



*Journal of Advances and
Scholarly Researches in
Allied Education*

*Vol. IV, Issue No. VIII,
October-2012, ISSN 2230-
7540*

**AN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ABOUT PSYCHO-
FACTORS IN UTILIZATION OF NATURAL
LANGUAGE**

AN
INTERNATIONALLY
INDEXED PEER
REVIEWED &
REFEREED JOURNAL

An Empirical Research about Psycho-Factors in Utilization of Natural Language

Vandana Prabhakar

Research Scholar, Shri Jagdish Prasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan

Abstract – The words people use in their everyday lives can uncover critical perspectives of their social and psychological worlds. With developments in computer technology, content analysis permits analysts to dependably and rapidly survey characteristics of what people say and in addition subtleties in their linguistic styles. Accompanying a short survey of some content analysis programs, we condense a portion of the proof that connections common word utilization to psyche, social and situational vacillations, and psychological intercessions.

Exceptionally compelling are discoveries that indicate the psychological quality of examining particles—parts of discourse that incorporate pronouns, articles, prepositions, conjunctives, furthermore assistant verbs. Particles, which serve as the paste that holds things and general verbs together, can serve as markers of emotional state, social character, and cognitive styles.

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

The ways people utilization words pass on an extraordinary arrangement of data about themselves, their gathering of people, and the circumstances they are in. People's decision of words can insight at their social status, age, sex, and thought processes. We sense if the speaker or writer is emotionally close or far off, mindful or shallow, and perhaps extraverted, psychotic, or open to new encounter. Despite the fact that a few Annual Review sections have abridged research on dialect securing, generation, understanding, furthermore its connections to cerebrum action, this is the first to talk about how dialect and, more particularly, word utilization is a serious marker and infrequent arbiter of regular social and identity forms.

That the words people utilization are analytic of their mental, social, and even physical state is not another idea. Freud (1901) gave a few forcing cases in his talk of parapraxes, or slips of the tongue. He brought up those normal blunders in discourse double-cross people's deeper intentions or reasons for alarm. Drawing vigorously on psychoanalysis, Jacques Lacan (1968) augmented these plans by recommending that the oblivious affirms itself through dialect. Undoubtedly, dialect, in his perspective, is the scaffold to actuality. Thinker Paul Ricoeur (1976) contended that the ways we depict occasions characterize the implications of the occasions and that these implications help us keep our grip on actuality. Comparative suspicions are understood in a significant part of the work in sociolinguistics (e.g., Eckert 1999, Tannen 1994), account and talk dissections (Schiffrin

1994), and communication research (Robinson & Giles 2001).

This article investigates the techniques and later discoveries on word utilize instead of dialect in essence: the styles in which people utilization words as opposed to the content of what they say. The refinement between linguistic style and linguistic content can be seen in how two people may make a basic appeal. "Might it be conceivable for you to pass me the salt?" and "Pass the salt," both express the speaker's craving for salt and immediate the audience's activity. Nonetheless, the two utterances additionally uncover distinctive characteristics of the interact ants' relationship, the speaker's emotional makeup, and maybe the way the speaker comprehends himself.

PSYCHO-WORD COUNT TECHNIQUES

In spite of the fact that a considerable lot of the suppositions about dialect as a psychological marker are imparted, the routines for contemplating dialect and word utilization have frequently been a battleground.

Most story scientists accept that dialect is, by definition, relevant. Thus, expressions, sentences, or whole messages must be acknowledged inside the connection of the objectives of the speaker and the relationship between the speaker what's more the crowd. In light of the intricacy of communication, this procedure expects that the agent must go to the significance of the utterances in connection.

However characterized, significance is accepted to be sufficiently multilayered to just be decoded by human judges who then assess what is said or composed. Qualitative dissections, then, give the scientist wide impressions or concurred upon depictions of content samples. Very few discourse dissections depend on numbers or detail (e.g., Schiffrin 1994).

An elective point of view is that characteristics of dialect or word utilization could be counted and measurably examined. Quantitative methodologies to content analysis have picked up expanding fame over the past half century (for audits see Popping 2000, Smith 1992, Weber 1994, and West 2001). The existing methodologies might be sorted into three wide philosophies. Judge-based topical content examinations commonly include judges who distinguish the vicinity of basic topical references in content specimens on the premise of observationally created coding frameworks (Smith 1992).

