

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
THE UNIVERSITY OF DANANG

TRẦN THỊ MINH GIANG

**A STUDY OF COGNITIVE NON-FACTIVE VERB
AND EPISTEMIC ADVERB COLLOCATIONS
IN ENGLISH**

Major: English Linguistics

Code: 62.22.02.01

**DOCTORAL THESIS
IN SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES
(A SUMMARY)**

Danang- 2018

The study has been completed at The University of Danang

Supervisor : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Luu Quý Khương

Examiner 1: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Võ Đại Quang

Examiner 2: Dr. Ytrou Alio

Examiner 3: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tôn Nữ Mỹ Nhật

The thesis was orally defended at the Examining Committee

Time : 31/ 3/ 2018

Venue: The University of Danang

This thesis is available for purpose of reference at:

- *Library of University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Danang*
- *The Information Resources Centre, The University of Danang*
- *National Library of Viet Nam*

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Rationale

In daily communication, our ultimate goal is not only to impart information described in utterances but also to express our judgement to the truth of what is said, or the content of the proposition. Linguists attribute the speaker's attitude to the states of affairs **modality** in general and **epistemic modality** in particular.

Especially in epistemic modality, *cognitive non-factive verbs* and *epistemic adverbs* are often used to hedge or mitigate the speaker's imposition and give the addressee a chance to argue about the truth, or the falsity of states of affairs. Hedging items or modulations combined a cognitive non-factive verb and an epistemic adverb with the singular first person subject pronoun *I* such as *I certainly think, I possibly believe, maybe I guess, I suppose perhaps ...* may be an interesting and useful aspect to all language learners of English as in the following example

(1.1) "***I think perhaps*** I can too. But I try not to borrow. First you borrow. Then you beg." (The old man and the sea, 1952, p.10)

Until now although there have been some researchers referring to the combination of a modal verb and a modal adverb such as Coates (1983), Halliday (1979), Hoyer (1997), Lyons (1977), Perkins (1983)... a study of the structure consisting of the singular first person subject and a cognitive non-factive verb and epistemic adverb collocation remains an unexploited area. Therefore, the thesis entitled *A study of cognitive non-factive verb and epistemic adverb collocations in English* is hoped, once finished, may help both

learners of English and native speakers of English use the structure effectively in communication. Furthermore, the study of the structure in terms of syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics might contribute a better understanding of modal meanings in English, therefore, improving the quality of teaching and learning English.

1.2. Aims and Objectives of the Study

1.2.1. Aims of the Study

This study aims at examining the linguistic features of the structure that consists of the singular first person subject pronoun *I* and a collocation of CNFVs and EAs in English and showing the interplay of these linguistic aspects in order to provide learners of English and native speakers of English with practical knowledge to use the structure more effectively in communication.

1.2.2. Objectives of the Study

- To identify the linguistic features of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* in three aspects of syntactics, semantics and pragmatics.
- To present the interplay of three linguistic dimensions in the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations*.
- To make suggestions of using the construction mentioned to teach and learn English as a foreign language.

1.3. Research Questions

- What are the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* in English?
- What is the interplay of three above mentioned linguistic dimensions in the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* in English?

1.4. Object of the Study

The object of the study is the structure *I + cognitive non-factive verb and epistemic adverb collocations*

1.5. Scope of the Study

In the study we examined the collocations created from six CNFVs such as *think, believe, guess, suppose, assume, hope* and epistemic adverbs including epistemic adverbs like *certainly, perhaps, probably, possibly, maybe, surely, definitely, really, indeed, verily...*

1.6. Significance of the Study

1.6.1. Theoretical Significance of the Study

The study can make an essential contribution to the investigation of linguistic features of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* in English in syntactics, semantics and pragmatics. More importantly, the study presented the interplay of three above linguistic aspects in the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations*.

1.6.2. Practical Significance of the Study

- It provides a very useful source of reference for compiling lectures, books, and materials related to the scope of the study.
- The findings of the study form a good theoretical background for next language researches on modality.
- It assists learners of English to have better understanding of modal meanings of the construction in order to use the structure more effectively in communication.

