Asian Journal of Scientific Research and Innovations
ISSN: 2715-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.23 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY AS AN OBJECT OF MODERN LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

Urinova Sevara Botir qizi
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
3rd year student
Email: sevaraurinova.06@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines the theoretical foundations, main characteristics, and significance of linguistic personality in contemporary linguistics. It explores how this concept connects language knowledge, conceptual understanding, communicative intentions, and individual language choices. The study adopts a focused narrative literature review to examine the development of linguistic personality and its applications across different linguistic disciplines. Particular attention is given to Yuri Karaulov's three-level model and the concept's role in psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and linguodidactics. The findings highlight the value of linguistic personality as a theoretical framework for understanding the relationship between language, cognition, and communication. However, terminological inconsistencies and methodological differences remain significant challenges to developing a unified analytical approach. The article concludes that linguistic personality remains a valuable area of linguistic research, provided that researchers clearly define their terms and select analytical methods appropriate to their research objectives.

Key words: linguistic personality, modern linguistics, anthropocentric approach, verbal-semantic level, linguistic cognition, communicative activity.

Introduction

Language is a primary medium by which humans make sense of the world, structure their thoughts, share their experiences and engage in social activities. Throughout the years, numerous linguistic studies focused mainly on structural aspects of language, such as its syntax, its phonological system, its lexical units, and its grammatical rules. These strategies laid groundwork for the study of language. However, it is not possible to fully account for the way in which people choose their linguistic resources, form their meaning and employ language for various communicative purposes by analysing only the language structures.

The subject of linguistics and its users has been of growing interest and has led to the emergence of anthropocentric approaches to the study of language. The anthropocentric approach to language focuses on the human being as the pivot of language research and sees language in relation to human thought, feeling, language use and social life. From this view, the notion of linguistic personality has gained special significance when considering the relationship between people and the language through which they express themselves.

The notion of linguistic personality has been closely linked with the Russian linguistic tradition. While previous researchers made their own contributions to the field, the research of Yuri Nikolaevich Karaulov was particularly influential in the creation of a model of linguistic personality with a systematical approach. In 1987, his monograph Русский язык и языковая личность (Russian Language and Language Personality) introduced the concept of a language personality, which was based on the relationship between linguistic competence and knowledge and communicative motivation (Karaulov, 1987).

The value of this idea is that it challenges the assumption that an L1 user can be sufficiently described by their knowledge of grammar. The linguistic behaviour of a person is defined as his ability to use the linguistic forms, organize his knowledge, interpret situations

and choose expressions based upon communicative needs. These dimensions come into play in communication and help to shape unique aspects of person's communication.

The linguistic personality has been studied from different theoretical frameworks in subsequent studies. Yudina (2012), for instance, speaks about the concept in the Russian linguistic tradition, and outlines its related issues in the fields of psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics and stylistics, and also language instruction. Sorokovykh and Shafikova (2020) also illustrate the different understanding of the concept and its terminology in domestic and international linguodidactic research. The differences suggest that the notion of linguistic personality is not monochrome in all linguistic traditions.

The development of these changes brings a need for a better insight into the theoretical basis, the analytical potential and limitations of the object of study – the linguistic personality. While this idea has been the subject of much scholarly study, it can be approached in various ways and with varying definitions. It is therefore essential to critically analyze its theoretical framework in order to build a solid basis for subsequent linguistic studies.

Methods

2.1. Research design

The article is designed as a qualitative, theoretical research using a focused narrative review approach based on selected academic literature. This is justified, since the main interest will be on the development, interpretation and analysis of a theoretical concept and not on some new set of empirical data measuring a specific language phenomenon.

A narrative review allows for a discussion of the relationship between different theoretical approaches, a focus on the recurring conceptual issues and a comparison of how the research concept is applied in related disciplines. But no systematic coverage like preregistered or protocol-based systematic review is available. The results of the present article should therefore be interpreted as a conceptual synthesis of selected literature rather than a definitive evaluation of all research on linguistic personality.

2.2. Selection of literature

The review is a compilation of selected publications dealing with theoretical foundations of linguistic personality, its models and its interdisciplinary applications. Special emphasis is placed on Karaulov's original research, post-Karaulovian studies of the linguistic personality concept in the Russian linguistic tradition, and the comparative studies of the domestic and foreign works on the concept of linguistic personality.