Topical content dissections have been generally requisitioned concentrating on a mixture of psychological phenomena, for example, rationale symbolism (e.g., Atkinson & McClelland 1948, Heckhausen 1963, winter 1994), logical styles (Peterson 1992), cognitive many-sided quality (Sued Feld et al. 1992), psychiatric syndromes (Gottschalk 1997), objective structures (Stein et al. 1997), arousal examples connected with social movements (Martindale 1990), and levels of considering (Penne baker et al. 1990).

A moderately new approach, word design analysis, has risen up out of the simulated sagacity group. Instead of investigating content "top down" inside the setting of formerly characterized psychological content extents or word classifications, word design systems numerically locate "base up" how words covary crosswise over vast specimens of content (Foltz 1998, Popping 2000). One especially guaranteeing system is dormant semantic analysis (LSA) (e.g., Landauer & Dumais 1997), which is similar to a component analysis of unique words. By creating the component structure of word use inside an extensive number of composing examples, it is conceivable to figure out how any new composition examples are like each one in turn. Customarily, this strategy has been utilized to focus the degree to which two writings are comparative in terms of their content.

The third general methodology prominent in quantitative text analysis focuses on word count strategies. Psychological word count strategies exist for both the analysis of content (what is being said) and style (how it is being said). Whereas they sometimes require rather complex linguistic analysis (e.g., active versus passive voice or metaphoric language use), most current approaches involve simple word counts, such as standard grammatical units (personal pronouns, prepositions) or psychologically derived linguistic dimensions (e.g., emotion words, achievement related words). Word

count strategies are based on the assumption that the words people use convey psychological information over and above their literal meaning and independent of their semantic context. Although some language researchers consider his assumption problematic, others see unique potentials in analyzing word choice because of judges' readiness to "read" content and their inability to monitor word choice (e.g., Hart 2001). With only one exception (Weintraub 1989), the most commonly used approaches presented below are computer based. In this section we briefly review six widely used methods that have evolved from very different theoretical perspectives.

Linguistic Inquiry and word Count - Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) (Penne baker et al. 2001) was initially created inside the connection of Penne baker's deal with emotional written work (Penne baker & Francis 1996, Penne baker et al. 1997). It was intended to find which characteristics of expounding on negative backgrounds could foresee ensuing health enhancements. All the more as of late the utilization of LIWC has been stretched to following dialect use in content sources traversing traditional expositive expression, individual accounts, public interviews, and transcripts of commonplace discussions (Penne baker & Gray Beal 2001).

LIWC utilizes a word count procedure whereby it hunt down over 2300 words or word stems inside any given content index. The pursuit words have at one time been classified by autonomous judges into over 70 linguistic sizes. These measurements incorporate standard dialect classes (e.g., articles, prepositions, pronouns— counting first individual independent, first individual plural, and so on.), psychological methods (e.g., positive and negative feeling classes, cognitive methodologies, for example, utilization of causation words, disparities toward oneself), relativity-related words (e.g., time, verb strained, movement, space), and conventional content sizes (e.g., sex, demise, home, occupation). The LIWC sizes are progressively composed. Case in point, the word "yelled" might fall into the classes "misery," "negative feeling," "generally speaking influence," and "past-strained verb." The system is sufficiently adaptable to take into consideration client characterized classes too.

Variable Analyzing the English Language - Although Bibber's (1988) work on dialect utilization was produced as an instrument to get it the English dialect, it has critical suggestions for brain science. Bibber, an English teacher, embraced a far reaching experimental examination in which he contemplated which linguistic extents develop when talk work rather than linguistic capacity is taken as the arranging guideline. The reason for this inductive methodology was to variable examine dialect and distinguish linguistic sizes that might constitute a functional skeleton for depicting dialect varieties crosswise over diverse content sorts and kinds.

Bibber's study embodied two divide steps. The initially inspected content from 23 spoken and composed classifications, for example, science fiction, silliness, and press reports. An aggregate of 481 writings with very nearly 1,000,000 words were submitted to a wide computerized word count analysis. The linguistic target characteristics were chosen without hypothetical interest. Around the 67 chose variables were pronouns, modifiers, qualifiers, adverbials, strained markers, nominalizations (words with mention, -ness, and additions), uninvolved voice, and refutations.