1.7. Organization of the Study

Chapter 1: *Introduction*; Chapter 2: *Literature Review and Theoretical Background*; Chapter 3: *Research Methodology*; Chapter 4: *Syntactic Features of the Structure I + CNFV and EA*

collocations; Chapter 5: *Semantic Features of the Structure I + CNFV and EA collocations*; Chapter 6: *Pragmatic Features of the Structure I + CNFV and EA collocations*; Chapter 7: *Interplay of three linguistic dimensions: syntactics, semantics, pragmatics of the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations*; Chapter 8: *Conclusion*.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Review of Previous Researches Related to the Study

2.1.1. Syntactics

Urmson (1982) discussed parenthetical verbs such as *suppose*, *believe*, *think*, *expect*... Mackenzie (1987) went on Urmson's research about the mobility of mental verbs such as *know*, *believe*, *guess* but they had deep studies of the parenthetical verbs.

Halliday (1961) described a type of collocational study. Later in his study (1994), he presented all components of theme such as *interpersonal theme*, *topical theme* and *textual theme*.

In Viet Nam, Hoàng Tuệ (1962) and Nguyễn Kim Thân (1999) presented syntactic linguistic features of Vietnamese epistemic verbs.

The syntactic theory of neg-raising proposed by Fillmore (1963), Horn (1978), and later Bublitz (1992) has enjoyed a good deal of attention and is supported by a number of compelling arguments.

In addition, Thompson and Mulac (1991) applied the theory of grammaticalization in order to explain more about the parenthetical ability of the structures.

Cao Xuân Hạo (1991) states that there are two different kinds of modality: modality of utterance-act (modalité d' énonciation), modality of predication (modalité d' énoncé).

2.1.2. Semantics

Basing on the criteria of time, Vendler (1967) distinguished two meanings of the verb “*think*”. Searle (1969) considered the theory of speech acts by Austin (1962) as the most suitable to discuss modality. In Viet Nam, Hoàng Phê (1984) called “*nghĩ*” in the structure “*tôi nghĩ là*” parenthetical verb.

Goddard (2003) investigated the semantic expansion of the verb “*think*” in English, Chinese, Yupik Eskimo, Samoan and Japanese. Besides, Iraide (1999) and Evans and Wilkins (2000) studied the semantic change from perception verbs to cognition verbs in some languages in Australia.

2.1.3. Pragmatics

In pragmatics, we have to refer to Grice's study (1975) with his cooperative principle. Next, Grice's maxims were examined and developed by Lakoff (1977) and Sperber (1986). Later, the politeness theory, a sociolinguistic theory in the pragmatic tradition was developed by Brown and Levinson (1987)

Hoàng Trọng Phiến (1983), Đỗ Hữu Châu (1983), Hoàng Tuệ (1988) have discussed the notion of modality since 1980s.

Hengeveld (1988) discussed the impact of illocution and modality through a representation of main clauses which can distinguish several layers, each representing a different mode of speech acts. Aijmer (1997), Kaltenböck (2010), Karkkainen (2003), (2007), (2010), and Thompson (2002) express the state of latent

instability and especially susceptible to change of grammaticalizing elements, which is the adoption of new pragmatic functions.

In Cappelli's paper (2005),(2007),(2008) She also mentioned modulating attitudes via adverbs, which have a cognitive-pragmatic approach.

2.1.4. Combination of Three Aspects

Aijmer (1997), Thompson & Mulac (1991), Van (2011), and Vandenberg (2000) express that in order to understand *I think* well, we should study it in three aspects : syntactics, semantics and pragmatics. Høye (1997) mentioned modal - adverb collocations.

In the cross linguistic studies, Ngũ Thiện Hùng (2004) did the research into grammatical and lexical devices in epistemic modality in English and Vietnamese in aspects of syntactics, semantics and pragmatics. Besides, Võ Đại Quang (2009) also presented linguistic features of some modal devices in English and in Vietnamese in three aspects: syntactics, semantics and pragmatics.

Recently, the cross linguistic study by Nguyễn Thị Thu Thủy (2015) has described, analysed and compared/ contrasted English and Vietnamese root and epistemic modality as realized by modal verbs from Cognitive perspective. Next, Nguyễn Thị Thu Hà (2016) showed the group of cognition verbs in Vietnamese in reference to English. Last, Trần Hữu Phúc (2017) conducted an investigation into modality expressions used as politeness strategies in English course via a corpus-based method.

2.2. Theoretical Background

2.2.1. Modality and Epistemic Modality

2.2.1.1. Traditional Logic Modality

In traditional logic, judgements are divided into two kinds: *necessity* and *possibility*.

