Degrees of metaphoricity: A quantitative gesture analysis

Greg Woodin, Bodo Winter and Jeannette Littlemore English Language & Linguistics, University of Birmingham



osf.io/3mpc7/

gregwoodin.co.uk

@greg_woodin

gawoodin@gmail.com



Bodo Winter @BodoWinter



Jeannette Littlemore @JeannetteL16









BYU-BNC (Davies, 2004)

Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Gibbs (1994), Kövecses (2002)



'raise the standard' upper good space target domain source domain

'lower the standard'







Casasanto & de Bruin (2019) Meier & Robinson (2004)



Casasanto & Dijkstra (2010)



Woodin & Winter (2018), see Tversky et al. (1991)

However...

Some linguistic metaphors may be so conventionalised that their metaphorical meanings hardly occur to those who use them.

Black (1993), Müller (2008)

So, how do we know when someone is 'thinking metaphorically' when they use a linguistic metaphor?

One answer is by looking at whether they use metaphoric gestures.

McNeill (1992), Cienki & Müller (2008), Müller (2008)

Monday

YOUNG SOUTHEAST ASIAN LEADERS INITIATIVE

The White House East Room



VHITE HOUSE



Thursday

Metaphoric gestures

McNeill (1992, 2005), Kendon (2005), Cienki & Müller (2008), Müller (2008)



Müller (2008), see also Cameron (1991)



Metaphoricity:

continuum

Müller (2008)



Müller (2008)





Gesture as a Lens Into Metaphoricity hypothesis

Gestures as Simulated Action

Hostetter and Alibali's (2008) GSA framework proposes that gestures are the outward manifestations of mentally simulated actions.

Mental simulation:

the mental recreation of perceptions and actions

Barsalou (1999), Glenberg & Kaschak (2002), Zwaan (2009), Bergen (2012)



"As simulators for words develop in memory, they become associated with simulators for the entities and events to which they refer."

Barsalou, 1999 (p. 592)







e.g., Pulvermüller (2005)







Klatzky et al. (1989)

put the pencil in the cup



Stanfield & Zwaan (2001)



Wilson & Gibbs (2007)





Image from *Bodytomy*



Hostetter & Alibali (2008)

Predictions

The more actively the source domain of a metaphor is simulated, the greater the chance that the premotor activation caused by this simulation will spread to the motor cortex and cause a speaker to gesture.

Predictions

Moreover, the form of this gesture should iconically reflect the metaphor's source domain.

Increased premotor activation should also manifest itself in more effortful gestures.

Predictions





'lower' 'raise'

visuospatial information

'low' 'high'

Based on the GSA framework, the GLIM hypothesis suggests three criteria for quantifying the metaphoricity of a given linguistic metaphor

Gesture co-occurrence

whether or not speakers gesture at all when using a linguistic metaphor





whether or not speakers produce gestures that reflect the meaning of the linguistic metaphor.





how effortful speakers' gestures are, e.g., one hand vs. both hands







raise the standard

high standard

low standard lower the standards







Special Collections



• • •



see Winter et al. (2013)







Videos manually coded for

- 1. Gesture co-occurrence (gesture vs. no gesture)
- 2. Gestural fit (fit vs. no fit)
- 3. Gestural effort (of those gestures that fit: one hand vs. two hands)



Prediction:

There will be higher rates of gesture cooccurrence, gestural effort and gestural fit for verbs ('lower', 'raise') than for adjectives ('low', 'high')



Statistical analyses





Gesture co-occurrence





Verbs vs. adjectives:

Log odds of speakers gesturing were 0.92 times higher alongside verbs than alongside adjectives (p = 0.0026)



Gestural fit



fits does not fit

raise the

standard

Gestural fit

fits does not fit



Verbs vs. adjectives: Log odds of speakers producing 'fitting' gestures were 1.28 times higher alongside verbs than alongside adjectives (p < 0.001)



Gestural effort





Verbs vs. adjectives: Log odds of speakers producing bothhanded metaphoric gestures were 1.16 times higher alongside verbs than alongside adjectives (p = 0.018)







