
A Forensic Linguistic Analysis of Modality on Prosecutors' Resolutions

Jerson S. Catoto, PhD, FRIEdr¹

¹ Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, DoroLuman, Arakan, Cotabato, Philippines
Email: jcatoto13@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received:	January	5, 2022
Revised:	February	10, 2022
Accepted:	March	5, 2022
Available Online:	March	30, 2022

Keywords:

Forensic Linguistics, modality, prosecutors' resolutions, Cotabato Province, Philippines

JEL Classification Codes:

O15, O47, R13

ABSTRACT

Prosecutors are individuals assigned to resolve cases filed on courts. Their abilities to make keenly decisions provided a wide spectrum on the world of forensic linguistics. This study aimed at identifying the types of modals used and their functions in the prosecutors' resolutions of different cases. Further, this forensic linguistic analysis determined the frequency of overused and misused modals. Anchored on the premise of Palmer (2001) on the types and functions of modals, this study found that the common speculative modality is -may. Deductive modality included modals such as -shall, -must, -would, -may, and -could. As appeared, modal -could was categorized under the reported modality. Permissives were -can, -cannot, -will, -would, and -must. Modals were used to predict, give the possibility, capability, and permission, necessity, requirement, and prescription. The modal -would appeared 14 times among the prosecutors' resolutions. Implications for legal parlance and educational milieu were presented.



© 2022 The Authors, Published by (TJLSS). This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Common Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0

Corresponding Author: jcatoto13@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Forensic linguistics is an approach that applies the linguistic knowledge to a specific social parlance-the legal forum (Coulthard, 213, Coulthard & Johnson, 2010; Johnson & Coulthard, 2010; Coulthard et al., 2016; Olsson & Luchjenbroers 2013). It constitutes the interfacing between language, crime and law, which includes law enforcement (Cotterill, 2002; Shuy & Roger, 2005; Oxburgh et al., 2015), judicial matters (Gray, 2010; Galyashina, 2016), legislation (Gibbons &

Turell, 2008; Coulthard et al., 2016), disputes or proceedings in law (Tiersma & Solan, 2002; Butters, 2011), and even disputes involving some infraction of the law or some matters which seeks legal solution (Leonard, 2006; Olsson & Luchjenbroers, 2013). Its application may result to some legal action (Kredens & Morris, 2010; Northcott, 2013).

Prosecutors are the ones who are responsible in providing resolutions to cases being filed in courts (Luna & Wade, 2010). They decided based on the evidences presented in the by both parties. Decisions are made to weather the case is dismissed or need to proceed to further hearings in the court. They make it sure that decisions made are not questioned, hence, thorough presentation of the details of the case are their utmost considerations. Consequently, this study is forensic linguistics since it deals with how the modals are used in prosecutors' resolutions.

Different types of modals have been used in the courtroom proceedings. Its grammatical functions played a significant role to the veracity of the testimonies of the witnesses in the witness stand. In its extent, modalities were defined as a category which solidifies the proposition of the speaker based on their statements (Adha, 2020). As posited by Palmer (2001) and Narrog (2009), modality qualify the factual contents of the person's utterances, to oppose the possibility and necessity (Van der Auwera & Plungian, 1998), and it presents the speakers' subjectivity (Halliday, 1970; Lyons, 1977; Palmer, 1986).

The utilization of modals and its functions have been explored in the legal parlance. The study of Ballesteros-Lintao et al. (2016) focused on identifying the incorrect usage of *shall* which resulted to misunderstanding of the contracts reflected on cases filed in Philippine courts. Another, by Zelenka (2013) on the Modality in the Legal Document that the modal *shall* was the overused and misused in the legal documents. Among the frequently used modals, *may* is polysemous which gave an ambiguous meaning (Huisman & Blackshield, 2014). Similarly, some researches traversed on different aspects of forensic linguistics like courtroom questioning (Hale, 1999; Catoto, 2017), authorship identification (Grant, 2008; Nieto et al., 2008), and on online identification (Grant & Macleod, 2016).

The above premise motivated the researcher to conduct this study in the local context. This study is timely and relevant since this will open the doors of opportunities to legal practitioners and even in the academe to become mindful of the usage of the modals in their discourses. Also, it will guide speakers of the English language like the Filipinos to the proper and correct usage of the modals based on the contexts. Thus, this study was conceptualized.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the qualitative employing the content analysis is to identify the types of modals used and their functions in the prosecutors' resolutions of different cases. Further, this forensic linguistic analysis will determine the frequency of overused and misused modals.

Research Questions

1. What are the types of modals used in the Prosecutor's Resolutions?
2. What are the functions of modals used in the Prosecutor's Resolutions?

3. What are the overused modals in the Prosecutor's Resolutions?

Theoretical Lens

I anchored my analysis on the premise of Palmer (2001) on the types and functions of modals. He presented the two categories of modality. The propositional modality which includes the epistemic and evidential. Conversely, epistemic and evidential fall under event modality. In epistemic modality, the speaker verbalizes their judgment about the factuality of the proposition. It may be speculative, deductive, and assumptive. On event modality, the speaker presents evidences for the factuality of the proposition. This includes the reported and sensory evidences. Deontic modality allows the speaker to condition the external factors that are relevant to a specific person may it be permissive, obligative, and commissive. Lastly, dynamic modality expresses internal conditioning factors that have relevancy may it be ablative or volitive. For Palmer (2001), three grammatical categories dominated in the expression of the notional categories. These are affixation of verbs, modal verbs, and particles.

Correspondingly, modality talks about the certainty of the events to happen (Nuyts, 2001). Meanwhile, deontic modality was conceptualized on permission and obligation (Starr, 2016). Conversely, evidentiality is bounded obligatory grammatical evidential system and also considered to be universal since this is true to all languages (Aikhenvald et al., 2004). Propositional modality focuses on the attitude of the speaker relative to the truth value or fact (Palmer, 2001).

Modality was found to be the core in negotiations of civil cases. Epistemic modality *sure* was used to elicit doubt in a testimony. Witnesses utilized modal expressions to lessen the force of opponent's lawyer propositions. Modal expressions are frequently used by witnesses in order to express futurity since lawyers usually asked them with regards to the condition of the plaintiff in the future caused by the injury they have. Thus, lawyers frequently engaged in a hypothetical way of questioning with markings as *If x then y* structure. This type of questioning is used to test the limits of expert opinion which might weaken the claim of the opposing side (Lowndes, 2007). Participants in a trial adopted to use different epistemic stance styles which may be motivated by pragmatic and rhetorical aims based on their role in the case (Mortensen S & Mortensen J, 2017).