Three main criteria were used to consider the literature:

- Theoretical relevance: The publications had to be about the definition, structure or conceptual development of the linguistic personality.
- Analytical relevance: Publications needed to be related to the research and investigation of linguistic personality, using linguistic, cognitive, and/or communicative evidence.
- Interdisciplinary relevance: Language personality studies relevant to other disciplinary fields of linguistic study were included when they shed light on the scope of language personality.

The principal works considered are: Karaulov (1987), Yudina (2012), Sorokovykh and Shafikova (2020) and Romanchuk et al. (2024). Bucholtz and Hall (2005) are also regarded as a source for the discussion of the difference between the study of linguistic personality and interactional approaches to identity.

These are the publications of various views and research traditions. Not treated as interchangeable; not assuming that their theoretical assumptions are the same.

2.3. Analytical procedure

The literature selected was analysed using conceptual comparison. The analysis focused on the following points: definition of linguistic personality, suggested structural components, the connection of the linguistic form and communicative activity, methodological problems.

The first step was the identification of the main features given to linguistic personality. The second studied the organization of these characteristics in the existing theoretical models. The third dealt with the importance of the concept in various fields of linguistics. The last phase highlighted common problems and future research implications.

No new corpus or questionnaire or experiment or participant-based dataset was used. The article, therefore, doesn't offer statistical conclusions or empirical evidence on a specific population. The article contributes to the interpretation and organisation of selected theoretical perspectives.

Results

3.1. Linguistic personality as a theoretical construct

From the review, it can be seen that the concept of linguistic personality can be interpreted as a theoretical concept in studying the relationship between the personality of the individual and the language used in communication. It focuses on the language user's linguistic resources, knowledge, and communicative activity, as opposed to focusing on language only as an abstract system of rules.

In this context, linguistic personality is not only a matter of the number of words known, grammatical skills and capacity to form sentences. These qualities are important indicators of linguistic competence but they cannot stand alone as indicators of the extent of an individual's language use.

For instance, two people could have the same grammatical competence, but with different usage patterns when using the language. Some might like to use short statements and others might use extended explanations. A speaker can use familiar expressions while another speaker can use more specialized vocabulary. These distinctions can be related to experience, education, communicative goals, professional practices and specific situations.

These examples, however, should not be taken to mean that a certain linguistic trait indicates a set personality. Communicators may use different styles of words and style in different contexts for various purposes and audiences. Linguistic personality must be analyzed in the context of the language, and not be deduced from single expressions.

Another feature of the idea is that it is integrative. It offers a structure through which to relate form to knowledge and use of language. Rather than study these aspects individually, researchers may analyze their interaction in the processing of language.

Yudina (2012) states that the concept of linguistic personality, in various aspects, has been touched upon at different fields of linguistic research such as psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, stylistics, pragmatics and linguodidactics. This range of applications reflects the concept's potential to link different levels of linguistic analysis.

However, it is important to note that interdisciplinary relevance does not imply conceptual uniformity. The term can be used in various ways to highlight various aspects of the language user in the work of researchers from different traditions. Therefore, each study should define and assume what they wish it to be.

3.2. The Structural Model of Linguistic personality

The three-level model by Karaulov is one of the most influential theoretical approaches to the study of linguistic personality. It distinguishes between verbal-semantic level, a linguocognitive level, and motivational-pragmatic level (Karaulov, 1987).

The levels provide an analytical framework that is helpful in understanding the contribution of linguistic knowledge, conceptual organization and communicative motivation to language use.

3.2.1. The verbal-semantic level

The verbal-semantic level is a person's mastery of the language forms and their denotative meaning. It contains lexical knowledge, grammatical resources and the capacity to synthesize linguistic units into meaningful expressions.

This level is critical, for in order to communicate, the speaker must make use of the resources of a language. Their vocabulary, knowledge of the grammatical structures and conventional expressions affect their message construction and comprehension of others' language.

For instance, if a speaker is familiar with a number of expressions of disagreement, he/she might, depending on the communicative context, use one of them.

"I disagree."

I think differently about what you're saying.

I'm not sure that makes sense.

I see your point but I have an alternate reading.

The examples show linguistic formulations. But it is not language and grammar that explain the choice of expression. It can also be determined by the relationship between the speakers, what they are doing in the conversation, and how direct the conversation should be in this context.

The verbal-semantic level is thus a crucial starting point for analysis, but cannot fully account for all aspects of linguistic personality.

3.2.2. The linguocognitive level

The linguocognitive level is related to the nature of the relationship between the linguistic expression and the structures of knowledge that people use to comprehend and organize their experiences.

