



# PSYCHOLINGUISTIC FACTORS OF SPEECH EFFECT

**Qurbanov Elbek Elmurodovich**  
Doctorate of Andijan State University

## ABSTRACT

*The given article deals with psycholinguistic factors of speech effect and their working process. The investigation from which this information is drawn was the study into the acquisition of linguistic knowledge and linguistic processing.*

**KEY WORDS:** *speech effect, psycholinguistic factor, linguistics, phonological process, curriculum, automatisisation.*

## INTRODUCTION

A large part of our daily life exists of interactions with our family, friends, neighbors, colleagues, officials and others. These interactions differ in the way interlocutors use language to express themselves, for instance in word choice, pronunciation and sentence structure. One of the most important dimensions of this linguistic variation is formality, but while most people can make an intuitive distinction between formal and informal manners of speech, it is an ongoing challenge to grasp the exact relation between particular speech situations and the corresponding linguistic characteristics. As Dittmar claims, there is an urgent need to refine existing models of linguistic variation by investigating this relation in more detail.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

During this research various methods and materials were used written by different famous scholars. Various studies revealed that certain linguistic features occur more in formal than in informal language or vice versa. The concept of formality is not as straightforward as one might think though, because formality is influenced by many parameters, such as the setting, the topic of conversation, the modality (written versus spoken language), and the speaker's audience, which potentially have different impacts on speech behavior. Following Bell, who argued that "speakers design their style primarily for and in response to their audience", this paper focuses on the parameter audience and addresses the question whether speakers express the same idea differently to interlocutors with whom their relation is either formal or informal.

## DISCUSSION

Many scholars assume that two kinds of knowledge present in the model become more accessible as a result of frequency of use. Fluency is seen as the result of the automatisisation of knowledge.

Learners would be seen to build up more and more knowledge of the grammar and the lexicon and to make that knowledge available more and more quickly as a result of practice. Both declarative and procedural knowledge develop in this way: there is general agreement that knowledge is in some way strengthened as a result of use. Views differ, however, as to how this process is carried out. Anderson, for example, claims that the same knowledge may be held in both procedural and declarative form. He argues that declarative knowledge can become proceduralised to a point where it becomes autonomous.

In terms of our study here, if this view is correct we would expect there to be continuous development in the L2 for each individual in both knowledge and fluency over time. The critical variable for fluency would be the extent of the linguistic knowledge and the extent to which that knowledge had been automatised. More knowledge and more automatisation would lead to swifter passage through it. Both would depend on exposure. There would be no barrier to prevent development and there would be no reason to expect much variation between mature speakers of the L1.

Under the second view, the relationship between knowledge and processing is reversed. This view is associated with the work of Pienemann. He claims that the development of the knowledge of language depends on the ability to process the L2. He attaches particular importance to the creation of linguistic relationships across phrase boundaries and argues that learners cannot develop knowledge of such relations unless they have already attained a certain level of processing capability. The reason why individuals may not have that ability may be physiological, such as a less well-developed. As we have seen in Section 1, there is good evidence to show that differences it can affect language learning. In this case we would expect learners to vary individually and in a parallel way in the L1 and the



L2. Their linguistic knowledge would develop once they have attained a certain level of processing ability.

Paradis insists on the fact that implicit competence is qualitatively very different from explicit knowledge: 'explicit knowledge is conscious awareness of some data (utterances) and/or of their explicit analyses (structure). Implicit competence, on the other hand, is a set of computational procedures (of which the speaker is unaware) that generates sentences. A crucial point is that 'metalinguistic knowledge does not evolve or change into implicit linguistic competence. We have two different sources of knowledge one that remains explicit, the other that independently develops in the form of implicit competence.

This also has implications for the role of the memory systems. If L2 users rely more on declarative knowledge, then this undoubtedly increases the load on the STM. This could account for the larger variation in fluency of even relatively advanced L2 users compared to that of native speakers and learners at intermediate level. Indeed, as Paradis points out, 'speeded-up control over explicit rules is not the same as automatic use of implicit competence'.

As regards our study here, this view would lead us to expect all subjects to perform at a lower level in the L2 than in the L1. In the L1, learners have acquired the grammatical knowledge and proceduralised it in one natural implicit process. In the L2, learners may have acquired the grammatical knowledge by a different, explicit route and automatised it by general cognitive learning mechanisms. This view therefore implies that there is a differently balanced combination of declarative and procedural knowledge. The critical variable here would be the amount of linguistic knowledge learnt through the implicit as opposed to the explicit route. This understanding of the psycholinguistic factors that contribute to fluency gives rise to four specific research questions to be examined in the context of our longitudinal study.

In addition to this, fluency in the context of automatised knowledge: mini-story recall subjects were required to repeat a mini-story. This consists of four sentences which together provide an account of some kind of event. An investigator reads the mini-story to the subject, who is then asked to reproduce as much of it as he or she can immediately after hearing it. The mini-stories are deliberately too long to be held in the research. The subject has to decode the meaning and then recode it using linguistic knowledge which they possess in their own linguistic storage systems. This task places the emphasis on the retrieval process which is taken to be essential for fluency. The quantitative product consists of percentage scores indicating the amount of exact repetition of the forms offered.

## RESULT

The intention is to reveal the degree of automatised knowledge. If it is correct to assume that L1 knowledge is more 'implicit' than L2 knowledge, then the L1 performance will be higher. We would also expect that between Time 1 and Time 2 the necessary L2 language will have become more automatised and that this would give rise to increased scores. One possible interpretation of this part of the evidence is that the less able L2 learners have difficulty in storing knowledge. The problem is not so much that the less able learners can't learn forms but that they have difficulty in storing language forms and procedures. A salient and unexpected fact is that the Low group performed less well on Recall in the L1 than they did in the L2 at Time 2. This would suggest that any storage difficulty that these subjects may have could also apply in their L1. It may be that these learners have difficulty in creating, storing and recalling language productions whether implicit or explicit in any language.

## CONCLUSION

Finally, we will seek briefly to integrate the findings of this experiment with some of the experiments. Despite what has just been said, it is likely that how WM actually works and how it may fail to function as well in the L2 as in the L1 remain key issues. There are many views as to why this may be the case, and some of these have produced evidence similar to this study. There are similarities with some of the evidence presented as they suggest that performance may be influenced by the age at which the speaker acquired knowledge. All these learners have learned their L2 after the age of seven. Rosen and Engle point to high-memory-span participants as those who can complete tasks whilst monitoring.

## REFERENCES

1. Ager, Dennis. 1990. *Sociolinguistics and contemporary French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Akaike, H. 1973. *Information theory as an extension of the maximum likelihood principle*. In B. N. Petrov & F. Csáki (eds.), *Second international symposium on information theory*, 267–281. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.
3. Baayen, Harald. 2008. *Analyzing linguistic data: A practical introduction to statistics using R*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Bell, Allan. 1984. *Language style as audience design*. *Language in Society* 13(2). 145–204.
5. Bell, Allan. 2001. *Back in style: Reworking audience design*. In Penelope Eckert & John R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation*, 139–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Berruto, Gaetano. 2010. *Identifying dimensions of linguistic variation in a language space*. In P. Auer & J. Schmidt (eds.), *Language and space: An international handbook of linguistic variation*. Volume 1: *Theories and methods*, 226–241. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.