Conversely, the functions of modals were anchored on Twaddle (1960). He proposed that modals will and shall are used to predict. On the other hand, modals can, may and dare function to give possibility, present capability of the speaker, and the ability to give permission. Moreover, modals like *need*, *must* and *ought* are used to assess the necessity, requirement, and prescription of the discourse.

Limitation and Delimitation of the Study

The types of modals and their functions were the focus of this study. In addition, this also identified the overused and misused modals in the courtroom proceedings. Types of cases are taken from the archives of the Provincial Prosecutor's Office of the Province of Cotabato. Though the City Prosecutor's Office is situated in the City of Kidapawan, cases in this are excluded in the study.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This qualitative research employing textual analysis aimed to analyze the contents of the discourses presented in the courtroom proceedings of murder cases. In the same manner, it is a process whereby the researcher has to seek for meanings and worldviews in a certain phenomenon (Slevitch, 2011; Steffen & Coyle, 2011; Bogna et al., 2020; Leavy, 2020). Additionally, it is referred to the collection of data and analysis by utilizing the purposive sampling (Bakkalbasioglu, 2020; Campbell et al., 2020; Hennink et al., 2020; Johnson et al., 2020), semi-structure (Kallio et al., 2016, Ralph et al., 2020; Walker et al., 2020), and open-ended interviews (Britten, 1995; Gaber, 2020; Schaefer & Alvesson, 2020; Tavory, 2020). Consequently, this process also involves the use of documents, corpora, pictures, films, and the immediate participation of the informants and participants where they have to share their stories and lived experiences (Gaber, 2020; Mays & Pope, 2020; Po & Hickey, 2020).

Correspondingly, used the content analysis to determine the different types of modals and their functions on Prosecutors' Resolutions. This type of methodology begins with a detailed description of its procedures by presenting different examples and applications (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992; Kyngäs, 2020; Lindgren et al., 2020). Similarly, its goal is for external validity since it focused on human communication (Raaphorst et al., 2020) Moreover, the analysis of the data is done systematically and reliably in order to make vivid generalizations (Oswald, et al., 2011; Hennink et al., 2020).

Content analysis also organized and elicited the meanings from the collected data to make the conclusions realistic (Bengtsson, 2016). The researcher must have to choose between the two structures of analyses-a broad surface (a manifest analysis) (Vaismoradi et al., 2013; Graneheim et al., 2017) or a deep structure (a latent analysis) (Lee & Kim, 2001; Thyme et al., 2013; Neuendorf & Kumar, 2015). There are four main stages in doing the content analysis: the decontextualization (Bergman, 2010; Stepchenkova, 2012) the recontextualization (Bergman, 2010; Wodak & Fairclough, 2010; Jones, 2020) the categorization (Spens & Kovács, 2006; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Neale, 2016) and the compilation (Finney & Corbett, 2007; Jegadeesh & Wu, 2013; Huber, 2020).

This study is qualitative since I used the Prosecutors' Resolutions. Through this I was able to extract different types of modals and eventually drawing the meaning and the usage to give force to the discourses. Lastly, this study gave a wider perspective on the proper usage of modals and their implications in courtroom discourses and eventually will open the doors of opportunities to awaken the great minds to serve justice.

Role of the Researcher

My role as a researcher is important in the following aspects. First, I was the one who wrote a letter asking for the copies of the Prosecutors' Resolutions from the Office of the Provincial Prosecutor. Second, I grouped them according to the types of cases. Third, I assigned codes to the corpora as well as with the names and case numbers to hide the identities of the personalities involved. Fourth, it was also my duty to do the analysis by identifying the types of the modals and

their corresponding functions. Fifth, I sought legal and linguistic advice to a lawyer and those who are experts in the field of applied linguistics to avoid biases. Lastly, I did some readings on Forensic Linguistics and courtroom discourses to give me the panoramic perspectives as a researcher.

Research Materials

In this study, I used 30 Prosecutor's Resolutions as the corpora of my study. These were taken from the files of the Office of the Provincial Prosecutor. There were varied cases included in this study since the court did not provide the researcher with specific cases. This is also in consideration that the court was busy in this time of the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Data Collection

This study underwent the following processes. First, I consulted a gatekeeper who is an Assistant Provincial Prosecutor of the Cotabato Provincial Prosecution Office. Then, I wrote a letter addressed to the Provincial Prosecutor for the utilization of the Prosecutor's Resolutions taken from the archives. I immediately did the tagging of the corpora by assigning codes which guided me all throughout the course of the analysis. Second, I also assigned pseudonyms and codes to name of persons involved in the study to uphold the ethical standards.

The categorization of the cases followed. In the same vein, during the course of the analysis, I asked the help of a lawyer especially on the legal terms. As such, this gave me the profound understanding of the terms that are beyond my cognizance. After the analysis, this paper underwent peer-debriefing from the field of law and linguistics.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed based on the research questions. I employ frequency to determine the number of occurrences of these modals in the Prosecutor's Resolutions. The modals were categorized based on their types and functions.

Trustworthiness

The assessment on the truthfulness in a qualitative study was anchored on the concept of Lincoln and Guba (1985) that includes credibility, confirmability, transferability, and dependability. These are contexts of the rigor in qualitative research which will manifest the strength of the research design and the appropriateness of the methods used to answer the problem (Milne & Oberle, 2005; Morse, 2015; Grodal et al., 2020; Hamilton, 2020; Johnson et al., 2020).

Credibility was addressed in this study for the confirmation of internal validity. This is essential in qualitative research to attain the truthfulness (Elfenbein & Schwarze, 2020; Nyirenda et al., 2020). Hence, I ensured that all the data are true since these were taken from the Provincial Prosecution Office of the Province of Cotabato. In terms of the analysis, I anchored it based on the theoretical lens of the study. Peer debriefing was employed through the help of the experts in the language of law and in linguistics to validate whether the analysis was properly done (Benoot et al., 2020; Hamilton, 2020; Norris et al., 2020; Rose & Johnson, 2020; Sweeney et al., 2020). To

further enhance this, I also did some readings on the Forensic Linguistics and books relative to law.

In terms of confirmability, I made it sure that the findings were not based on my viewpoints but were grounded on the contents of the corpora (Cutcliffe & McKenna, 2004; Korstjen & Moser, 2018). I did not make my own interpretations that were beyond the contexts of the previous researches. The audit trail was presented which enabled the auditor to confirm the transparency of the path of the research (Bowen, 2009; Backes et al., 2020; Rose & Johnson, 2020). More so, confirmability aims to allow the present study to confirm or to negate previous researches.

