University "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola
Faculty of Education – Bitola
ISSN: 1857- 8888
DOI: 10.20544/teacher.30.12

EMBODIED COGNITION IN THE AGE OF DIGITAL INTERACTION

Bisera Kostadinovska Stojchevska, Elena Shalevska
University "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola, N. Macedonia
elena.shalevska@uklo.edu.mk, k_bisera@yahoo.com

Abstract

The theory of embodied cognition holds that linguistic meaning is fundamentally grounded in sensory-motor experience. Yet contemporary communication increasingly unfolds in digital environments where physical co-presence, gesture, and shared perceptual context are limited or absent. This paper examines how such digitally mediated interaction challenges, extends, and reframes embodiment-based approaches in cognitive linguistics. I argue that rather than producing genuine disembodiment, digital communication gives rise to new forms of mediated or quasi-embodiment. Emojis, GIFs, typographic stylizations, and other symbolic cues function as schematic proxies for facial expression, gesture, and affect, enabling recipients to engage in embodied simulation during interpretation. Touchscreen interfaces further introduce action-based routines—such as swiping, tapping, and dragging, that draw upon familiar spatial and force schemas and contribute to users 'construal of communicative events. These practices, together with the spatial and temporal affordances of digital platforms, constitute emerging image schemas and multimodal patterns that shape meaning construction. By situating digital interaction within an expanded framework of embodied cognition, the paper highlights how bodily grounding persists through new channels and shows the need for cognitive linguistic theory to account for hybrid, technologically mediated forms of embodiment.

Keywords: Cognitive linguistics, Cognition, Emojis, Gestures.

1. Introduction

Embodied cognition has become a central framework in cognitive linguistics, grounding meaning in the sensory-motor structures that shape human experience. Early work in this tradition emphasized that linguistic concepts arise from recurring bodily patterns—image schemas, perceptual routines, and action-based metaphors—rather than from abstract, amodal symbols (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Later accounts elaborated this view by arguing that language comprehension recruits perceptual and motor systems through simulation processes (Barsalou, 1999). These theories, though diverse, share a core assumption: communication is fundamentally rooted in bodies interacting within shared physical environments.

Digital communication complicates this assumption. Most contemporary interaction—texting, messaging, social media, comment threads—occurs without co-present bodies. There is no gesture, gaze, or shared physical context. At first glance, such environments seem to strain the embodied view of meaning. They appear disembodied. Yet users still communicate efficiently. They express emotion, nuance, stance, and interpersonal alignment. Something else is happening beneath the surface.

This paper argues that digital communication does not eliminate embodiment. Instead, it restructures it. People rely on symbolic proxies—emojis, GIFs, reaction images, typographic cues—to simulate affective and gestural signals. They also engage with touchscreens through swiping, tapping, and dragging, embedding motor routines into communicative practices. These actions are small, but meaningful. They constitute a new layer of mediated embodiment.

Understanding this shift requires treating digital environments as cognitive ecologies. They are not neutral channels. They shape how users attend, interpret, and act. Work on distributed and extended cognition shows that cognitive processes often incorporate tools, artifacts, and environments as part of their functional systems (Clark & Chalmers, 1998). Digital platforms operate in similar ways. Their affordances channel embodied habits into new forms, creating hybrid modes of meaning-making that blend physical action with symbolic mediation.

This paper explores these emerging forms of quasi-embodiment. It examines how digital interaction challenges, extends, and reframes classic embodied approaches. It also argues that cognitive linguistics must broaden its theoretical tools to account for technologically mediated forms of bodily grounding. Our communication habits are changing. Our theories must change with them.

2. Theoretical notions

2.1. Embodiment in Cognitive Linguistics

Embodiment is a cornerstone of cognitive linguistics. It posits that linguistic meaning is grounded in patterns of perception, action, and bodily experience. These patterns form recurrent structures—known as image schemas—that organize how speakers conceptualize spatial relations, force dynamics, and event structure (Johnson, 1987). The idea is simple but powerful. Our bodies shape our concepts. Our concepts shape our language.

This perspective has been reinforced by research showing that language comprehension involves partial reenactment, or simulation, of sensory-motor states. When people read about actions or emotions, neural systems associated with those states become active. The body participates in understanding. It does so automatically and often below conscious awareness (Glenberg & Kaschak, 2002). These findings support the view that meaning is not stored in abstract symbols but arises from embodied cognitive processes.

Multimodality further strengthens this claim. Gesture, prosody, posture, and other bodily cues form an integrated system with speech. Together they create complex meaning packages that cannot be reduced to words alone. As Gibbs (2005) argues, language and bodily action are deeply intertwined, and each shapes the cognitive routines that underlie communication. Without the body, linguistic meaning would be impoverished. This is the classical position.

Digital environments complicate this tradition. They restrict access to full-bodied cues, yet communication still thrives. Understanding why requires expanding the framework of embodiment to incorporate mediated forms of interaction.