PSYCHOMETRIC ATTRIBUTES OF WORD UTILIZE

The primary venture in investigating the connections between word use and different single person distinction markers is to create the psychometrics of words themselves. That is, do people's word utilization examples satisfy the fundamental psychometric necessities of steadiness crosswise over time and consistency crosswise over setting? A few agents have started to address this issue.

Glaser et al. (1959) had people talk for 5 minutes about a fascinating background furthermore acquired a measure of interior consistency by computing part half reliabilities. Over 21 dialect classes (e.g., word count, modifiers, substantives, pronouns, emotions) the normal relationship between progressive 2-moment interims was 0.51, giving the first proof that word decision is stable inside a quite brief time allotment. Utilizing the General Inquirer approach, Schnurr et al. (1986) gave further backing to the fleeting solidness of dialect use by reporting high inside individual rank request relationships for the 83 variables of the Harvard In lexicon over a time of one week.

King (1999) broke down an extensive assemblage of content specimens taken from journals, school composing assignments, and diary modified works composed crosswise over days and indeed years and showed great inner consistency (crosswise over content sort) for 36 dialect measurements. The dialect variables were taken from the LIWC lexicon also contained standard linguistic sizes (e.g., articles, prepositions, pronouns) and more extensive psychological ideas (e.g., feeling words, causation words, words demonstrating social methodologies). Over some studies, word utilization in composed dialect rose as solid crosswise over time, point, and content source.

In a later naturalistic field study, Mehl & Penne baker (2002a) tested understudies' regular discussions twice for two days differentiated by 4 weeks utilizing a recently created insignificantly meddlesome recording unit called the electronically enacted recorder (EAR) (Mehl et al. 2001). Once more, the linguistic breakdowns demonstrated that learners' spontaneous

word utilization is stable over the long haul (normal test-retest relationship for standard linguistic variables: r_D 0.41, psychological methods: r_D 0.24) also steady crosswise over social connection (e.g., word use at home versus out in the open spots alternately in a beguilement versus work connection). These last two studies give especially guaranteeing proof, as they show dependability dependent upon a greatly substantial grouping of content specimens (Penne baker & King 1999) and spontaneous word utilization examined from the whole range of members' regular genuine discussions.

SITUATIONAL AND SOCIO TECHNIQUES

What we say and how we say it changes depending on the situation we are in. Piaget (1926) and other early develop mentalists (e.g., McCarthy 1929) noted that young children changed the ways they spoke depending on the context of their interactions. As adults, we know that we use different words when addressing an audience of our peers versus when talking with a close friend. Although research on how language varies as a function of social situations has been systematically addressed in psychology and sociology, very little has relied on word use per se.

Perhaps the first in depth discussion of situational and social variations in language was by Goffman (1959) in his *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Drawing on dramaturgical metaphors, Goffman argued that we all play different roles depending on the situation. In his analyses of groups, for example, Goffman suggested that voice characteristics and other nonverbal and paralinguistic cues shift depending on the formality of the situation, the nature of the audience, and the degree to which the speaker is integrated with or excluded from the other actors.

Although he did not focus on the words people used, his work served as an important foundation. Later research attempted to define which dimensions within social situations are most likely to be associated with language and, eventually, word usage. Hymes (1974), an anthropologist and a founder of sociolinguistics, argued that any speech act must be considered within eight dimensions ranging from the setting of the utterances, who the participants were, the goals of the interaction, etc. Other researchers such as Brown & Fraser (1979) and Forgas (1985) expanded on the idea of developing taxonomic structures of situations to help identify when and how language shifted. Psychological dimensions of situations related to language and communication included the situation's formality, cooperativeness, and involvement. Note that these approaches focused more on the nature of the interactions than on the word usage (Forgas 1985).

In most cases, when two people interact they use words. Remarkably little research has been conducted on the ways the interact ants use words with each other. An exception to this is a study by Cegala (1989), who sought to identify linguistic correlates of conversational engagement and detachment. In the study, 120 participants who did not know each other were asked to engage in a brief casual interaction with a same-sex peer. Participants were preselected on self-reported dispositional involvement in interactions and high-high, low-low, and high-low involvement dyads were created. Contrasts between the couple types showed that highly involved couples used a higher amount of certainty expressions, a higher degree of verbal immediacy, and more relational pronouns (we, us, our).