On the aspect of transferability, it is defined as type of external validity in which the findings of the study can be applied or used to theory, practice, and future researches. This allowed the transfer of the findings to other contexts to show its relevancy to other contexts (Kuper et al., 2008; Curtin & Fossey, 2007; Johnson et al., 2020). In addition, this can be used to predict findings especially when this will be applied in a wider scope (Malterud, 2001; Amin et al., 2020; Kaae & Traulsen, 2020)

To assert the essence of dependability, I presented the transparency through thick description of the process taken from the formulation of the study up to the presentation of the significant findings (Guest et al., 2012; Villarejo-Rodriguez & Rodriguez-Martin, 2020; Zhu et al., 2020). These were kept thoroughly to check the consistency whether the processes in analyzing the data are based on the contexts of the problem and the bodies of knowledge presented by the experts in the field of Forensic Linguistics.

Ethical Consideration

This study adhered to the following ethical principles of confidentiality, deception, affiliation, honesty and transparency, and misrepresentation (Bell & Bryman, 2007). The confidentiality requires the researcher to protect the anonymity of individuals or organizations (Sweeney, 2002; Doody & Noonan, 2016; Alderson & Morrow, 2020). Hence, it is my sole duty to change the names of persons involved in each case into alias or codes to hide their identities (Barnes & Wittingham, 2020; Chalfen, 2020; Dym & Fiesler, 2020; Gachago & Livingston, 2020; Jones, 2020). Also, I removed the docket number of each case to avoid being traced. Meanwhile, to avoid deception, I see to it that the process in the conduct of the study was strictly followed (Fisher & Anushko, 2008). Conversely, I declared my professional and personal affiliations and remove my personal interests (Bell & Bryman, 2007; Harriss et al., 2019). In terms of honesty and transparency, the audit trail was presented to show to the members of the panel the sources of the data information presented in the paper (Gelman, 2017; Chase et al., 2020). Lastly, I ensured that everything in the paper would not cause misleading, misunderstanding, or reporting of erroneous research findings (Alston & Bowles, 2020; Leavy, 2020; Mays & Pope, 2020).

RESULTS

The results of the analysis of the data were guided by the research questions and anchored on a lens by Palmer (1976) on the typology of modals and by Twaddell (1960) on the functions of modals.

Types of Modals used in Prosecutors’ Resolutions

There are two main types of modals as proposed by Palmer (2001). In which, these are divided into different categories. These modals were found the Prosecutors’ Resolutions.

A. Propositional Modality

Propositional modality is categorized into two: the epistemic and evidential. Each category has also categorized each of the modals based on its usage in the written discourse.

1. Epistemic Modality

This type of modality encompasses knowledge, belief, or credence in a proposition. Usually, it is exemplified by modals such as may, might, and must. Cross-linguistically, some modals are part of it depending on its syntactic features.

1.1 Speculative Modality

Table 1 presents the first type of propositional modality under the epistemic modality. Speculative modal –*may* here presents uncertainty based on the presented evidences in the court.

Table 1. *Speculative Modality found in Prosecutors’ Resolutions*

Modals	Examples	Sources
may	In the mind of the undersigned, he <i>may</i> have seen them but he did not know them by names.	PR11
	Privileged communication <i>may</i> be either absolutely privileged or conditionally privileged.	PR14
	There are many Sarge in North Cotabato, which <i>may</i> refer to a policeman, soldier or even a plain nickname.	PR19

1.2 Deductive Modality

The analysis of the corpora shows that there are varied modals under this type of modality as shown in table 2. This type of modality expresses that the prosecutors express their inferences based on facts of the case as presented by the opposing parties. These include modals such as – *shall*, –*must*, –*would*, –*may*, and –*could*.

Table 2. Deductive Modality found in Prosecutors' Resolutions

Modals	Examples	Sources
shall	<p>The failure of the drawer of the check to deposit the amount necessary to cover his check within three (3) days from the receipt of notice from the bank and/or the payee of holder that said check has been dishonored for lack of insufficiency of funds shall be prima facie evidence of deceit constituting false pretense of fraudulent act (As amended by R.A. No. 4885, June 17, 1967)</p>	PR1
must	<p>For it to be lawful the arresting officer must have personal knowledge of such commission and it must precede the arrest.</p> <p>After careful evaluation of the evidence submitted for investigation, undersigned investigating prosecutor finds that PROBABLE CAUSE DOES NOT EXISTS for the commission of the acts complained. It is worthy to note that conspiracy, being alleged, must be proven not just by mere allegation such as naming all of the respondents, but with independent evidence showing that conspiracy indeed existed.</p>	PR3
	<p>Record of the case <i>would</i> show that complainant is a retired PNP police officer.</p>	PR30
	<p>Since the qualifiedly privileged communications are the exceptions to the general rule, these require proof of actual malice in order that a defamatory imputation <i>may</i> be held actionable (Yuchengco v. The Manila Chronicle Publishing Corp.).</p> <p>Respondent has a right to due process in a preliminary investigation. Right to due process entails the right to be informed of the offense filed against them, so that they <i>may</i> be able to properly defend themselves.</p>	
would		PR21

<p>may</p>	<p>However, the crimes for which he <i>could</i> be held liable have already prescribed.</p>	<p>PR14</p>
<p>could</p>	<p>The TRA contemplated by law where one <i>could</i> be held criminally liable for estafa under the RPC affect situations wherein entruster, who own or holds absolute title or security interests over specified goods. Documents or instruments, releases the subject goods to the possession of the trustee.</p>	<p>PR17</p> <p>PR16</p> <p>PR21</p>

2. Evidential

This type of propositional modality connotes that the discourse is based on personal knowledge of the speaker based on the occurrence of the events (McLendon, 2003).

2.1 Reported Modality

As shown in table 3 there is only one reported modality found in prosecutors’ resolutions. This is the use of the modal –*could*.

Table 3. Reported Modality found in Prosecutors' Resolutions

Modals	Examples	Source
could	It allegedly threatens her reputation within the BJMP because respondent made it appear that she <i>could</i> not be trusted with money.	PR20

3. Event Modality

This type of modality has two categories. These are the deontic and dynamic. The latter is excluded in the study since its contexts are the ability and expressions of willingness in the discourses.

3.1 Deontic Modality

Essentially, this modality provides the performative acts of the discourses. Usually, it provides permission, obligation, a promise, or a threat.

3.1.1 Permissives Modality

Under the category of deontic modality, there is only one type of modal that was identified. Permissive modality presents the discourses of the prosecutors who command, request, and required the person involved in cases to act in accordance to the mandate of the law. Modal such as *-can*, *-will*, *-may*, *-would*, and the negated structure (*-cannot*).