2.2.1.2. Linguistics Modality

The notions of modality in linguistics have been given by many linguists such as Bybee (1985), Lyons (1977), Rescher (1968), Đỗ Hữu Châu (2009) ...especially Palmer (1986)'s definition is the most important for the study.

2.2.1.3. The Distinction between Modality and Proposition

In linguistics, Bally, as cited in Nguyễn Văn Hiệp (2008) distinguished meaning structure of the sentence made up by *modus* and *dictum*, which influence each other. Thus, according to Ngũ Thiện Hùng (2004) the semantic structure of an utterance can be presented like: **M [P]** (M= Modality; P= Proposition)

And we have modalized utterances like: I think *possibly* **P**; I *maybe* believe **P**, I *certainly* think **P**.

2.2.1.4. The Distinction between Deontic and Epistemic Modality

2.2.1.5. Types of Modality

According to Jespersen (1949) there are two features which share are subjectivity, i.e. the involvement of the speaker and non-factuality which consists of "Deontic" and "Epistemic".

2.2.1.6. Types of Modality

According to Palmer (1986), epistemic modality is divided into three subtypes: *factive*, *contra-factive*, and *non-factive*.

2.2.2. Collocations of Cognitive Non- Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverbs

2.2.2.1. Modal Lexical Verbs

a. Mental Space Theory

Fauconier gave the definition of mental space that a mental space does not have a faithful representation of reality, but an idealized cognitive model whereas a possible world consists of both actual world and other distinct possible worlds.

b. Cognitive Non-Factive Verbs

According to Kiparsky (1968), these verbs are also divided into two main types: factive verbs and non-factive verbs. Especially, Palmer (1986) called the non-factive verbs such as *think, suppose, believe...* weak assertive verbs.

c. Characteristics of Cognitive Non-Factive Verbs

- Always going with the singular first person subject in simple present tense; the omission of complementizer *that* , and in tag-questions, the tags only aiming at the subject of proposition (complement clause)

2.2.2.2. Modal Adverbs

a. Epistemic Adverbs

According to Biber, et al. (1999, p.549), there are three major types of adverbs: circumstance adverb, linking adverbs and stance adverbs. Stance adverbs are *apparently, clearly, perhaps, possibly...*

b. Types of Epistemic Adverbs in English

Khuong and Giang (2012) divided epistemic adverbs into two kinds: assertive epistemic modal adverbs and Quirk et al (1985) showed three modality meanings of adverbs such as *emphasis, approximate, restriction*. We have the scale of EAs as follows.

Table 2.1. Scale of epistemic adverbs

Degrees	Epistemic Adverbs
High	certainly, surely, definitely, actually, verily, really,

	indeed, infact
Medium	probably, possibly, maybe, perhaps
Low	Just, rather, only, hardly, scarcely

c. Characteristics of Epistemic Adverbs

c₁. Syntactic Functions of Epistemic Adverbs

c₂. Semantic Roles of Epistemic Adverbs

c₃. Multiple Occurrence of Epistemic Adverbs and the Interplay of Semantics, Syntactics, and Pragmatics

2.2.2.3. Cognitive Non- Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations

a. The Definition of the Term collocation

b. Modally Harmonic Combinations of a Modal Verb and a Modal Adverb

Lyons (1977) acknowledged “modally harmonic” and “modally non-harmonic” combinations, where the modal verb and its adverb satellite have to complement and reinforce each other.

2.2.3. Linguistic Features

2.2.3.1. Syntactics

a. Mobility of Modal Collocations in the Same Clause

b. Moved Negation and Epistemic Modality

2.2.3.2. Semantics

a. Epistemic Scale

Givón (1982) gave a scale of certainty. Later Cappelli (2008) divided epistemicity into two dimensions: certainty and probability.

b. Epistemic Modality Based on Deduction

- Assumptive mood, Declarative mood, Deductive mood, Dubitative mood, Hypothetical mood, Interrogative mood, Speculative mood.

2.2.3.3. Pragmatics

a. Pragmaticalization and Pragmatic Markers

b. Factors Affecting the Mobility of the Modal Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

c. The 'Conversational Maxim' View in Communicative Strategies

d. The 'Face-Saving' View in Politeness Theory

e. Speech-Act Modality

- There are five types of general functions performed by speech acts: declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

2.3. Summary

This chapter chiefly presented two main parts: a brief review of previous researches related to the study and theoretical background.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The descriptive and statistical method of the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations in English in terms of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features were conducted to seek qualitative and quantitative information.