In the model of Karaulov this dimension is related to an organized system of concepts, ideas and relationships which help to interpret the world, namely to the individual's thesaurus (Karaulov, 1987).

This perspective concerns more than word knowledge and grammar. It also includes the capacity to relate expressions to ideas, events, and other systems of meaning.

A person talking about education may choose to present a description with the concepts of opportunity, professional development, independence, or social responsibility. Yet another individual talking about the same topic might highlight in particular practical skills, financial stability, or community expectations.

These disparities may serve as the fodder for studying the organization and communication of knowledge. However, they don't necessarily mean that the personalities are very different. The concepts chosen for discussion may be affected by the speaker's education, background, purpose, and context.

This linguocognitive level is thus important because it integrates language and concept with the goal of identification of researchers distinguishing between the language produced and its underlying concepts.

3.2.3. The motivational-pragmatic level

The motivational-pragmatic level is related to intention, motivation, and communicative purpose that affect language use.

Communication doesn't just consist of producing grammatically correct sentences. Language can be used in a variety of ways to ask for information, build relationships, convey ideas, oppose ideas, persuade decisions, or perform tasks.

Consider the sentence:

"Could you open the window?"

It has the grammatical form of an interrogative but it can also be a request rather than a question concerning the listener's physical capacity. It is, therefore, important to consider communicative intention and situational context of the utterance if one is to understand it.

The motivational-pragmatic level accounts for the choice of expressions made by the speaker and the relationship between them and their communicative objectives. It also draws attention to the need to consider language as an activity, not just a set of linguistic forms.

But sometimes it is not possible to determine intents unequivocally by language alone. There can be multiple interpretations for a single piece of discourse and the intentions of the speaker are not always given. Researchers should, therefore, rely on contextual evidence and avoid stating speculative interpretations as fact.

The three levels provide a multi-dimensional framework when taken together. The verbal-semantic level is related to the linguistic resources, the linguocognitive level is related to the conceptual knowledge, and the motivation-pragmatic level is related to the communicative intentions and activity. They are analytically distinguishable but they interact in the process of communication.

3.3. Linguistic personality and modern linguistics.

The theoretical significance of linguistic personality is related to its potential to unite different questions traditionally studied by various branches of language.

Firstly, it is relevant to psycholinguistics, the study of mental processes in language use, understanding and learning. The concept of linguistic personality allows a more comprehensive view of the relationship between the language knowledge and communicative behaviour of a speaker. (Romanchuk et al., 2024).

Secondly, the idea has also cognitive linguistic implications as it takes the focus towards the interconnection between linguistic expression and knowledge organization. Researchers can explore the nature of concepts, the semantic relationships and patterns of interpretation that emerge in language.

Thirdly, linguistic personality is applicable in pragmatics and discourse analysis. These approaches analyze the language in its context and how the speakers employ language for communicative purpose. Of special relevance is the motivational-pragmatic aspect of the model of Karaulov.

From the perspective of language education, the issue of linguistic personality has also been raised. In their article, Sorokovykh and Shafikova (2020) analyse the concept and the related terminology from the perspective of domestic and international L2 didactics. The differences in the conceptualization of the linguistic personality and related notions across these research traditions are stated in their review.

It is important that there is a variation in this because it shows that researchers can't take it for granted that they are talking about the same thing when they use the same term. The theoretical framework should be clearly stated, particularly when research from various fields is contrasted.

Linguistic personality is also pertinent to the investigation of the use of individual language, which involves the analysis of characteristic lexical, grammatical and stylistic features. Depending on the question raised by the research and the material available, such research can address individual speakers, writers or other language users.

In these applications, it is shown that linguistic personality is not confined to a particular linguistic subdiscipline. Its main value lies in its ability to link multiple forms of linguistic evidence within a clearly established theoretical framework.

3.4. The variation in the use of words and the structure of concepts.

A major conclusion of the review was that the term 'linguistic personality' needs careful terminology.

Language personality, linguistic personality, verbal personality, communicative personality and linguistic identity are related concepts. While it may be tempting to regard these concepts as synonymous, that should not be done without careful consideration.

Yudina (2012) calls for the definition of the relationship between linguistic personality and related categories. Also, Sorokovykh and Shafikova (2020) mention a difference in terminology between domestic and foreign research in linguistic and linguodidactic aspects.

This is especially relevant to the distinction between linguistic identity and linguistic personality. The concept of linguistic personality usually focuses on the language user as the multidimensional object of linguistic analysis; however, the term does not have the same meaning in all theoretical approaches. Linguistic identity, on the other hand, is often explored in terms of the processes with which individuals establish, negotiate and communicate identities in social interaction.