Table 4. Permissives Modality found in Prosecutors' Resolutions

Modals	Examples	Sources
can	Once it is registered, the owner can rest assured without having to wait for the doors of the court, to avoid losing his land.	PR2
	After all, entering into a romantic relationship with a man is utmost a choice. Women can very well choose whom to romantically involve themselves with.	PR9
	Sadly, in this case there can be no point of reference to convince the undersigned that respondent contributed to the commission of the incident.	

cannot	<p>The confession of the accused to another person as to a crime he committed cannot be considered as evidence for it was not made in the presence of counsel.</p> <p>Hence, the undersigned will resolve based on the uncontroverted allegations and evidence at hand. (PR4)</p> <p>The incidents on February 26, 2020 and February 28, 2020 are DISMISSED since there is no eyewitness to the incidents who will identify the respondents as the culprits.</p>	PR15
will	<p>It would make a mockery of the whole proceedings underwent before the DENR concerned would have the effect of invalidating the title issued by it had been prosecuted successfully.</p> <p>Otherwise, women would just file Violation of R.A. 9262 cases to compel men to marry them.</p>	PR18
would	<p>A preliminary investigation is in effect a realistic judicial appraisal of the merits of the case; sufficient proof of the guilt of the criminal respondent must be adduced so that when the case is tried, the trial court may not be bound, as a matter of law, to order an acquittal.</p>	PR4 PR24 PR2

must		PR9 PR10
------	--	-----------------

Functions of Modals

This part of the study is anchored on the two-dimensional matrix as proposed by Twaddell (1960) with three terms in each dimension. The functions of the modals are categorized into three. To predict, to show possibility, present capability, and to give permission. Another is the provide the necessity, to prescribe, and to require.

Predict

This category usually uses the modals *–will* and *–shall* and its past tense counterpart. The following extracts show the function of the modals in each sentence.

*“It is at this point in which the presence of the three witnesses is most needed, as it is their presence at the time of seizure and confiscation that **would** belie any doubt as to the source, identity, and integrity of the seized drug. If the buy bust operation is legitimately conducted, the presence of the insulating witnesses **would** also be controverting the usual defense of frame-up as the witnesses **would** be able to testify that the buy-bust operation and inventory of the seized drugs were done in the presence in accordance with Section 21 of RA 9165. (PR12)”.*

Another example shows the function of modal *–will*:

*“For whatever it is, in the prosecution and filing of cases, it is always important to provide every detail which **will** aid in the investigation of the case. (PR6)”.*

Meanwhile, the modal *–shall* is used in the extract below:

*“The failure of the drawer of the check to deposit the amount necessary to cover his check within three (3) days from the receipt of notice from the bank and/or the payee of holder that said check has been dishonored for lack of insufficiency of funds **shall** be prima facie evidence of deceit constituting false pretense of fraudulent act (As amended by R.A. No. 4885, June 17, 1967) (PR1)”.*

Possibility, Capability, and Permission

Modals such as –can, -may, the negation, and its past tense counterpart are included in this category. The extracts from the resolutions show the function of each of the modals that illuminates both parties on the decisions being made by the prosecutors:

*“After all, entering into a romantic relationship with a man is utmost a choice. Women **can** very well choose whom to romantically involve themselves with. (PR9)*

*Hence, if we file this case in Court, we **cannot** prove with certainty that the respondent was referring to the herein complainant. (PR19)*

*In the mind of the undersigned, he **may** have seen them but he did not know them by names. (PR11)”.*

Necessity, Requirement, and Prescription

The discourse of the speakers contains modals such as need, must, and out. The necessity of discourses is found on the following extracts with the modal –*must*.

*“For it to be lawful the arresting officer **must** have personal knowledge of such commission and it must precede the arrest. (PR3)*

*Although this Office sympathize with the loss the complainant and her family suffer, its however worthy to note that conspiracy, being alleged, **must** be proven not just by mere allegation such as naming all of the respondents, but with independent evidence showing that conspiracy indeed existed. (PR10)*

*After careful evaluation of the evidence submitted for investigation, undersigned investigating prosecutor finds that **PROBABLE CAUSE DOES NOT EXISTS** for the commission of the acts complained. It is worthy to note that conspiracy, being alleged, **must** be proven not just by mere allegation such as naming all of the respondents, but with independent evidence showing that conspiracy indeed existed. (PR30)”.*

Overused Modals

Table 2 provides information on the overused modals transpired in the resolutions. It can be gleaned that modal –*would* appeared 14 times. This is followed by the modals –*must*, and –*may*. Each of which appeared in the corpora for 13 times. The negated –*can* with 11, 7 each for –*should* and –*will*, 5 –*could* and 3 –*shall* and –*can*.

Table 2. Overused Modals

Types of Modals	Frequency of Occurrence	Percentage	Sources

shall	3	3.95	PR1, PR1, PR29
should	7	9.21	PR4, PR10, PR24, PR24, PR25, PR27, PR30
can	3	3.95	PR2, PR9, PR15
can (negated)	11	14.47	PR1, PR6, PR17, PR18, PR19, PR24, PR25, PR25, PR27, PR28, PR30
could	5	6.58	PR12, PR16, PR20 PR21, PR21
will	7	9.21	PR4, PR6, PR9, PR20, PR24, PR29, PR30
would	14	18.42	PR1, PR2, PR2, PR2, PR9, PR9, PR10, PR11, PR12, PR21, PR21, PR22, PR26, PR27,
must	13	17.11	PR3, PR10, PR10, PR11, PR12, PR17, PR20, PR20, PR20, PR20, PR20, PR25, PR30
may			PR4, PR9, PR9, PR10, PR11, PR14, PR14, PR14, PR17, PR19, PR25, PR29, PR30

	13	17.11	
Total	76	100.00	

DISCUSSIONS

This includes the discussions of the findings of the study, the implications for practice, and implications for future research.

Types of Modals used in Prosecutors' Resolutions

Propositional Modality

Epistemic Modality

Speculative Modality. This type of modality is expressed based on its contexts in the resolutions. In PR 11, the modal *-may* used to present uncertainty and speculation with regards to the identity of the suspects. However, the prosecutor based on the evidence president did not find any probable to pursue the case in which led to the dismissal of the case being filed against them. The statement of the witness is just a mere speculation and no basis to put the suspects with regards to the case filed.

Also, in PR 14 a speculation can be attributed to the discourse of the prosecutor. As shown in the extract it can be inferred that there is no certainty with regards to the privileged communication because it could either be absolute or condition. In the same vein, another speculative modality is found in PR19 when the prosecutor decided about the identity of a certain individual who is named as "Sarge." In fact, there are many persons in the province which have the same name, thus the charge filed was a mere speculation and no truth value which resulted to the dismissal of the case.

As Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (2008) affirmed, the use of the modal *-can* expresses a level of uncertainty. It is used to present that meaning can vary in the degree of speaker's confidence about the statement being true (Huddleston, 2002). Modal *may* signal the decreasing probability. It is used rarely in the permission sense.

Deductive Modality. The use of the modal here is based on the underlying data/evidences/sources which led the prosecutors to make their decisions. In PR1, *-shall* is used in reference to the RA 4885 of June 17, 1967. The decision made was anchored in this law. Conversely, *-must* is used in reference in PR3 to the lawful actions that the arresting officer has especially the knowledge on the committing of the crime. In PR30, the prosecutor in their decision used the same modal to justify the business of the court which is the presentation of the evidences. Failure to present reliable witnesses leads to the dismissal of the case.

More so, in PR21 the record showed that the complainant was a retired police office. The modal *-would* was used to determine the information based on the record presented to the court. In PR14, modal *-may* was used by the prosecutor to refer to the previous case presented in the Philippine court which is the Yuchengco versus The Manila Chronicle Publishing Corp. This is

also true in PR17 wherein the law provided that the respondent of the case is protected. Hence, due process allowed him to enjoy his rights and privileges as a citizen of this country to defend himself. Lastly, *–could* in PR16, and PR21 is not only used as a past form of *–will* but was used by the prosecutor to interpret their decisions based on the previous information and documents as mandated by law.

This type of modality I expressed based on the inferential statements which have concerned on the certainty of judgment. More so, it indicates the truthfulness of the statements as deduced from other information. Initially, it is used with the *–must* modal (Palmer, 2001).

Evidential

Reported Modality. This type of modality falls under the evidential. It examines the reported details of events based on the evidences provided by the respondents in the court. Here the modal *–could* is used by the prosecutor to indicate that the respondent is person who cannot be trusted in terms of money because of her inability to pay as a borrower. Furthermore, it implies that the modal is used to report the presented evidences in the resolution.

This type of modal is usually used for the reported or indirect quotation. Here, the modal is changed from its present form to the past form to show that the statement is quoted from the original speaker (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 2008). On the other hand, Plungian (2001) argues that the evidential value is always inherently present in the epistemic meaning: “while an evidential supplement can always be seen in an epistemic marker, the opposite does not always hold: not all evidential markers are modal in that they do not all necessarily imply an epistemic judgment”. Interestingly, such a view implies that the evidential dimension does not necessarily overrule the epistemic modal qualification.

Event

Deontic Modality

Permissive Modality pertains to the usage of the modals based on the giving of permission or order by the person in authority. The modal *–can* in PR2 suggested that the once the parcel of land is already registered on the name of the owner even the court could do otherwise but to respect his claim. Another, on PR9 implied that it is a reality that women regardless of their socio-economic backgrounds have their own choice with regards to men of their choice. In fact, the law suggested and that it is a universal rule that love cannot be taught it is felt and thus being respected by the law. This is also true in PR15 where in the modal is used by the prosecutor in making decisions to actions allegedly committed by the suspect but could not find probable cause to put him into trial.

Its negated counterpart *–cannot* explains in PR8 that the confession of the of the accused to the supposed crime that he committed is not a sufficient ground for him to be found guilty. The modal *–will* in PR4 and PR24 manifest that the prosecutor resolved the case based on the evidences presented before them. In fact, the presence of the witnesses as stated by law is the basis in the finding of the probable cause. However, the absence led the prosecutor to dismiss the case. Meanwhile, its past form *–would* entwines that the previous decisions made by the concerned

agency would be an insult if this would be invalidated. Another, the violation of the law in PR9 would oblige men to marry women as what it mandates. Lastly, the modal –*must* showed a strong effect on the assessment of the case based on the preliminary investigation that evidences president must be quoted and used to the criminal respondent when the case was still in trial.

Santos (2004) found that the modal auxiliaries 'Can' and 'Could' were used as a softening device and/or as an indirect request. Both modals pervaded during the direct examination, whereas the nominals of address were used in almost the same number of times by both the prosecution and the defense lawyers. Gairdner's (1992) uses of modalities of permission include examples of *may*, *may not*, *can*, *cannot*, and *could not*. Most of these involve statements about what the law does or does not permit.

Functions of Modals

Indeed, modals played a significant role in the discourse. Each of the modals present the underlying legal aspects in words and in the whole syntactic structures.

Predict. In PR12, the prosecutor used the –*would* modal to make a prediction based on the evidences presented in the court. This is not just a mere understanding but based on the premise of the law. As stated in the extract, the prosecutor cited the section of the Republic Act. Consequently, the modal –*will* is used to assume that everything that is provided in the court especially that this is substantial enough would be of great help to the dismissal or finding a probable cause. In PR1, the use of –*shall* is evidently used based on the language of the law as cited by the prosecutor. Since it is unethical for the court to make an immediate decision without the due process as well as the filing of sufficient evidences with the presence of reliable witnesses, hence this modal is utilized.

Lewis (1986) convinced that even if most *will* examples refer to future time, not all of them do, offering counterexamples of general truth or likelihood/certainty. Further, he explains that time is an element of human experience of reality while tense is a purely grammatical idea and it is a mistake to introduce *will/shall* as the future in English. Instead, he offers the concept of logical inevitability which correlates with other sources (Eastwood, 1999), ranging from prediction to objective facts.

Possibility, Capability, and Permission. This assumed that the speaker presents the possibilities, capacity to do the action, and give permission. As the extract shows in PR9, the modal –*can* allowed the capability women to choose the person whom they are going to love and be with them. In fact, women here are pictured as someone who have the sagacity not to be coerced and influenced by the decisions that they are going to make. As human as they are, they need to be rationale enough in choosing their partners. On the contrary, PR19 shows that modal –*may* leads the the decision of the prosecutor on behalf of the court that it cannot proceed with the case unless evidences would be filed against the respondent. The ability of the prosecutor presumes that the witness did not have the ability to name the culprit, thus it resulted to the dismissal of the case.

In virtue of this function, the speaker involves himself into a certain condition, expressing his own attitudes, and meanwhile, trying to affect others' opinions and behaviors. With the authentic transcripts of judicial cases as the data, this study adopts both quantitative and qualitative

research methods to analyze the modal verbs used in Chinese criminal courtroom discourse from the perspective of its prosodic features. It has been found out that, in criminal courtroom discourse, the distribution of modal verbs indicates the discourse center in the trial, value shows the asymmetry in power among different participants, and their goal-oriented prosodic features, namely, extension in length and stress in pitch and intensity, highlighting their important roles in the realization of interpersonal function (Zejun et al., 2017).

