THE COGNITIVE PROCESSING OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN SPEECH

Durdona Khudoykulova
Faculty of Foreign Filology
National University of Uzbekistan

Abstract. This research explores the cognitive mechanisms involved in the processing of figurative language within spoken communication from a psycholinguistic viewpoint. Figurative language—encompassing metaphors, idioms, and similes—serves a vital function in daily interactions by enhancing meaning and expressiveness. Nevertheless, comprehending such language involves intricate cognitive processes that extend beyond straightforward interpretation. The current investigation analyzes how individuals interpret figurative phrases in comparison to literal statements, focusing on comprehension speed, accuracy, and perceived challenge. A small-scale experimental study was conducted with university students. Results reveal that processing figurative language necessitates greater cognitive investment but results in more profound semantic understanding and improved memory retention. This research adds to the ongoing discourse regarding the relationship between language, cognition, and the construction of meaning.

Keywords: figurative language, psycholinguistics, cognitive processing, metaphor, idioms, speech comprehension

Introduction. Language comprehension is a crucial cognitive function that entails the interpretation of linguistic input and the formation of meaning. Direct language communicates clear and explicit meanings, whereas figurative language conveys concepts in a more indirect manner through the use of metaphors, idioms, similes, and various stylistic elements. Figurative language plays a significant role in oral communication, enhancing speech by making it more vivid, expressive, and persuasive. Nevertheless, from a psycholinguistic standpoint, the interpretation of figurative language is more intricate than that of literal language. It necessitates that listeners move beyond mere surface meanings to tap into more profound conceptual frameworks and associative knowledge. Prior studies indicate that engaging with figurative language triggers a range of cognitive processes, such as semantic mapping, inferencing, and contextual integration. For instance, when individuals interpret a metaphor, they must discern the similarities between two different conceptual domains. Likewise, understanding idioms frequently involves drawing upon established meanings from long-term memory rather than analyzing the individual words.

Despite the considerable body of research conducted in this area, there remains an ongoing dialogue regarding the manner in which figurative language is cognitively processed—whether it occurs through direct interpretation or first necessitates a literal understanding. Certain theoretical frameworks advocate for a sequential model, wherein a literal interpretation precedes a figurative one, while alternative perspectives propose that processing occurs in parallel. The current investigation seeks to examine the cognitive mechanisms involved in the processing of figurative language during spoken communication, as well as the distinctions in comprehension and cognitive demands between figurative and literal expressions.

The study will focus on the following key research questions:

1. In what ways does figurative language influence the speed and accuracy of comprehension?

2. Is there a greater cognitive workload associated with figurative language compared to literal language?

3. How do listeners assess the clarity and expressiveness of figurative language?

Methods. The research involved thirty undergraduate students who possessed upper-

intermediate to advanced proficiency in English. Each participant had previously encountered figurative language in English contexts. The study utilized two categories of sentences as experimental stimuli:

1. Literal sentences, which convey direct meaning.
2. Figurative sentences, encompassing metaphors, idioms, and similes. For instance:
- Literal: He is very angry.
- Figurative: He is boiling with anger.
- Literal: This task is very easy.
- Figurative: This task is a piece of cake.

In terms of methodology, participants were exposed to both written and auditory formats of the sentences. They were instructed to interpret each sentence's meaning, assess the speed of their comprehension, rate the difficulty on a scale from 1 to 5, and evaluate the expressiveness of the sentences. Reaction times and precision were meticulously recorded, and participants also filled out a brief perception questionnaire.

The research utilized both quantitative and qualitative approaches to analyze the data. Metrics such as average response time, accuracy percentages, and subjective difficulty ratings were evaluated across both literal and figurative conditions.

Results. The analysis indicated significant distinctions in the way literal and figurative language is processed. Firstly, figurative language necessitated more extensive processing time than literal sentences, as participants frequently paused to deduce non-literal meanings. Secondly, the accuracy of comprehension for figurative phrases was marginally lower, particularly when the idioms were not familiar to the participants. Additionally, figurative expressions were perceived as more expressive and engaging compared to literal language, with participants indicating that such expressions rendered speech more dynamic and memorable. Lastly, the engagement with figurative language fostered deeper semantic processing, as participants often linked these expressions to their prior knowledge and personal experiences.

Discussion. The study's outcomes affirm that figurative language entails a more intricate cognitive processing mechanism than literal language. The prolonged processing time indicates that listeners partake in supplementary interpretive stages, such as inference and conceptual mapping. These findings lend support to interactive models of language processing, which suggest that literal and figurative meanings might be activated concurrently rather than in succession. This phenomenon is particularly observable with well-known idiomatic expressions, which tend to allow for quicker meaning retrieval. However, the slight decline in accuracy associated with figurative language underscores the significance of familiarity and contextual cues in comprehension. For unfamiliar idioms, understanding can be impeded, thereby increasing cognitive load. Crucially, despite the heightened cognitive demands, figurative language improves communicative effectiveness. It draws attention, evokes emotions, and enhances memorability, all of which are vital components of effective communication. The implications of these findings extend to language education, especially in the context of second language acquisition, suggesting that instruction in figurative language can enhance learners' communicative competency and interpretative abilities. Nevertheless, limitations of the study must be acknowledged, including a restricted sample size and a narrow selection of figurative expressions. Future research should aim for a larger participant base and investigate cross-linguistic variances, particularly among bilingual individuals.

Conclusion. Figurative language is crucial for understanding speech and cognitive processing within the realm of linguistics. While its interpretation demands increased cognitive resources, it enhances comprehension and facilitates more impactful communication. The research illustrates that engaging with figurative language necessitates intricate relationships among linguistic knowledge, cognitive functions, and contextual elements. Additional investigation is essential to examine how these processes function in various languages and across different levels of proficiency.

References:

1. Aitchison J. The Articulate Mammal: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics. – London: Routledge, 2012.

2. Carston R. Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication. – Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

3. Cutting J. Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students. – London: Routledge, 2002.

4. Field J. Psycholinguistics: A Resource Book for Students. – London: Routledge, 2004.

5. Gibbs R.W. The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

6. Giora R. On Our Mind: Salience, Context, and Figurative Language. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

7. Glucksberg S. Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphors to Idioms. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

8. Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

9. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

10. Osgood C.E., Suci G.J., Tannenbaum P.H. The Measurement of Meaning. – Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

11. Osgood C.E. Lectures on Language Performance. – New York: Springer, 1980.

12. Pinker S. The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature. – New York: Viking, 2007.

13. Simpson P. Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students. – London: Routledge, 2004.

14. Traxler M.J. Introduction to Psycholinguistics: Understanding Language Science. – Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

15. Wales K. A Dictionary of Stylistics. – London: Routledge, 2011.