Beyond word use, numerous studies have pointed to the coordination of communicative behaviors during conversation. Indeed, the development of communication accommodation theory (Giles & Coupland 1991) has explored how individuals adapt to each other's communicative behaviors in order to promote social approval or communication efficiency. According to communication accommodation theory, individuals negotiate the social distance between themselves and their interacting partners, creating, maintaining, or decreasing that distance. This can be done linguistically, paralinguistic ally, and nonverbally. Specific accommodative strategies may include speech styles, speech rate, pitch, accent convergence, and response latency, use of pauses, phonological variations, smiling, or gaze. Most tests of the theory have not focused on word use.

To our knowledge, only one project has explored linguistic accommodation at the word level (Niederhoffer & Penne baker 2002). In two studies from Internet chat rooms, individuals getting to know one another in dyads exhibited linguistic style matching on both the conversational level as well as on a turn-by-turn level.

This coordinated use of language occurs at a remarkably low level and includes word count and use of articles, prepositions, affect words, and cognitive words. These effects appear to hold up across the perceived quality of an interaction, the length of the interaction, whether face-to-face or on an internet-like chat, whether for experimental credit or, in the case of a separate analysis of the Watergate transcripts, to avoid impeachment and imprisonment.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This survey is expected to whet researchers' appetite for the power of words in characteristic dialect. From a methodological viewpoint, the analysis of word utilization is straightforward, dependable, quick, and moderately modest. Likewise, specimens of words are promptly accessible from open-finished survey things, the Internet, messages, banks of content corpora, and transcripts of spoken content. Notwithstanding the

common sense of measuring word utilize, a large portion of the greatest inquiries encompass their significance and understanding.

In this last area we indicate some interesting and vexing inquiries raised by the word utilization approach. The greater part of this review has centered on words that reflect linguistic style as opposed to content. Markers of linguistic style are for the most part connected with moderately normal words, for example, pronouns and articles. A large portion of the more content-substantial words— things, consistent verbs, and modifiers—have not yielded numerous predictable social or psychological impacts. This may reflect the way that linguistic content is intensely subject to the circumstances or theme the individual is educated to contemplate.

Three general subjects that are ready for examination are the analysis of particles, feelings, and accepted content extents. Particles serve as the magic that binds content words. At the same time particles are more than insignificant paste. They are referential words that have enormous social and psychological significance. To utilize a pronoun requires the speaker and audience to impart a regular information of who the referent is. Think about the accompanying: "John went to the store to purchase some bread. In the wake of getting it, he drove home." The pronouns "it" and "he" are spot holders and speak to the imparted and interim learning that it D bread and he D John. Pronoun utilization obliges a generally refined familiarity with the gathering of people's capacity to track who will be who. Prepositions are likewise referential. To know the significance of over, on, to, and so forth requests that the speaker and audience have a simple comprehension of the relative, genuine, or typical area of the speaker. Comparable contentions could be made about articles (the utilization of "a" versus "the") and conjunctions (be that as it may, which). More casual settings presuppose an imparted casing of reference (cf., Brown 1968). Particles, then, could be translated as having enormous social suggestions. From a Grice (1975) perspective, the discerning particle user must have some degree of social and cognitive skill.

REFERENCES

- Ambady N, Koo J, Lee F, Rosenthal R. 1996. More than words: linguistic and nonlinguistic politeness in two cultures. *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.* 70:996–1011
- Brown P, Fraser C. 1979. Speech as a marker of situation. See Sherer & Giles 1979, pp. 33–62
- Dulaney EF. 1982. Changes in language behavior as a function of veracity. *Hum. Commun. Res.* 9:75–82
- Freud S. 1901. *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books

- Hymes D. 1974. Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
- Krauss RM, Fussell SR. 1996. Social psychological models of interpersonal communication. In Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles, ed. ET Higgins, AW Kruglanski, pp. 655–701. New York: Guilford
- Mehl MR, Pennebaker JW. 2002a. The Sounds of Social Life: A Psychometric Analysis of Students' Daily Social Environments and Natural Conversations. Submitted
- Pennebaker JW, Francis ME. 1996. Cognitive, emotional, and language processes in disclosure. Cogn. Emot. 10:601–26
- Vaes J, Paladino M-P, Leyens J-P. 2002. The lost e-mail: prosocial reactions induced by uniquely human emotions. Br. J. Soc. Psychol. In press