3.2. Research Methods

The principal method applied for the study is the descriptive one and there are other techniques such as substitution, transformation, insertion, contextual analysis.

3.3. Procedures of the Study

There are 9 steps in the procedures of the study.

3.4. Data Collection and Data Analysis

3.4.1. Description of Samples

1000 samples collected from different sources such as novels, short stories, and online materials must be a complete sentence which contains a structure consisting of the singular first person subject *I* and a collocation of a cognitive non-factive verb and an epistemic adverb, and followed by a complement clause. Especially samples have to meet four following criteria.

3.4.1.1. Authenticity

3.4.1.2. Accessibility

3.4.1.3. Variation

3.4.1.4. Reputation

3.4.2. Data Collection Procedure

3.4.3. Data Analysis Procedure

3.5. Analytical Framework of the Study

The analysis of linguistic features of the study was carried out in the theoretical framework by Palmer (1986), Givón (1982) - scale of certainty, Bublitz (1992) – approach to negation, McIntosh (1961)- collocation, Sweetser (1990)- Speech-act modality in 3 linguistic aspects: syntactics, semantics, pragmatics, and their interplay.

3.6. Reliability and Validity

The patterns from the data collection were always compared with the results from the theoretical background to maintain the quality of the research.

3.7. Summary

In sum, this chapter showed us the research design with methods known as description, interpretation, quality, quantity, statistics... and techniques including substitution, transformation,

insertion, contextual analysis.

Chapter 4

SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF THE STRUCTURE

I + CNFV AND EA COLLOCATIONS

4.1. Analysis of the Structure I + Cognitive Non-Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations

(4.1) “*I think perhaps* I should have made a show of the indignation”
 (The moon and six pence, 1996, p.46)

The syntactic structures of (4.1) can be demonstrated in bracket diagrams like this:

[*I think perhaps* [I should have made a show of the indignation]]

4.2. Harmony of Cognitive Non-Factive Verbs and Epistemic Adverbs in the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

4.2.1. The Structure *I think* + EAs

I think + strong epistemic adverbs/ medium epistemic adverbs/ low epistemic adverbs.

4.2.2. The Structure *I believe* + EAs

I believe + strong epistemic adverbs/ medium epistemic adverbs/ low epistemic adverbs.

4.2.3. The Structure *I hope* + EAs

I hope + strong epistemic adverbs/ medium epistemic adverbs/ low epistemic adverbs.

4.2.4. The Structure *I guess* + EAs

I guess + really/ probably/ maybe

4.2.5. The Structure *I suppose* + EAs

I suppose + really/ rather

4.2.6. The Structure *I assume* + EAs

I assume + just/ perhaps

4.3. Frequency of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

Table 4.17. Frequency of six pattern of the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations

Constructions	Occurrence	%
I think + EAs	552	55.2
I hope + EAs	256	25.6
I believe + EAs	156	15.6
I guess + EAs	17	1.7
I assume+ EAs	12	1.2
I suppose + EAs	7	0.7
Total	1000	100

4.4. Mobility of Epistemic Adverbs in the Matrix Clause

4.5. Ordering of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations in the Superordinate Clause

The structure can stand in the following positions.

4.5.1. *Initial*

4.5.2. *Medial*

4.5.3. *Final*

4.5.4. *Frequency of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations in Initial, Medial, and Final Positions*

Table 4.18. Frequency of the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations in initial, medial, final positions

Positions of I + CNFV and EA Collocations	Occurrence	%
Initial	975	97.5
Medial	16	1.6

Final	9	0.9
Total	1000	100

4.6. The Complementizer “that” in a Superordinate Clause

4.6.1. The Complementizer “that” with Epistemic Adverbs in the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

Table 4.19. Positions in correlation with the employment of “that” with epistemic adverbs in the matrix Clause

Positions of EAs	Initial	Medial	Final
That	±	+	±

4.6.2. Omission of Complementizer “that” in the Superordinate Clause

Table 4.20. Positions of complementizer ‘that’ in the superordinate clause

Positions	Initial	Medial	Final
That	±	–	–

In 500 random English samples collected from different sources, we have the following result of using and omitting the complementizer “that”

Table 4.21. Omission of complementizer “that” in English sentences

English Examples	Occurrence	%
With “that”	128	25.6
Without “that”	372	74.4
Total	500	100

4.7. The Raising of Negative Form in Sentences with the Structure I + Cognitive Non-Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations

We have the following results of using moved negation in daily communication with 200 negative English samples (see Appendix B)

Table 4.22. Frequency of the moved negation in English sentences with the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations

Negative Examples	Occurrence	%
Marked Negative Move	118	59
Unmarked Negation	82	41
Total	200	100

+ Marked Negative Move means the negative part which is put in the *theme* (in the matrix clause)

+ Unmarked Negation means the negative part which is put in the *rheme* (in the subordinate clause)

4.8. Summary

The harmony of CNFVs and EAs, the mobility of the structure, the omission of the complementizer “that”, moved negation of the structure were discussed in this section.