2.2 Digital Interaction as Cognitive Ecology

Digital communication does not occur in a vacuum. It takes place within structured environments, interfaces, platforms, screens, that offer specific possibilities for action. These possibilities, or affordances, shape how users attend to information, how they move through communicative space, and how they coordinate social meaning. The body adapts to these environments. It learns new routines. Sometimes these routines become habitual.

The idea that cognition is distributed across individuals, tools, and environments is not new. Research in distributed cognition has long demonstrated that cognitive processes extend beyond the skull and into the material and social world (Hutchins, 1995). Digital platforms function in a similar way. They guide users through specific spatial layouts, temporal rhythms, and interaction patterns. In doing so, they become part of the cognitive system.

From this perspective, digital communication is not disembodied. It is differently embodied. Users manipulate touchscreens, navigate interfaces, and interpret symbolic cues embedded in platform design. These actions are grounded in sensory-motor experience. They rely on familiar schemas, up/down, container, path, force, and reorganize them within digital space. The environment shapes the body, and the body, in turn, shapes meaning.

This ecological view provides a theoretical foundation for understanding quasi-embodiment in digital interaction. It allows us to recognize how technological mediation alters—but does not erase—the embodied basis of linguistic meaning.

3. Methods

This study employs a qualitative, interpretive research design aimed at examining how digitally mediated communication challenges and extends traditional models of embodied cognition. Because the focus lies in conceptual analysis rather than hypothesis testing, the methodology integrates three complementary components: (1) a targeted theoretical literature review, (2) multimodal discourse sampling, and (3) analytic synthesis grounded in cognitive-linguistic principles. Together, these methods enable a systematic exploration of how symbolic, visual, and interactional cues function as forms of quasi-embodiment in digital contexts.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Quasi-Embodiment Through Visual and Symbolic Cues in Digital Text

4.1.1 Emojis as Affective and Embodied Proxies

Although digital communication lacks co-present bodies, users continually compensate through symbolic means. Emojis are a primary example. They represent schematic versions of facial expressions, gestures, and emotional states. Their simplicity is part of their power. A single curved mouth or tilted eyebrow can stand in for complex affective cues.

These symbols invite readers to perform embodied simulation during interpretation. When encountering a laughing emoji or a crying face, users mentally reenact the corresponding expression. They “feel” the smile. They “feel” the wince. Research shows that emoji processing activates affective and facial-motor systems similar to those involved in interpreting real emotional expressions (Kaye et al., 2016). Emojis are thus not mere decorations. They form a layer of quasi-embodied communication that supplements text.

They also conventionalize quickly. Some emojis retain iconic links to bodily states; others develop community-specific meanings or ironic uses. Regardless of their evolution, they continue to operate as compressed, easily deployable embodiments of feeling.

4.1.2 GIFs, Stickers, and Reaction Images

GIFs and reaction images extend this phenomenon. While emojis are schematic, GIFs often depict full-bodied movements, eye rolls, shrugs, applause, laughter. These images introduce dynamic cues that resemble gesture in face-to-face communication. They show bodies in motion. They show attitude.

Research in multimodal communication has shown that moving images can evoke strong embodied resonance, triggering motor and affective simulations in viewers (Mayer & Moreno, 2003). In digital contexts, GIFs function as performative stand-ins for gesture, prosody, or stance-taking. They allow users to project tone without using their own bodies.

They also create shared cultural repertoires. Much like conventional gestures, certain GIFs become recognizable shorthand for emotions, reactions, and social alignments. They form part of the embodied symbolic landscape through which digital communities communicate.

4.1.3 Typographic and Orthographic Embodiment

Not all quasi-embodied cues are visual. Some are built directly into the text itself. Users routinely manipulate typography, elongated letters, repeated vowels, capitalization, spacing, to convey rhythm,

intensity, or vocal expression. “Soooo goooood,” “NOPE,” or “uhhh…” invite readers to imagine prosodic contours. They encourage readers to hear the text.

These practices align with work showing that readers often simulate vocal and motor patterns during silent reading (Abramson & Goldinger, 1997). Text becomes performative. It points to breath, timing, emphasis, and bodily rhythm.

Typographic conventions thus form another domain of quasi-embodied expression. They remind us that embodiment need not rely on visible bodies. It can emerge from cues that prompt readers to mobilize their own bodily resources during meaning construction.

4.2. Embodiment in Touchscreen Interaction

4.2.1 Touch as Interface and Motor Schema

Touchscreen devices have introduced a new repertoire of everyday motor routines. Users swipe, tap, pinch, scroll, and long-press with remarkable fluency. These actions are not neutral. They draw upon deeply entrenched sensory-motor schemas that structure how humans interact with the physical world. A swipe echoes a pushing motion. A pinch mirrors a compressing or bringing-together action. Even a tap carries the logic of brief, targeted contact.