In contrast, Bucholtz and Hall (2005), for instance, suggest a sociocultural linguistic perspective in which identity is experienced in linguistic (and other) semiotic practices. The framework they use focuses on interaction, social relations and the construction and deconstruction of identity in specific contexts.

This is applicable to linguistic studies, but it would not be a mere copying of Karaulov's model. Each of the two has emphasized different aspects of theory, and only when the research question calls for it should they be combined.

Similarly with psychological personality. While linguistic behaviour can be evidence for the study of individual differences, it can not establish any psychological profile on its own. There should be some supporting evidence other than isolated language samples as well as suitable theory for psychological characteristics that can be claimed.

It is therefore important to have conceptual boundaries to prevent a conclusion without support and to interpret the research results within the boundaries of the selected framework.

Discussion

4.1. How much an explanation about language can provide about its use.

The results of the conceptual review indicate that the concept of linguistic personality is a useful concept in analyzing the relationship between the language and individual users.

It has the main benefit of stimulating the study of linguistic form to look at how linguistic resources are used in relation to knowledge and communicative goals. This viewpoint can be useful in understanding how a given language can be used in diverse ways by various users.

An advantage of the three levels of the model is that they provide a framework for the investigation in distinct yet interrelated dimensions which is particularly useful for Karaulov. It does not assign primacy to any one aspect of the phenomenon of language, but invites researchers to take a wider view of resources (lexical and grammatical), conceptual organization, and communicative motivation.

However, the model is not to be interpreted as an exhaustive account of all aspects of language use. The immediate context, social relations, genre, institutional norms and expectations, and resources of the speaker also shape individual communication. The model

is presented as a conceptual starting point and can be supplemented by other models in individual studies to explore these factors in an appropriate manner.

A good research design must thus determine what parts of the linguistic personality are relevant to the research question and describe how these will be analyzed.

4.2. Language personality and related methods

The interdisciplinary nature of the linguistic personality opens up opportunities for the development of theory, but also poses challenges.

Linguistic personality and cognitive linguistics can be used together, for instance, when researchers study the expression of concepts and semantic relations within language. In cases where they are using pragmatics, they might consider the connection between the choices of language and communicative functions. They may analyze how meanings are generated in specific texts and interactions, when using discourse analysis.

These may complement each other so that the study can be enhanced by adding a clearly defined analytical function from each one. But just enumerating a few disciplines will not define a clear methodology. Researchers require to explain the connection and how the concepts and methods relate to each other and what research questions they will try to answer.

The difference between linguistic personality and linguistic identity provides an illustration. The former can be used to analyse the communicative and linguistic features of a specific language user, whereas the latter can be used to analyse how social positions and social relationships are negotiated in interactions.

These approaches can be used in conjunction with one another, but not in isolation. The selection depends on which of the researcher's primary focus is on the individual's linguistic profile, construction of identity in interaction or the connection between the two.

It is the same with regards to research on psychological personality. Researchers should not assume stable psychological traits as a result of linguistic patterns unless there is appropriate evidence. Any theory of language needs to separate the actual language behavior from the theories explaining it.

4.3. Methodological challenges

A number of methodological limitations are also highlighted in the review.

The first relates to the selection of language data. Linguistic personality can be studied through spoken interaction, written texts, interviews, literary works, and other linguistic materials. Each type of data, however, gives access to a different language use. Literary characters, public speeches, and informal conversations are not necessarily equivalent ways of representing an individual's linguistic behaviour.

The second problem is one of context. The language of an individual can change depending on the listener(s), communicative purpose, formality, and the relationship between the participants. Therefore, researchers should not make statements about their data that go beyond the scope of their study and should acknowledge the limitations of their study.

The third challenge is interpretation. When a researcher tries to make an inference about knowledge, motivation, or psychological traits, linguistic evidence may be used to provide multiple explanations. In order to minimise interpretative bias, researchers should pre-define their analytical categories; give examples of evidence to support their analyses; and acknowledge other interpretations if they exist.

The fourth challenge relates to terms and comparability. The results of different studies cannot be directly compared if the concept of linguistic personality has significantly different meanings in different studies. It is, therefore, necessary for researchers to give explicit definitions and explain the relationship between the selected model with the previous theoretical models.