Gesture co-occurrence





Conclusions



Metaphoric gestures for numerical quantity and emotional valence in the TV News Archive

Greg Woodin¹, Bodo Winter¹, Marcus Perlman¹, Jeannette Littlemore¹ and Teenie Matlock²









References

Barsalou, L. W. (1999). Perceptual symbol systems. Behavioral & Brain Sciences. 22: 577-660. Bergen, B. K. (2012). Louder than Words: The New Science of How the Mind Makes Meaning. New York, New York: Basic Books. Black, M. (1993) More about metaphor. A. Onony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 19-41. Bodytomy (2019). URL: https://bodytomy.com/premotor-cortex-location-structure-function [Accessed 1st May 2019] Casasanto, D. & Dijkstra, K. (2010). Motor action and emotional memory. *Cognition*. 115: 179-85. Casasanto, D. & de Bruin, A. (2019). Metaphors we learn by: Directed motor action improves word learning. *Cognition*, 182: 177-183. Davies, Mark. (2004-) BYU-BNC. (Based on the British National Corpus from Oxford University Press). URL: https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/ [Accessed 1st May 2019] Cienki, A. & Müller, C. (2008). Metaphor, gesture, and thought. R. W. Gibbs Jr. (ed.). The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 483-501. Gibbs Jr., R. W. (1994). The Poetics of Mind. Figurative, Thought, Language and Understanding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Glenberg, A. & Kaschak (2002). Grounding language in action. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. 9: 558-65. Hostetter, A. B. & Alibali, M. W. (2008). Visible embodiment: gestures as simulated action. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review. 15(3): 495-514. Jeannerod, M. (1994). The representing brain: Neural correlates of motor intention and imagery. Behavioral & Brain Sciences, 17: 187-245. Kendon, A. (2004). Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Klatzky, R. L., Pellegrino, J.W., McCloskey, B.P. & Doherty, S. (1989). Can you squeeze a tomato? The role of motor representations in semantic sensibility judgments. Journal of Memory and Language, 28: 56-77. Kosslyn, S. M. (1980). Image and Mind. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. Kövesces, Z. (2002). Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. London: Chicago University Press. McNeill, D. (1992). Hand and Mind: What Gestures Reveal about Thought. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. McNeill, D. (2005). Gesture and Thought. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Meier, B. P. & Robinson, M. D. (2004). Why the sunny side is up: associations between affect and vertical position. *Psychological Science*, 15(4): 243-7. Müller, C. (1998). Redegebegleitende Gesten: Kulturgeschichte-Theorie Sprachvergleich. Arno Spitz Verlag. Müller, C. (2008). Metaphors Dead and Alive, Sleeping and Waking: A Dynamic View. London: University of Chicago Press. Pulvermüller, F. (2005). Brain mechanisms linking language and action. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 6: 576-82. Stanfield, R. A. & Zwaan, R.A. (2001). The effect of implied orientation derived from verbal context on picture recognition. *Psychological Science*. 12: 153-6. Tversky, B., Kugelmass, S. & Winter, A. (1991). Cross-cultural and developmental trends in graphic productions. *Cognitive Psychology*, 23: 515-57. Woodin, G. & Winter, B. (2018). Placing abstract concepts in space: Quantity, time and emotional valence. Frontiers in Psychology, 9. Woodin, G., Winter, B., Perlman, M., Littlemore, J. & Matlock. T. (under review). Metaphoric gestures for numerical quantity and emotional valence in the TV News Archive. PLOS ONE. Winter, B., Perlman, M. & Matlock, T. (2013). Using space to talk and gesture about numbers: Evidence from the TV News Archive. Gesture, 13(3): 377-408. Wilson, N. L. & Gibbs Jr., R. W. (2007). Real and imagined body movement primes metaphor comprehension. Cognitive Science. 31: 721-31. Zwaan, R. A. (2009). Mental simulation in language comprehension and social cognition. European Journal of Social Psychology, 39(7)