

УДК 925 : 159-134-124.14

**Ernest Ivashkevych**

PhD in Psychology, Professor's assistant  
the translator at the Department of English Language Practice  
and Teaching Methodology  
Rivne State University of the Humanities,  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7219-1086>

DOI <https://doi.org/10.35619/prapr.v1i18.294>

## PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS OF THE DISCOURSE'S ACTUALIZATION

**Abstract.** *In this article there were proposed psychological factors of the discourse's actualization. They are, first of all, psycholinguistic presupposition in the process of communication, quasi- communication or understanding the text is a special kind of logical mastering of information, cognitive explication of frames by means of actualization of a common fund of knowledge of participants in communication about the world, its organization, the place of a person in it and others. Psycho-linguistic presupposition in a case of human implementation of communication or quasi- communication in the cross-cultural environment is characterized by common experience, a common thesaurus, updating of common preliminary information about a certain phenomenon, event, state of affairs, etc., which communicants have. Thanks to psycholinguistic presupposition, discourse creates a zone of intersection of cognitive spaces of communication of participants, which are also narrow from the point of view of their expanding into the process of communication or quasi-communication.*

*It was shown that in the Internet communication psycho-linguistic presuppositions are cognitive in their content. The existence of all possible presuppositions of the person forms its outlook, makes it possible for a broader communicative space. The absence of joint presuppositions makes it impossible for people to understand each other, makes their communication more and more difficult. In this case, on the contrary, people who have joint presuppositions without any complication understand the information, which for representatives of other linguistic culture may seem completely "opaque", difficult for understanding.*

*Consequently, psycholinguistic presupposition in the process of communication or quasi-communication is an implicit component of the meaning of the message (statement) that is real, therefore, this message (statement) can not, in general, be perceived as semantically abnormal one or inappropriate in a certain area of communication or quasi-communication. The second factor was psycholinguistic semantic presuppositions. We analyzed it as a certain semantic component of the message (statement, judgment), the inaccuracy of which in a particular situation makes the message abnormal or inappropriate. We proved, that in the space of communication or quasi-communication there were actualized pragmatic psycho-linguistically marked presupposition, which were a component of the message, the speech genre, and discourse (or a text), were directly related to subjective factors of communication (orientation in different situations of communication or quasi-communication, actualization of social, cognitive, gender, etc., characteristics of people in one communicative act), the absence of which converted a message, speech genre, discourse (or a text), communication in general into inappropriate – such as insincere, unnatural, provocative, that did not conceal positive conditions, which made a success in a whole.*

**Key words:** *psychological factors of the discourse's actualization, psycholinguistic presupposition, psycholinguistic semantic presuppositions, pragmatic psycho-linguistically marked presupposition.*

**Problem's statement.** Traditionally *discourse* has the meaning of an orderly written, but often speech activity of the individual subject. In recent decades the term has become widespread in

humanities and now it has new values. Frequent identification of the text and the discourse are linked, firstly, to the lack of a term equivalent to French and English in some European languages. Secondly, the discourse is nearly to the fact that earlier in the scope of the notion of discourse it had been included only into linguistic practice. In such times when discourse analysis has become a special field of scientific researches it became clear that the meaning of discourse is not limited to written and verbal speech. It also indicates exotic semiotic processes. The emphasis in the paradigm of the interpretation of discourse is placed on its interactive nature. Discourse is, first of all, a language immersed in life, in a social context (for this reason, the concept of discourse is rarely used in relations to ancient texts).

**Analysis of recent researches and publications.** Discourse is not an isolated textual or dialogical structure, because much more meaning within this term acquires paralinguistic accompaniment of a language that performs a number of functions (rhythmic, reference, semantic, emotional and evaluation, etc.). Also discourse is an essential component of socio-cultural interaction (Михальчук & Онуфрієва, 2020).