Necessity, Requirement, and Prescription. The modal –*must* explains that there is necessity in the discourse of the resolutions. In PR3, the prosecutor verbalized that it is *must* for the arresting officer to have the knowledge of the crime being committed and *must* know when to arrest the suspect. In addition, it provided that the police officer’s background on the legal aspect is necessary to avoid any detrimental actions that could sometimes put them in the perilous situations.

The court in *PR10* affirmed the necessity and thus required the complainant to provide sufficient evidences and not just mere allegations. In the same manner, the court stated that having the reliable witnesses could lead to the solving of the case. Lastly, PR30 articulated that probable cause does not exist because of the lack of the evidences provided. Hence the case was dismissed.

Coates (1983) presents a different interpretation of *should* and *ought*, however, based on her study of two large corpora. Specifically, she argues that *ought* is somewhat weaker than *should* on a continuum from offering advice through conveying moral obligation, to conveying obligation typically communicated by *must*. Obligation is most often signaled by *must*, but Gairdner (1992) also employed the quasi-modal *have to* to signal obligation.

Overused Modals

The result indicated that among the modals transpired in the Prosecutors’ Resolutions, the *would* modal appeared to have been used more in the corpora. This implies that this is not only shows its used to report the occurrences of the events but to integrate the language is more in a formal manner. This further shows that the court as a respected institution of the land carefully uses words which is integral in the decisions made.

This is in congruency Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (2008) that the past form of modal will is more polite and less presumptuous than the historical present forms, and thus the person making the request will often use historical past tense to “soften” the request. More so, it contradicts the findings of Zelenka (2016) that the modal *shall* was the overused and misused in the legal documents.

Implications for Practice

My interest with the language of the law opened this greater opportunity for me to explore the wonders of language in different perspectives. To study Forensic Linguistics as one of the disciplines of Linguistics is such an enormous and gargantuan task to fulfill. As a teacher and a researcher, it is deemed necessary first for teachers to have the profound knowledge of modals in which in the simplest form called as an auxiliary verb. These are the types of verbs which have significant roles to play in the construction of sentences and also by allowing people to have the full understanding of the discourse.

Basically, modals are being taught to express the tense of the verb, the possibility of the actions, as well as the certainties. By looking into the results of the study, one cannot easily grasp the purport of the identification as proposed by Palmer (2001) where the study is anchored. It is being studied, recorded, and presented based on the findings of the researches of linguists especially in the field of Syntax. Hence, it is necessary for teachers to determine the types of modals and integrate them into teaching.

Having the immense background on modals one can be satisfying since this body of knowledge will not only be utilized by students, teachers, but also lawyers and those in the legal parlance. Indeed, modals are not just words being utilized in the Prosecutor's Resolutions but these have deeper meaning of expression which give the vivid picture of the details to why the case is dismissed and if they found any probable cause to bring the case in the courtroom proceedings.

Lastly, lawyers are great individuals since they knew how to play with words. The choice of words in the resolutions are well-studied and these put together in order to come up with better decisions. The fact that prosecutors are well-rounded persons, still they are able to present the story of the case clear and are beyond questions.

Implications for Future Research

Undeniably, this paper has its limitations. Hence, future researchers can still find another lens where the study will be anchored. Consequently, it is suggested that a Corpus Linguistics Analysis will be utilized as an approach in the identification of words in the corpora. This can be conducted using the quantitative method whereby the researcher has to make an authorial analysis based on the choice of words that are unique to each of the prosecutors. As such, an additional number of corpora is deemed necessary.

In the same vein, the identification should not only be limited to the types of modals but also to the different lexical categories and their functions in the sentence. Also, if possible after the end of the COVID-19 Pandemic future researchers could sit in the courtroom to record the courtroom discourses. Through this, they will be able to see the modalities in the court and therefore can find studies that would bring the wonders of language in the greater heights.

Henceforth, this study also implies for future researchers to empower themselves to explore the possibilities by using the same corpora –the prosecutors' resolutions. They can look into the structures by utilizing the moves of Swales and Bhatia. Having this, researchers will be guided well with the contents and sequence of writing that prosecutors follow.

REFERENCES

- Adha, A. (2020). Linguistic Based Cues in Detecting Deception in Indonesian Language Use. *Argumentum*, 16, 14-30.
- Aikhenvald, A. I., Aikhenval'd, A. I. E., Aïkhenval'd, A. I., Aikhenvald, A. Y., & Ajherval'd, A. J. E. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press.
- Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2020). *The ethics of research with children and young people: A practical handbook*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- Alston, M., & Bowles, W. (2020). *Research for social workers: An introduction to methods*. Routledge.
- Amin, M. E. K., Nørgaard, L. S., Cavaco, A. M., Witry, M. J., Hillman, L., Cernasev, A., & Desselle, S. P. (2020). Establishing trustworthiness and authenticity in qualitative pharmacy research. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*.
- Backes, B. L., Fedina, L., & Holmes, J. L. (2020). The criminal justice system response to intimate partner stalking: A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative research. *Journal of Family Violence*, 35(7), 665-678.
- Bakkalbasioglu, E. (2020). How to Access Elites When Textbook Methods Fail: Challenges of Purposive Sampling and Advantages of Using Interviewees as "Fixers". *The Qualitative Report*, 25(3), 688-699.
- Ballesteros-Lintao, R., Arriero, M. R. P., Claustro, J. M. A. S., Dichoso, K. I. U., Leynes, S. A. S., Aranda, M. R. R., & Reintegrado-Celino, J. (2016). Deontic meanings in Philippine contracts. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, 1(2), 421-454.
- Barnes, S., & Whittingham, K. (2020). Informal carers' experiences of caring for a person with heart failure in a community setting. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 28(3), 883-890.
- Bell, E., & Bryman, A. (2007). The ethics of management research: an exploratory content analysis. *British journal of management*, 18(1), 63-77.
- Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8-14.
- Benoot, C., Enzlin, P., Peremans, L., & Bilsen, J. (2020). A Qualitative Study About How Nurses in Belgium Offer Relationship Support to Couples in Palliative Care. *Journal of Family Nursing*, 26(1), 38-51.
- Bergman, M. M. (2010). Hermeneutic content analysis: Textual and audiovisual analyses within a mixed methods framework. *SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research (2nd ed., pp. 379-396)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Bogna, F., Raineri, A., & Dell, G. (2020). Critical realism and constructivism: merging research paradigms for a deeper qualitative study. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Supporting a grounded theory with an audit trail: An illustration. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 12(4), 305-316.
- Britten, N. (1995). Qualitative research: qualitative interviews in medical

