

A MODEL OF PREDICTION STRATEGY IN MONOLINGUAL COMPREHENSION

Ismailova Dilfuza Atabekovna

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

2nd year Master's student of the

Department of Interpretation

E-mail: dilfuzaismailova.ok@mail.ru

ANNOTATION

It is well accepted that individuals utilise prediction to their advantage when trying to understand complicated and challenging language. Due to the requirement that interpreters pay attention to and generate statements in two distinct languages simultaneously, simultaneous interpreting is extremely challenging. Therefore, it is not unexpected that most explanations assume simultaneous interpreters employ prediction during understanding. There is, however, no widely recognised explanation of how interpreters forecast, despite efforts to ascertain when, what, and on what basis they make these predictions.

key words: prediction, simultaneous interpreting, comprehension, source language, target language, theoretical and empirical studies, prediction in monolinguals, predictable term.

Introduction

Without prediction, translators would not be able to render the proper translation of a phrase in the target language prior to coming across the pertinent phrase in the source language. People facilitate understanding by foreseeing future statements. But what happens when speakers of two different languages simultaneously perceive and

generate statements in each language? This article analyses the function of prediction in simultaneous interpreting and attempts to answer that query.

Methods

When a simultaneous interpreter creates the translated phrase in the target language before it is said in the source language, this is known as predictive production. It is thought to be a method employed by translators dealing with language pairings that are mismatched and have a lot of syntactic asymmetry. We've gone over how quickly words are recognized by listeners and how they're incorporated into a syntactic and semantic framework during comprehension. When a word in a phrase is predictable, such as the word 'bath' in the sentence 'The exhausted mother gave her dirty child a bath', the listener will often understand the predictable word more rapidly than a less predictable term (such as *shower*)¹.

One explanation for this is that the term 'bath' fits in with the previous context rather well; as a result, listeners understand it right away. However, understanding occurs much more swiftly than this bottom-up approach would imply since listeners frequently anticipate what they will hear (for a review, see Pickering & Gambi, 2018).²

Prediction, to us, refers to the pre-activation of any feature of a language representation—meaning, syntax, or form—prior to the listener hearing (or reading) that representation. In other words, it is feasible to predict the word mouth at several levels while listening to the sentence 'The dentist ordered the guy to open his **mouth** a bit wider' - for example, at the semantic (conceptual), at the syntactic (noun, singular), and at the phonological (e.g., /maʊθ/) levels. Thus, semantic, syntactic, and phonological prediction may be seen as distinct stages in the prediction process. Empirical investigations have shown prediction at each of these levels (and occasionally at more than one level). It's critical to distinguish between the quick integration of a predictable word in a context (as in Schwanenflugel and Shoben, 1985)

¹Schwanenflugel, P. J., & Shoben, E. J. (1985). The influence of sentence constraint on the scope of facilitation for upcoming words. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 24(2), 232-252. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(85\)90026-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(85)90026-9)

²Pickering, M. J., & Gambi, C. (2018). Predicting while comprehending language: A theory and review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(10), 1002-1044. doi:10.1037/bul0000158

and the pre-activation of a predictable word's properties. It is not the same as proving that an utterance has been anticipated to show that it is predictable. A precaution must be taken before the anticipated word is said, not after, in order to be certain that prediction has occurred. The psycholinguistic research examined in this review either use techniques that enable measurement of predictive processing prior to the appearance of a predictable word in conversation or else adopt a methodology that disqualifies an integration account from being the source of their results¹. Prediction is sometimes referred to as anticipation in Interpreting Studies, and theoretical and empirical studies have been founded on slightly diverse definitions of prediction. Studies on prediction in monolinguals provide empirical support for prediction during comprehension. In a ground-breaking experiment, Altmann and Kamide² (1999) gave participants scenarios with an agent (*e.g., a boy*) and four items (*e.g., a cake, a train set, a toy car, and a balloon*). The verb in the statement, such as '*The boy will eat the cake*' or '*The boy will move the cake*', was semantically related to either one or all four of the items in the display. When the participants heard the constraining verb (eat), anticipatory eye movements started toward the cake before the noun onset, but they did not do so when they heard the non-constraining word. This demonstrates how the verb edible's semantic information was utilized to anticipate the noun's meaning (an edible object). The visual-world paradigm (Boland, 2005; Kamide, Altmann, and Haywood, 2003) and investigations without a visual scene (Grisoni, McCormick Miller, & Pulvermüller, 2017)³ provide additional support for verb-mediated semantic prediction in monolinguals.

Conclusion

As interpreters must concurrently prepare their own forthcoming utterances based on the speech they are hearing, simultaneous interpreting is an ecological environment

¹ Federmeier, K. D., & Kutas, M. (1999). A Rose by Any Other Name: Long-Term Memory Structure and Sentence Processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 41(4), 469- 495. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1999.2660>

² Altmann, G. T. M., & Kamide, Y. (1999). Incremental interpretation at verbs: restricting the domain of subsequent reference. *Cognition*, 73(3), 247-264. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(99\)00059-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(99)00059-1)

³ Grisoni, L., McCormick Miller, T., & Pulvermüller, F. (2017). Neural correlates of semantic prediction and resolution in sentence processing. *The Journal of Neuroscience*. doi:10.1523/jneurosci.2800-16.2017

in which prediction during comprehension is particularly favourable. The more accurately they can anticipate the end of an incoming speech, the more effectively they may plan their own utterance. In rare situations, they may even translate a word into the target language before they hear it said in the source language. The degree of syntactic symmetry between the two languages, cognitive load, competency in the non-native language, and the extent of cross-activation that may occur between the two languages employed might all have an impact on this prediction. Future studies could investigate the impact of some of these elements on simultaneous interpreting prediction.

REFERENCES

1. *Altmann, G. T. M., & Kamide, Y. (1999). Incremental interpretation at verbs: restricting the domain of subsequent reference. Cognition, 73(3), 247-264. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(99\)00059-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(99)00059-1)*
2. *Federmeier, K. D., & Kutas, M. (1999). A Rose by Any Other Name: Long-Term Memory Structure and Sentence Processing. Journal of Memory and Language, 41(4), 469- 495. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1999.2660>*
3. *Grisoni, L., McCormick Miller, T., & Pulvermüller, F. (2017). Neural correlates of semantic prediction and resolution in sentence processing. The Journal of Neuroscience. doi:10.1523/jneurosci.2800-16.2017*
4. *Pickering, M. J., & Gambi, C. (2018). Predicting while comprehending language: A theory and review. Psychological Bulletin, 144(10), 1002-1044. doi:10.1037/bul0000158*
5. *Schwanenflugel, P. J., & Shoben, E. J. (1985). The influence of sentence constraint on the scope of facilitation for upcoming words. Journal of Memory and Language, 24(2), 232-252. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(85\)90026-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(85)90026-9)*