The use of discourse in the learning process is necessary as one of its important functions is to familiarize those people who are learning a foreign language with samples of speech and the behavior of native speakers of different languages, their ways of presentation of different cultures in different, not unclear situations (Mykhalchuk & Ivashkevych, 2019).

Discourse is also important for the process of mastery of linguistic means which are in need to be studied not in isolation, but in the context. In such a way the discourse shows how a particular language phenomenon is used in one or another language situation. So, **the aim** of our article was to show psychological factors of the discourse's actualization.

**The results of the research and their discussion.** The word "discourse" in French linguistics means speech in general, with some peculiar terminological meaning that is also the same in the individual speech of the person. Throughout of this existence the concept of "discourse" was interpreted ambiguously. Also some scientists considered discourse to be a coherent text (Гончарук & Онуфрієва, 2018). Other scientists regard it as a type of the text. For example, some of them call discourse a collection of texts of a certain thematic direction: 1) *special discourse* – texts of monographs; 2) *popular science discourse* – texts of popular scientific magazines; 3) *didactic (pedagogical) discourse* – texts of textbooks; 4) *legal discourse* – texts of the country's legal system (Максименко, Ткач, Литвинчук & Онуфрієва, 2019).

Discourse is also called a process associated with a real speech production, which unfolds in time and space in a certain way. Discourse is also interpreted as a dialogue and as a category of speech, having been materialized in the oral or written form, having been completed from semantic and structural points of view. There is a definition of discourse as a social and communicative object, basic psycho-linguistic characteristics of which are determined by contacts with the practical actions which, in their turn, are necessary for the understanding of discourse (Івашкевич & Коваль, 2020).

Over the last decades the concept of "discourse" has become interdisciplinary and was studied by various sciences, each of which imposes its own meaning. For example, cognitive linguistics understand discourse as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, extra-linguistic factors (knowledge of the world, thoughts, settings, goals of the addressee) which are necessary for understanding this or that text (Mykhalchuk & Bihunova, 2019). Discourse is understood by us from the standpoint of lingual pragmatics. We'll highlight three stages in people's behavior: a situation, the discourse and the manifestation. In the opinions, discourse is a linguistic implementation of coded relevant constituent and recipient of information. It consists of three components: a plot, a dialect (oriented geographically, by time and social factors) and a dia-type (a discourse field, a discourse register, a discursive modus and the phases of discourse implementation, a design, structuring, a content of presentation, a conclusion, the evaluation, the interactions). The latter indicates that discourse is understood by us as a unique speech act.

So, we identify three psychological approaches to the concept of “discourse”. The first approach, taken from the standpoint of formally or structurally oriented Psychology, defines discourse as two or more sentences connected by their content. The second approach provides a functional definition of discourse as “any way of the language use”. This approach determines the conditionality of the analysis of the functions of discourse by studying the functions of a language in a broad socio-cultural context. The third approach defines discourse as the utterance and puts its meaning on the paradigm of interaction of the form and the functions of the statements. In this case, discourse is understood not as a primitive set of isolated units of the linguistic structure “bigger than sentences”, but it is understood as the integral set of functionally organized, contextualized units of language use.

The expansion of the sphere of use of the concept of “discourse” led to the fact that it is also used in the theory of teaching foreign languages. According to scientists, the borrowing from the linguistics of the term “discourse” and then the application of discursive analysis in the theory and practice of teaching foreign languages are important. This allows us for better distribution of foreign language discursive structures that are characteristics of a particular sphere of communication, since discourse helps to select and make structures of necessary texts, to define the categories of documents. We believe that discursive analysis also allows a specialist who has come across a communicative situation unknown to him/her to acquire the necessary skills to transfer the discursive competence from one discursive space to another one.

Consequently, the introduction of the concept of “discourse” in the theory of teaching foreign languages was not an accidental use of the linguistic term. The notion of “discourse” is used by a number of sciences who have their own points of view from different perspectives. For the theory and practice of teaching a foreign language the understanding of discourse as a unique speech act is important, it is not limited to concrete language expressions, but also has certain extra-linguistic parameters (they are personal and social characteristics).