Chapter 5

SEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE STRUCTURE

I + CNFV AND EA COLLOCATIONS

5.1. Semantic Features of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations Based on Deduction

5.1.1. The Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations Expressing Belief

5.1.2. The Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations Expressing Inference

5.1.3. The Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations Expressing Prediction

Table 5.1. Semantics features of the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations in English based on deduction

Semantics features of I + CNFV and EA collocation based on deduction		I + CNFV and EA collocations
<u>Belief</u>	<p>I say I + CNFV and EA collocations belief P</p> <p>1. Low certainty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I want you to know that I am not sure of the likelihood of P. • P is just my own assumption. • P is less likely to be true. <p>2. High certainty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I want you to know that I am pretty sure of the likelihood of P • P is more likely to be true • P is self-evidence 	<p><i>I think perhaps, I really think, I definitely think, I really believe, I rather think, indeed I think, I certainly think</i></p>
<u>Inference</u>	<p>I say I + CNFV and EA collocations inference P</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I want you to know that I assume P is true. • P is likely to be true at some point in the past. • evidence about P is related to the state-of-affairs in the past. 	<p><i>I think probably, I think maybe, I guess maybe,</i></p>

Semantics features of I + CNFV and EA collocation based on deduction		I + CNFV and EA collocations
Prediction	<p>I say I + CNFV and EA collocations prediction P</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I want you to know that I assume P is true. • P is likely to be true at some point in the future. • Evidence about P is related to the state-of-affairs in the future. • If P is true, P can be pleasant/desirable. • If P is true, P can be unpleasant/undesirable. 	<p><i>I suppose really, I just assume, I just hope</i></p>

5.1.4. Frequency of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations Showing in Belief, Inference and Prediction

Table 5.2. Frequency of the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations in Belief, Inference, and Prediction

Deduction	Occurrence	%
Belief	435	60.83
Inference	98	13.7
Prediction	182	25.45
Total	715	100

5.2. The Modal Meanings of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

There are three modal meanings of the structure as follows:

5.2.1. Tentativeness

5.2.2. Assertion

5.2.3. Negation

5.3. Semantic Features of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations Based on the Scale of Certainty

Followings are three degrees of certainty mentioned

5.3.1. High Certainty

5.3.2. Mid Certainty

5.3.3. Low Certainty

Table 5.3. Scale of certainty of the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations in English

Scale of Certainty of the structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations		I + CNFV and EA Collocations
High Certainty	<p>I + CNFV and EA collocation [high certainty] P</p> <p>I want you to know that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P is more likely to be true • I assume that I have evidence • P is my conclusion based on the cognitive outcome or belief 	<p><i>I certainly think, I certainly hope, I surely think, I really suppose, I believe indeed, I really hope</i></p>
Mid Certainty	<p>I + CNFV and EA collocation [mid certainty] P</p> <p>I want you to know that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P is likely to be true • I assume that I have evidence • P is my conclusion based on the cognitive outcome 	<p><i>I think perhaps, I guess maybe, I hope perhaps, I think maybe, I think possibly, I think probably,</i></p>
Low Certainty	<p>I + CNFV and EA collocation [low certainty] P</p> <p>I want you to know that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P is less likely to be true • If P is true, P can be unpleasant/undesirable • I don't want P to be true 	<p><i>I rather think, I just hope, I hardly think, I just think, I only think, I just assume</i></p>

5.4. Semantic Features of the Structure I think + EA Based on the Scale of Negation

[Affirmation] → I think EA → I scarcely think → I hardly think

I don't think + EAs [Negation]

Figure 5.7 Scale of Negation of the Structure I think + EAs

5.5. Summary

In conclusion, in order to use the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* effectively in communication, we think it is necessary for learners of English and native speakers of English to have further study in semantic features of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* such as semantic features basing on deduction, scale of certainty, and scale of negation.