Lastly, theoretical arguments should be separated from empirical evidence. While it is sometimes useful to have a conceptual explanation for language use, it is important to assess its utility in specific contexts with evidence that is appropriate to the task at hand. Theoretical review needs to be presented as a theoretical research and shouldn't be presented as an experimentally validated model.

4.4. Limitations of the present review

There are a few drawbacks to the present article.

It is first of all a focused narrative review and not a systematic review. The choice of publications is intended to serve as a basis for discussion of the concept, but is by no means meant to be exhaustive of all relevant publications or all research traditions.

Secondly, the article focuses on theoretical questions and not on the empirical applications. It does not assess the performance of linguistic personality models on a new collection of data.

Third, the use of terminology does not reflect all publications, and is therefore not to be read as a complete overview of the use of related concepts by all international scholars.

These restrictions also point to areas that could be further explored. A systematic literature review could provide a more complete definition and methodology "map". For an empirical study, the model could be tested with a well-documented set of linguistic data. Research can then be done in a comparative way to determine the appropriateness of the framework to other languages, contexts or communicative situations.

Studies conducted in this vein would develop the theoretical base laid here, but would not assume that any one model would account for all aspects of individual language use.

Conclusion

The present article has addressed the problem of linguistic personality, its theoretical background, structural aspects, interdisciplinary connections and methodological constraints, as it is an object of contemporary linguistic studies. The review suggests that the linguistic personality can serve as a connecting thread between linguistic resources and conceptual knowledge and communicative activity. Karaulov's three-level model is an important theoretical reference that distinguishes between verbal-semantic, linguocognitive and motivational-pragmatic aspects of language use, taking into consideration the interaction of these aspects.

Concept is applicable to many fields of linguistics such as psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis and language education. Its broad use makes greater terminological precision necessary. Linguistic personality, linguistic identity, communicative personality, and psychological personality are not synonymous; their meanings should not be treated as interchangeable without a clear theoretical basis. The main conclusion is that linguistic personality remains a useful concept, provided that researchers agree on its meaning, analytical scope, and evidential basis. It is not dependent upon the premise that language reveals all attributes of an individual. Instead, it is about developing a model to look at "the interaction between linguistic knowledge, conceptual organization, and communicative purpose in actual language use.

Clear conceptual definitions, clearly specified analyses, and careful distinctions between linguistic evidence and individual characteristics should be a priority for further research. Empirical applications of the models and systematic reviews could be useful to establish which part of the linguistic personality can be studied with a reliable degree of certainty and which part needs further theoretical elaboration. The article lays the foundations for a better understanding of linguistic personality as a multidimensional phenomenon that

can serve as an object of linguistic research and develop a basis to initiate more specific research on the individual use of language.

REFERENCES

1. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. Discourse Studies, 7(4–5), 585–614. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407
2. Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269–293). Penguin Books.
3. Karaulov, Y. N. (1987). Русский язык и языковая личность [Russian language and language personality]. Nauka.
4. Romanchuk, S., Kuzmenko, O., Berezhna, M., Vysoskyi, A., & Nikolaieva, T. (2024). Analysis of the linguistic personality as a subject of psycholinguistic research: Dynamics of development and forecasts for the future. Forum for Linguistic Studies, 6(6), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i6.6673
5. Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic Patterns. University of Pennsylvania Press.
6. 3. Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26(3), 287–306.
7. Sorokovykh, G. V., & Shafikova, I. R. (2020). Notion of professional's secondary linguistic personality in domestic and foreign linguodidactics: Systematic review. Pedagogy. Theory & Practice, 5(4). https://doi.org/10.30853/ped200101
8. Sadullayeva, G. I., & Urinova, S. B. Til o‘rganishda immersiv metodlar: Tezroq va samaraliroq o‘rganish uchun tilga sho‘ng‘ishning afzalliklari.
9. Urinova, S. B. (2024). The power of language: How learning a second language can change your brain. British Journal of Interdisciplinary Scientific Research and Development. Retrieved from https://www.bjisrd.com/index.php/bjisrd/article/view/3193
10. Urinova, S. B. (2025). Til qudrati: Qanday qilib ikkinchi tilni o‘zlashtirish insonning fikrlash doirasini o‘zgartirishi mumkin? Journal of International Scientific Research, 3(1). Retrieved from https://spaceknowladge.com/index.php/JOISR/article/view/1449
11. Urinova, S. B. (2025). Tinglab tushunishni oshiruvchi metodlar. Ta'lim va rivojlanish tahlili onlayn ilmiy jurnali, 5(1), 219. Retrieved from http://www.sciencebox.uz