A few thousand years ago the written form of speech was understood by us as a way to overcome the distance between the speaker and the addressee – the distance both spatial and temporal. This overcoming became possible only with the help of a special technological invention – the creation of a physical medium of information: clay tablets, papyrus, berries, etc. The further development of technologies have led to the emergence of a more complex repertoire of forms of a language and a discourse – such as *printed discourse, telephone conversation, radio broadcasting, correspondence by e-mail*. All these types of discourse are allocated on the basis of the type of information carrier and have their own peculiarities. Communication by e-mail is a special interest as a phenomenon that has been arisen 10-15 years ago, which has received during this time a huge distribution and has a medium position between oral and written discourse. Like a written discourse, electronic discourse uses a graphical way of fixing information, but like oral discourse it differs with passivity and informality. Even more pure example of connections of features of oral and written discourse is communication in the mode of Talk (or Chat), in which two partners of communication “speak” through a computer network: on the one half of the screen the participant of the dialogue writes his/her own text, and on the other hand the half of the text can be seen the initially as so called “displayed text” of another partner. The study of the features of electronic communication is one of the most actively developing areas of contemporary discourse analysis.

The pragma-psychological model of discourse highlights the signs by a way or channels of communication. By means of communication there are distinguished informational means, meaningful and actual ones, serious and not serious means, etc. By the channel of communication we’ll distinguish oral and written, contact and distance, virtual and real types of discourses.

It is worth mention another kind of discourse – it is imaginary ones. A person can use the language without making any acoustic or graphic traces of linguistic activity. In this case the language is also used communicatively, but the same person is both the speaker and the addressee. Due to the absence of easily observable manifestations the imagined discourse is much less studied than oral and written ones. One of the most famous studies of imaginary discourse, or, in traditional terminology, the internal language belongs to N. Mykhalchuk & S. Bihunova (2019).

Under the conditions of various general ways of techniques of teachings, communicative principles, argumentative ones, conflicts and harmonious types of discourse are realized. According to socio-demographic criteria, children, adolescents, men, women, residents of the city and villages, etc., are allocated.

Another approach to the classification of discourse is the classification of some Ukrainian scientists (Максименко, Ткач, Литвинчук & Онуфрієва, (2019)). They distinguish TV and radio discourses, newspaper, theater, film discourse, literary discourse, discourse in the field of public relations (PR), advertising discourse, also political and religious discourse. As we think, the main criteria for the selection of types of discourse is the degree of formalism of communication, as well as the opposition of oral and written discourse. On the basis of some type of information, the following types of contemporary discourse are distinguished: radio broadcast, printed discourse, telephone conversation, correspondence by e-mail, communication on the Internet. All varieties of discourse have their own peculiarities, their research is actively engaged in the field of contemporary discursive analysis.

So, we identified five types of discourse, which are implemented depending on the situation:

- *Discourse as using different means of some communicative action* (for example, conversation for the purpose of information and education or a pre-arranged discussion).
- *Discourse as means of ideological influence*, that is communicative action, which only takes into account the form of discourse (all forms of ideological justification).
- *Therapeutic discourse* (psychoanalytic conversation between a doctor and a patient).
- *Normal discourse*, which serves to substantiate problematic claims to values (for example, scientific discussion).
- *New forms of discourse* (learning through discourse instead of the discourse as a tool for information and instructions, a model of a free or open discussion).

Larger differences between the types of discourse are described with the help of the concept of the genre. This concept was originally used in literary criticism to distinguish such types of literary pieces of art as, for example, short stories, essays, novels, etc. We have suggested a broader understanding of the term “genre”, which extends not only to literary but also to other language achievements. From this point of view the concept of the genre is used in the discursive analysis quite widely. Exhaustive classification of genres does not exist, but examples can be called household dialogue (conversations), stories (narrative), instruction of using the device, interview, report, political statement, a poem, a novel.