Chapter 6

PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF THE STRUCTURE

I + CNFV AND EA COLLOCATIONS

6.1. The Communicative Strategies Using the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

6.1.1 The Structure I + Cognitive Non-Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations Used in Politeness Strategies

6.1.1.1. Negative Politeness Strategy

- a. Mitigating the Reproach
- b. Avoiding the Imposition of Knowledge
- c. Revealing the Speaker's Unflattering Things

6.1.1.2. Positive Politeness Strategy

- a. Mitigating Illocutionary Force to Downgrade the Positive Face of Speaker
- b. Enhancing the Hearer's Good Virtues to Respect His Positive Face
- c. Mitigating the Illocutionary Force of Claims of Knowledge by Negating the Speaker's Knowledge

Table 6.1 The structure I + CNFV and EA collocations with positive and negative politeness strategies

Politeness Strategies		English	Pragmatic Orientation
Negative	Mitigating the reproach	<i>I just think, I think perhaps, I really think</i>	Hearer-oriented, reducing his/her unflattering things (remarks, criticism)
	Avoiding the imposition of knowledge	<i>I think maybe, I think perhaps, I only hope</i>	Hearer-oriented, reducing disadvantages (claims of knowledge)
	Revealing the speaker's unflattering things	<i>I certainly don't think, I really don't think, I think perhaps, In fact I think</i>	Speaker-oriented, increasing his/her unflattering things
Positive	Reducing the speaker's good virtues	<i>I definitely think, Indeed I believe, I really hope, I really don't think, I really believe</i>	Toward the hearer's positive face
	Enhancing the hearer's good virtues	<i>Indeed I think, I really do sometimes think, I really believe, I really think</i>	Toward the hearer's positive face
	Negating the speaker's state of cognition	<i>I really don't think, I don't think really, I don't really believe</i>	Hearer-oriented, reducing his/her unflattering things

6.1.2. Hedges

The structure is used as hedges in communication to make the conversations more effectively.

6.1.3. Mitigation in the Mobility of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

Mobility of the structure has made mitigation in communication.

6.2. Pragmatic Meanings in Negation of the Structure I + Cognitive Non-Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations

There are two main purposes when using negation of the structure, as follows.

6.2.1. Hearer-Oriented Pragmatic Meanings of Moved Negation of the Structure I + Cognitive Non-Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations

6.2.2. Mitigating the Illocutionary Force of Claims of Knowledge by Using Moved Negation of the Structure I + Cognitive Non-Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations

6.3. Speech Act – Based Pragmatic Features Expressed by the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

The structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* can be used to display different Speech Acts as follows.

6.3.1. Decreasing Complaining/ Admonishing

6.3.2. Counselling

6.3.3. Reducing Boasting

6.4. Summary

Using the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* in negative and positive politeness strategies. the communicative strategies of the construction used as hedges, mitigation, and pragmatic features based on the moved negation and speech-act modality of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* were mentioned in this section.

Chapter 7

INTERPLAY OF SYNTACTICS, SEMANTICS, AND PRAGMATICS IN THE STRUCTURE I + CNFV AND EA COLLOCATIONS

7.1. Mobility of Epistemic Adverbs in the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

The mobility of EAs in the matrix clause creates changes in semantics and pragmatics like in table 7.1

Table 7.1. Interplay of three linguistic aspects based on the mobility of EAs in the structure I + CNFV and EA collocations

Positions of EAs in the matrix clause	Syntactics	Semantics	Pragmatics
Initial	Marked form	High conviction	Clause-oriented adverb
Medial	Unmarked form	Medium conviction	VP- oriented adverb
Final	Unmarked form	Low conviction	VP- oriented adverb

7.2. Interplay of Three Linguistic Dimensions in the Combination of *Just* and Other EAs in the Matrix Clause

The impact of *just* when combining with other EAs in syntactics, semantics and pragmatics was presented.

7.3. Interplay of Three Linguistic Aspects in Mobility of the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations in a Superordinate Clause

The mobility of the structure in a superordinate clause will lead to changes in semantics and pragmatics.