- research. *Bmj*, 311(6999), 251-253.
- Butters, R. R. (2011). Forensic linguistics. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 39(2), 196-202.
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Baywater, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 1744987120927206.
- Catoto, J. (2017). On courtroom questioning: A forensic linguistic analysis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 22(11), 65-97.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2008). *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course* (2nd ed). Thomson.
- Chalfen, R. (2020). Methodological variation in participant visual media production. *The Sage handbook of visual research methods*, 241-253.
- Chase, E., Otto, L., Belloni, M., Lems, A., & Wernesjö, U. (2020). Methodological innovations, reflections and dilemmas: The hidden sides of research with migrant young people classified as unaccompanied minors. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(2), 457-473.
- Coates, J. (1983). *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*. Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. (2013). On the use of corpora in the analysis of forensic texts. *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 1(1), 27-43.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). *The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics*. Routledge.
- Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2016). *An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence*. Routledge.
- Cotterill, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Language in the legal process*. Springer.
- Curtin, M., & Fossey, E. (2007). Appraising the trustworthiness of qualitative studies: Guidelines for occupational therapists. *Australian occupational therapy journal*, 54(2), 88-94.
- Cutcliffe, J. R., & McKenna, H. P. (2004). Expert qualitative researchers and the use of audit trails. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 45(2), 126-133.
- Doody, O., & Noonan, M. (2016). Nursing research ethics, guidance and application in practice. *British Journal of Nursing*, 25(14), 803-807.
- Downe-Wamboldt, B. (1992). Content analysis: method, applications, and issues. *Health care for women international*, 13(3), 313-321.
- Dym, B., & Fiesler, C. (2020). Ethical and privacy considerations for research using online fandom data. *Transformative Works and Cultures*, 33.
- Eastwood, J. (1999). *Practice Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
- Elfenbein, D. M., & Schwarze, M. L. (2020). Qualitative Research Methods. In *Health Services Research* (pp. 249-260). Springer, Cham.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of*

- advanced nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Finney, S., & Corbett, M. (2007). ERP implementation: a compilation and analysis of critical success factors. *Business process management journal*.
- Fisher, C. B., & Anushko, A. E. (2008). Research ethics in social science. *The SAGE handbook of social research methods*, 95-109.
- Gaber, J. (2020). *Qualitative analysis for planning & policy: Beyond the numbers*. Routledge.
- Gairdner, W. D. (1992). *The War Against the Family*. Toronto: Stoddart.
- Lewis, D. (1986). Counterfactual Dependence and Time's Arrow', in (Lewis [1986a]).
- Galyashina, E. I. (2016). Forensic linguistics in legal proceedings. *Lex Russica*, (9 (118)).
- Gelman, A. (2017). Ethics and statistics: Honesty and transparency are not enough. *Chance*, 30(1), 37-39.
- Gibbons, J., & Turell, M. T. (Eds.). (2008). *Dimensions of forensic linguistics* (Vol. 5). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Graneheim, U. H., Lindgren, B. M., & Lundman, B. (2017). Methodological challenges in qualitative content analysis: A discussion paper. *Nurse education today*, 56, 29-34.
- Grant, T. (2008). Approaching questions in forensic authorship analysis. *Dimensions of forensic linguistics*, 5, 215.
- Grant, T., & Macleod, N. (2016). Assuming identities online: Experimental linguistics applied to the policing of online paedophile activity. *Applied linguistics*, 37(1), 50-70.
- Gray, P. R. (2010). The future for forensic linguists in the courtroom Cross-cultural communication. In *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics* (pp. 619-629). Routledge.
- Grodal, S., Anteby, M., & Holm, A. L. (2020). Achieving Rigor in Qualitative Analysis: The Role of Active Categorization in Theory Building. *Academy of Management Review*, (ja).
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). Validity and reliability (credibility and dependability) in qualitative research and data analysis. *Applied thematic analysis*. London: Sage Publications, 79-106.
- Hale, S. (1999). Interpreters' treatment of discourse markers in courtroom questions. *Forensic Linguistics*, 6, 57-82.
- Halliday, M. A. (1970). Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of language*, 322-361.
- Hamilton, J. B. (2020). Rigor in qualitative methods: An evaluation of strategies among underrepresented rural communities. *Qualitative Health Research*, 30(2), 196-204.
- Harriss, D. J., MacSween, A., & Atkinson, G. (2019). Ethical standards in sport and exercise science research: 2020 update. *Int J Sports Med*, 40, 813-817.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. SAGE

- Publications Limited.
- Huber, M. (2020). Video-based content analysis. *Analyzing Group Interactions: A Guidebook for Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods*.
- Huisman, R., & Blackshield, T. (2014). Tenor in Judicial Reasoning: Modality in majority and dissenting judgments in the High Court of Australia. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 9(3), 229-248.
- Jegadeesh, N., & Wu, D. (2013). Word power: A new approach for content analysis. *Journal of financial economics*, 110(3), 712-729.
- Jones, C. (2020). Is person-centred counselling effective when assisting young people who have experienced bullying in schools?. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*.
- Johnson, J. L., Adkins, D., & Chauvin, S. (2020). A review of the quality indicators of rigor in qualitative research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 84(1).
- Kaae, S., & Traulsen, J. M. (2020). Qualitative methods in pharmacy practice research. In *Pharmacy Practice Research Methods* (pp. 31-54). Springer, Singapore.
- Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 72(12), 2954-2965.
- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 120-124.
- Kredens, K., & Morris, R. (2010). Interpreting outside the courtroom*‘A shattered mirror?’ Interpreting in legal contexts outside the courtroom. In *The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics* (pp. 483-498). Routledge.
- Kuper, A., Lingard, L., & Levinson, W. (2008). Critically appraising qualitative research. *Bmj*, 337
- Kyngäs, H. (2020). Qualitative Research and Content Analysis. In *The Application of Content Analysis in Nursing Science Research* (pp. 3-11). Springer, Cham.
- Leavy, P. (2020). introduction to the oxford handbook of qualitative research. *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 1.
- Lee, J. H., & Kim, Y. G. (2001). A stage model of organizational knowledge management: a latent content analysis. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 20(4), 299-311.
- Leonard, R. A. (2006). Forensic Linguistics: Applying the Scientific Principles of Language Analysis to Issues of the Law. *International Journal of the Humanities*, 3(7).
- Lewis, D. K. (1986). *On the plurality of worlds* (Vol. 322). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lindgren, B. M., Lundman, B., & Graneheim, U. H. (2020). Abstraction and interpretation during the qualitative content analysis process. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 103632.
- Lowndes, S. (2007). Barristers on trial: Comprehension and misapprehension in courtroom discourse. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 14(2), 305-308.
- Luna, E., & Wade, M. (2010). Prosecutors as judges. *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.*, 67, 1413.

- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics II*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Malterud, K. (2001). Qualitative research: standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The Lancet*, 358(9280), 483-488.
- Mays, N., & Pope, C. (2020). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative research in Health Care*, 211-233.
- Milne, J., & Oberle, K. (2005). Enhancing rigor in qualitative description. *Journal of Wound Ostomy & Continence Nursing*, 32(6), 413-420.
- Morse, J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research*, 25(9), 1212-1222.
- Mortensen, S. S., & Mortensen, J. (2017). Epistemic stance in courtroom interaction. In *Pragmatics and Law* (pp. 401-437). Springer, Cham.
- Narrog, H. (2009). *Modality in Japanese: The layered structure of the clause and hierarchies of functional categories* (Vol. 109). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Neale, J. (2016). Iterative categorization (IC): a systematic technique for analyzing qualitative data. *Addiction*, 111(6), 1096-1106.
- Neuendorf, K. A., & Kumar, A. (2015). Content analysis. *The international encyclopedia of political communication*, 1-10.
- Nieto, V. G., Sierra, C. V., Juan, M. P., Barco, P. M., & Cueto, A. S. (2008). Exploring state-of-the-art software for forensic authorship identification. *International Journal of English Studies*, 8(1), 1-28.
- Northcott, J. (2013). 11 Legal English. *The handbook of English for specific purposes*, 213.
- Nuyts, J. (2001). Epistemic modality. *Language and Conceptualization*.
- Nyirenda, L., Kumar, M. B., Theobald, S., Sarker, M., Simwinga, M., Kumwenda, M., Johnson, C., Hatzold, K., Corbett, E.L., Sibanda, E., & Taegtmeier, M. (2020). Using research networks to generate trustworthy qualitative public health research findings from multiple contexts. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 20(1), 13.
- Olsson, J., & Luchjenbroers, J. (2013). *Forensic linguistics*. A&C Black.
- Oswald, A. E., Wiseman, J., Bell, M. J., & Snell, L. (2011). Musculoskeletal examination teaching by patients versus physicians: how are they different? Neither better nor worse, but complementary. *Medical Teacher*, 33(5), e227-e235.
- Oxburgh, G., Myklebust, T., Grant, T., & Milne, R. D. (Eds.). (2015). *Communication in investigative and legal contexts: Integrated approaches from forensic psychology, linguistics and law enforcement*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Plungian, V. A. (2001). The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(3), 349-357.
- Po, J. Y., & Hickey, G. M. (2020). Cross-scale relationships between social capital and

- women's participation in decision-making on the farm: A multilevel study in semi-arid Kenya. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 78, 333-349.
- Raaphorst, K., Roeleveld, G., Duchhart, I., Van der Knaap, W., & Van den Brink, A. (2020). Reading landscape design representations as an interplay of validity, readability and interactivity: a framework for visual content analysis. *Visual Communication*, 19(2), 163-197.
- Ralph, A. F., Chadban, S. J., Butow, P., Craig, J. C., Kanellis, J., Wong, G., Logeman, C., & Tong, A. (2020). The experiences and impact of being deemed ineligible for living kidney donation: Semi-structured interview study. *Nephrology*, 25(4), 339-350.
- Rose, J., & Johnson, C. W. (2020). Contextualizing reliability and validity in qualitative research: toward more rigorous and trustworthy qualitative social science in leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1-20.
- Santos, M. (2004). A pragmalinguistic analysis of courtroom questions in a multilingual context. Tesolonline.it
- Schaefer, S. M., & Alvesson, M. (2020). Epistemic attitudes and source critique in qualitative research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 29(1), 33-45.
- Shuy, R. W., & Roger, W. (2005). *Creating language crimes: How law enforcement uses (and misuses) language*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Slevitch, L. (2011). Qualitative and quantitative methodologies compared: Ontological and epistemological perspectives. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12(1), 73-81.
- Spens, K. M., & Kovács, G. (2006). A content analysis of research approaches in logistics research. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*.
- Starr, W. B. (2016). Dynamic expressivism about deontic modality. *Deontic modality*, 355-394.
- Steffen, E., & Coyle, A. (2011). Sense of presence experiences and meaning-making in bereavement: A qualitative analysis. *Death Studies*, 35(7), 579-609.
- Stepchenkova, S. (2012). Content analysis. In *Handbook of Research Methods in Tourism*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sweeney, L. (2002). k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 10(05), 557-570.
- Tavory, I. (2020). Interviews and Inference: Making Sense of Interview Data in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Sociology*, 1-17.
- Thyme, K. E., Wiberg, B., Lundman, B., & Graneheim, U. H. (2013). Qualitative content analysis in art psychotherapy research: Concepts, procedures, and measures to reveal the latent meaning in pictures and the words attached to the pictures. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, 40(1), 101-107.
- Tiersma, P., & Solan, L. M. (2002). The linguist on the witness stand: forensic linguistics in American courts. *Language*, 221-239.
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic

- analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 15(3), 398-405.
- Van der Auwera, J., & Plungian, V. A. (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 79-124
- Villarejo-Rodríguez, M. G., & Rodríguez-Martín, B. (2020). Parents' and primary caregivers' conceptualizations of fever in children: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 22(2), 162-170.
- Walker, R. C., Tong, A., Howard, K., & Palmer, S. C. (2020). Clinicians' experiences with remote patient monitoring in peritoneal dialysis: A semi-structured interview study. *Peritoneal Dialysis International*, 40(2), 202-208.
- Wodak, R., & Fairclough, N. (2010). Recontextualizing European higher education policies: The cases of Austria and Romania. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(1), 19-40.
- Zelenka, R. (2013). Modality in the language of legal documents. Tomas Bata University in Zlin Bachelor Thesis.
- Zejun, M., Jia, L., & Haiqing, C. (2017). The Prosodic Features of Modal Verbs in Chinese Courtroom Discourse and Its Interpersonal Function. *Contemporary Rhetoric*, (6), 3.
- Zhu, Z., Xing, W., Zhang, X., Hu, Y., & So, W. K. (2020). Cancer survivors' experiences with financial toxicity: A systematic review and meta-synthesis of qualitative studies. *Psycho-Oncology*.