Genres have some fairly stable characteristics. For example, the story, firstly, should have a standard composition (a tie, the culmination, the interlace) and, secondly, has some linguistic features: the narrative contains some events organized in a timed manner, which are described by the same type of grammatical forms (for example, verbs in the past time) and between which there are some connecting elements (the types of unions). The problems of the language specificity of genres are not developed enough. In the researches having been done by us (Mykhalchuk & Ivashkevych, 2019) it was shown that for many genres to emphasize stable formal characteristics is quite difficult. We proposed to consider genres as cultural concepts, lacking stable language characteristics, and further to distinguish types of discourse on the basis of empirically observed and quantitatively measurable parameters – such as the use of past forms of time, the use of adjectives, the use of personal pronouns, etc.

From the point of view of sociolinguistics, two main types of discourse can be distinguished: personal one (individually oriented) and institutional discourse. In the first case, the speaker acts as the personality in the eighth riches of his/her inner world. In the second case the person is a representative of a certain social institution. Personal discourse exists in two main varieties: everyday and existential types of communication.

Consumer communication takes place between well-known people. It is reduced to maintain contacts and to solve everyday problems. The peculiarity of discourse is that this dialogue is dialogical in its essence, proceeds dashed, the participants of the communication know each other

well and therefore communicate by a shorter distance without talking in details about what is being discussed. This conversation is obvious and easy to understand. It is for this type of discourse that we rightly state that verbal communication only complements non-verbal, type of a dialogue, and the main information is transmitted by mimicry, gestures, actions accompanying the process of speech. The specifics of everyday communication are reflected in details in conversational language studies. Everyday communication is a natural source of discourse, organically assimilated from early childhood. This type of discourse is characterized by spontaneity, strong situational dependence, pronounced subjectivity, has logical violations, and it is characterized by structural formality of the expressions. Phonetically here is a fuzzy, fast process of pronunciation. Communicating is provided at the household level, people resort to lowered and slang vocabulary, although statistically speaking words make up no more than 10% of the lexical fund of expressions from colloquial speech. The most important characteristics of units of spoken language is their specific denotative orientation. These words are indicative by their purpose (that is why they are easily replaced by non-verbal signs). In addition, in a narrow circle of well-known people, the limiting (restrictive, passive) function of communication is realized, communicants use those signs that emphasize their belonging to the respective team (family, group words) and they are incomprehensible to outsiders. The fuzziness of the pronunciation correlates with the semantic fuzziness of the units: the meaning of the words is rather mobile, the words are easily replaced by the approximate substitutions, a language in which the pronouns and cries are led have such a presentation: “Well, what are you?” – “So, I’m here, here ...” – “Oh, well, well”.

Household discourse differs in such a way that the addressee has to understand the speaker from the first word. The active role of the addressee in the case of this type of discourse gives the sender more opportunities for quick switching of topics, as well as for easy translation of information into subtext (the irony, a language game, hints, etc.).

In contrast to the household in the paradigm of existential discourse, the attempts are made to reveal their inner world in all its characteristics; communication is widespread, with a richly saturated character; all forms of the language are used on the basis of the literary language; eternal communication is mostly monolithic and it is represented by the pieces of fiction and philosophical and by psychologically introspective texts.

*Exhaustive discourse* can be direct and indirect. *Direct existential discourse* is represented by two opposite views: a semantic transition and a semantic breakthrough. The compositional form of the semantic transition is reasoning; that is verbal expression of thoughts and feelings, the purpose of which is the definition of non-obvious phenomena that are related to the external or inner world of a man. Significant breakthrough is an insight, a sudden understanding of the essence of the matter, a state of heart, a state of things. The compositional-linguistic form of a semantic breakthrough is a text flow of images, a peculiar magma of content, torn apart with its closest mental formations; this may be a coordinate listing of diverse unconnected entities or phenomena, as a combination of incompatible signs or deliberate contradiction. The continuum of consciousness is rebuilt and structured according to new landmarks, which are suggested by certain figurative supports. This restructuring is accompanied by a strong emotional upheaval. That is why similar texts require multiple repetitions, and each repetition is realized by the recipient as the important experience.