7.4. Interplay of Three Linguistic Aspects in the Emphasis by Using Auxiliary Verbs *Do* in the Structure I + CNFV and EA Collocations

The emphasis by using *Do* in the structure makes a difference in semantics and pragmatics like in table 7.6

Table 7.6. EAs in the emphasis by using the auxiliary *Do* in the structure *I + CNFV* and EA Collocations

EAs in the emphasis with <i>Do</i>	Strong EAs	Medium EAs	Low EAs
<i>Do</i>	+	–	–

7.5. Interaction of Three Linguistic Aspects in Negative Move of the Structure *I + CNFV* and EA Collocations

Negative move of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* displays their interplay clearly.

7.6. Interplay of Three Linguistic Dimensions in the Structure *I + CNFV* and EA Collocations Based on Deduction

7.7. Summary

The interplay of three linguistic aspects in the structure *I + CNFV* and EA collocations plays an important part in English. Therefore, language users need to master it.

Chapter 8

CONCLUSION

8.1. Recapitulation

In the research, we have attempted to present an overall view on linguistic features of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* in English in three aspects: syntactics, semantics and pragmatics. With 1000 samples in English, some findings of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* were discovered and thanks to the descriptive, quantitative and qualitative approaches, the study

presented syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features and the interplay of three above linguistic aspects.

8.2. Conclusions

From the results of the study, it can come to the conclusion that the study described successfully linguistic features in syntactics, semantics, pragmatics of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations*, especially the interplay of these three aspects. In brief, this study is hoped to help learners of English a lot in mastering the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* and using it in communication and also open the paths for interesting questions relative to epistemic modality in particular, and linguistics in general.

8.3. Implications

8.3.1. For English Language Learning and Teaching

All linguistic features of the structure *I + CNFV and EA collocations* should be mentioned in teaching and learning English as a foreign language so that learners of English can use it effectively.

8.3.2. For Language Research

Hopefully, the study will be a useful reference for next researchers on modality.

8.4. Limitations of the Thesis and Suggestions for Further Studies

8.4.1. Limitations of the Thesis

- It's difficult to get all contexts for such large data (1000 samples)
- We could not carry out a fieldwork to collect authentic samples.

8.4.2. Suggestions for Further Studies

- Cultural features should be mentioned
- The impact of each pattern of the structure on other grammatical factors hasn't been discussed.
- Vietnamese equivalents of the structure should be argued.

THE AUTHOR'S ARTICLES RELATED TO THE STUDY

- [1]. Trần Thị Minh Giang, Ngũ Thiện Hùng (2011), “Sự khác nhau giữa động từ thực hữu và không thực hữu (Trên cú liệu tiếng Anh và đối dịch tiếng Việt)”, *Tạp chí Khoa học và Công nghệ Đại học Đà Nẵng*, số 2(43) năm 2011, tr. 218-225.
- [2] Lưu Quý Khương, Trần Thị Minh Giang (2012), “Nghiên cứu một số đặc trưng ngữ dụng của trạng từ tình thái nhận thức khẳng định và không khẳng định trong tiếng Anh”, *Ngôn ngữ*, số 5(276), tr. 50-56.
- [3] Lưu Quý Khương, Trần Thị Minh Giang (2013), “Đặc trưng của động từ tình thái tri nhận không thực hữu trong tiếng Anh”, *Ngôn ngữ và đời sống*, số 3(209), tr. 20-27.
- [4] Trần Thị Minh Giang, Lưu Quý Khương (2014), “A Study of Some Linguistic Features of the Transferred Negation of Cognitive Non-factive Verbs in English”, *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(3), pp.140-144.
- [5] Trần Thị Minh Giang (2015), “A Study of the Pragmatic Dimension of Epistemic Adverbs on Cognitive Non-Factive Verbs in English”, *The University of Danang- Journal of Science and Technology*, 6(91), pp.140-142.
- [6] Trần Thị Minh Giang (2016), “A Study of Syntactic Features of Cognitive Non-Factive Verb and Epistemic Adverb Collocations in English and Their Vietnamese Equivalents”, *International Journal of Mind, Brain & Cognition*, 7(1-2), pp. 35-58.
- [7] Trần Thị Minh Giang (2017), “Đặc trưng ngữ nghĩa của những kết ngôn giữa động từ tri nhận phi thực hữu và trạng từ nhận thức (trên cú liệu tiếng Anh và đối dịch tiếng Việt)”, *Kỷ yếu hội thảo khoa học quốc gia 2017- Nghiên cứu và giảng dạy ngoại ngữ, ngôn ngữ, quốc tế học tại Việt Nam*, tr. 465-475.