These gestures activate spatial and force schemas such as up/down, open/close, contact/no contact, and pressure, which cognitive linguistics has long viewed as foundational to conceptual organization (Talmy, 2000). Users therefore engage in bodily routines that underpin their understanding of digital space. The body learns these gestures as part of its communicative repertoire. They become automatic. They become meaningful.

Importantly, these actions also shape how information is accessed and navigated. A swipe does not just move content; it enacts a motion through conceptual space. The interface invites users to think through the body.

4.2 Interaction Design and Conceptual Metaphors

Touchscreen interfaces rely heavily on embodied metaphors. Commands such as “drag to trash,” “pull to refresh,” and “slide to unlock” present digital actions in terms of familiar physical ones. Users understand these metaphors immediately. They work because they map onto well-established patterns of bodily experience.

This design philosophy builds on the insight that conceptual metaphors structure cognition by projecting sensory-motor experience onto abstract domains (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Digital interfaces take this principle literally. They create environments where virtual objects behave according to physical expectations—folders look like containers; lists scroll like vertical paths; buttons react to pressure. These metaphors reduce cognitive load and encourage intuitive navigation (Norman, 2013). They also shape how users conceptualize digital communication as movement, contact, or manipulation within a spatial field.

In short, the interface is not merely a surface. It is a metaphorical landscape grounded in the body.

4.3 Gesture as Part of Linguistic Construal

Touch gestures become part of how users construe communicative sequences. Although these gestures are not visible to interlocutors, they contribute silently to the process of meaning-making. Scrolling through a conversation, tapping a message to open it, or pressing and holding to select text all involve micro-actions that structure how users perceive and interpret discourse. The body organizes the flow of language.

This aligns with research showing that gesture and motor activity influence how speakers conceptualize events and relations, even when the gestures are not communicative in the traditional sense (Hostetter & Alibali, 2008). Touch gestures operate similarly. They guide attention. They segment information. They shape interactional timing. Through these embodied routines, users develop a feel for conversation that blends physical action with symbolic interpretation.

Touch thus becomes an integral—if often invisible—component of digital linguistic practice. It grounds cognition in movement, even when the movement is small.

5. Conclusion

Digital communication does not sever the connection between language and the body. Instead, it reshapes it in ways that reveal the flexibility of embodied cognition. Even in environments where visible gestures, facial expressions, and shared physical context are absent, users draw on a wide array of quasi-embodied cues to construct and interpret meaning. Emojis, GIFs, reaction images, and typographic stylization operate as symbolic proxies for bodily states, inviting readers to simulate gestures, emotions, and prosodic rhythms. These cues demonstrate that embodiment persists through representational forms.

At the same time, touchscreen interfaces introduce a new layer of bodily grounding. The manual actions that structure digital interaction—swiping, tapping, pinching, long-pressing—are not merely functional motions. They rely on entrenched sensory-motor schemas and create patterned routines that shape how users navigate communicative space. Interface metaphors such as “drag to trash” or “pull to refresh” map familiar physical experiences onto digital actions, reinforcing the role of embodied cognition in interaction design. These gestures, though often invisible in the communicative exchange, contribute silently to users ’construal of messages and interactions. They anchor interpretation in movement.

Taken together, these forms of mediated and micro-embodiment call for an expanded theoretical framework. Cognitive linguistics must account for the hybrid systems in which meaning now emerges, systems that blend symbolic cues with physical action, and bodily routines with interface design. Digital communication is not a departure from embodied cognition but an evolution of it. As communicative practices become increasingly screen-based, understanding how meaning remains grounded in the body—both directly and through mediation—becomes essential for explaining how language continues to function in digitally saturated environments.

References

Barsalou, L. W. (1999). Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 22*(4), 577–660.

Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis, 58*(1), 7–19.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

Gibbs, R. W. (2005). Embodiment and cognitive science. Cambridge University Press.

Glenberg, A. M., & Kaschak, M. P. (2002). Grounding language in action. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 9(*3), 558–565.

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild.* MIT Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. University of Chicago Press.

Abramson, M., & Goldinger, S. D. (1997). What the reader's eye tells the mind's ear: Silent reading activates inner speech. *Perception & Psychophysics, 59*(7), 1059–1068.

Kaye, L. K., Malone, S. A., & Wall, H. J. (2017). Emojis: Insights, affordances, and possibilities for psychological science. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 21(2):*66-68.

Mayer, R. E., & Moreno, R. (2003). Nine ways to reduce cognitive load in multimedia learning. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(1), 43–52

Hostetter, A. B., & Alibali, M. W. (2008). Visible embodiment: Gestures as simulated action. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 15*(3), 495–514.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* University of Chicago Press.

Norman, D. A. (2013). The design of everyday things (Revised and expanded edition). Retrieved from: **https://dl.icdst.org/pdfs/files4/4bb8d08a9b309df7d86e62ec4056ceef.pdf**

Talmy, L. (2000). Toward a cognitive semantics (Vol. 1). MIT Presss.