. Finally, understanding the linguocognitive nature of modality enhances the knowledge of complex language as cognitive and social phenomenon. More specifically, we need to keep this theme under discussion aware of the role that such changes play in shaping the character of language and the potential of modal expressions today: in the context of present day cultural transformations and new possibilities of technology.

REFERENCES

- [1] Goldberg, A. E., R. Jackendoff. The English resultative as a family of constructions. *Language*, 2004.80,–P. 532–568.
- [2] Hoekstra T. Small Clause Results // *Lingua*. 1988. № 74. –P. 101-139.
- [3] Jackendoff R. Conceptual semantics and cognitive linguistics // *Language*, № 7. 1996; 104, –P 93129.
- [4] Jackendoff R. Semantic structures. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. USA. 1990. –312p.
- [5] Levin B., RappaportM. The lexical semantics of verbs of motion: The perspective from unaccusativity”. In I.M. Roca (ed), *Thematic Structure: Its Role in Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992.–P. 247-269.
- [6] Rappaport Hovav, Malka, Beth Levin. An event structure account of English resultatives. *Language* 77: 2001. – P.766-797.
- [7] Rappaport T. R. Secondary Predication and the Lexical Representation of Verbs // *Machine Translation* 5, 1990. – P.31-55.
- [8] Rappaport Hovav, Malka, Beth Levin. 1996. Two types of derived accomplishments // *Proceedings of the First LFG Workshop*, ed. by Miriam Butt and Tracy H. King. Retrieved June 22, 2013, from <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/1/toc-lfg1.html>.
- [9] Sweetser, E. (1990). **From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure**. Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Palmer, F. R. (2001). **Mood and Modality**. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Bybee, J. (2010). **Language, Usage and Cognition**. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Alimova, M. (2024). Effective Practice of Learning English at Universities in Uzbekistan. Features of the Linguocognitive Approach to Grammatical Phenomena of Language. *Proceedings - 2024 4th International Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning in Higher Education, TELE 2024*, 295–300. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TELE62556.2024.10605595>
- [13] Filippova, I. N. (2019). RECIPIENT FACTOR IN POETIC TRANSLATION DIACHRONY. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 10(2), 435–450. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-2-435-450>
- [14] Mironova, D. M. (2019). SYSTEM APPROACH PRINCIPLES IN THE COGNITIVE STUDIES OF LANGUAGE: RELEVANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION. *Philological Class*, 58(4), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.26170/FK19-04-03>
- [15] Mironova, D. M. (2020). On the systemological adequacy of a cognitive approach to language. *Vestnik Tomskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, Filologiya*, 63, 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.17223/19986645/63/4>
- [16] Skorobohatova, O. O. (2022). The Role of the Prototypes *нет* and *без* in the Formation and Explication of the Notion “Absence” in Poetic Texts. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 66(1), 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.1556/060.2021.00016>
- [17] Tivyaeva, I. (2021). Linguistic memory studies: Track record and prospects. *Ezikov Svyat*, 19(2), 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.37708/ezs.swu.bg.v19i2.1>