*The indirect existential discourse* is the analogous (portable) and allegorical (symbolic) development of the idea through the narrative and description. The narrative is a statement of events in their sequence, the plot and its in-depth development and a superficial recount of events which are essential to the artistic narrative in general. The description is a static characteristic of the obvious, observable phenomena. The narrative and descriptive analogy are based on the stable socially fixed immediate semantic connections, while the parable components of discourse requires a wider cultural context and relies on the active support of the recipient of the speech process.

*Institutional discourse* is a communication within the specified limits of status-role relationships. With proposals of a contemporary society, it is obvious that the following types of institutional discourse can be singled out: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military,

pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sport, scientific, stage and mass information. This list can be changed or expanded, since public institutions are significantly different from each other and can not be regarded as homogeneous phenomena. In addition, they are historically variable, can merge with each other and occur as some varieties within a particular type. For example, it's problematic to talk about the institutional discourse of numismatists or fishermen. Institutional discourse is allocated on the basis of two system-based attributes: the goals and participants of communication. The purpose of *political discourse* is conquest and maintenance of power. The *pedagogical discourse* is the process of socialization of a new member of a society. The *medical discourse* is the provision of qualified assistance to the person. The main participants in the process of institutional discourse are the representatives of the institute (agents) and the people who appeal to them (clients). For example, it is a teacher and a pupil, a doctor and a patient, a politician and a voter, a priest and a parishioner. Participants in the paradigm of institutional discourse are quite different by their qualities and behavioral precepts: the relationships between a soldier and an officer have many fundamental differences, for example, from the side of relationships between the consumer and the sender of advertising. There is a different degree of openness of discourse, for example, clients in the framework of scientific, business and diplomatic discourse do not differ from agents, whereas clients of political, legal, medical and religious discourse show a sharp difference from the agents of the relevant discourse.

In the paradigm of the *pedagogical discourse* the share of the personal components is quite large (it differs from the linguistic and cultural points of view, for example, different modes of communication between teachers and students are adopted in Ukrainian and American schools; in our country relations between schoolchildren and teachers are traditionally closer than in the USA, but, on the other hand, there is less formal relationship between students and university teachers than in Ukraine.

In scientific and business discourse the personal component is much less pronounced, though, for example, recently traditional impersonal types of communication are rarely used in the genres of scientific articles. Direct existential discourse in the form of a semantic transition is represented in any kind of logical inferences. These forms of discourse are well-lit in psycholinguistic literature. Less studied are types of semantic breakthrough. It should be noted that if a semantic transition with a high degree of probability leads the recipient to the result that was planned by the author, then a successful semantic breakthrough takes a place much less often. In the case of a communicative failure of the semantic transition, one or the other logical errors or deliberate sophistries can be detected, and a failed semantic breakthrough turns into a whole noise, an incomprehensible verbal accumulation. Here, perhaps, it is a suitable analogy with the special quasi-holographic images on the plane circular at this time, the volume depth and the strange sharpness of the image which appears in a particular way of viewing, all other methods disperse the attention and do not lead to stereoscopic effect.

Scientific discourse traditionally attracts the attention of psycho-linguists. Participants in scientific discourse are researchers as representatives of the scientific community, while the characteristic feature of this discourse is the fundamental equality of all participants in scientific communication in the sense that none of the researchers has a monopoly on the truth, and the infinity of knowledge makes each scientist critically treated as the alien, so and to their delights. In the scientific community, the "counterpart", which neutralizes all status features, is accepted. At the same time, scientists differ in their desire to set different barriers for the third-degree, degree of scientific qualification, academic rank and membership in prestigious scientific communities. The diada "the agent – a client", convenient for the description of participants of other types of institutional discourse, in the scientific discourse needs more great modifications. The fact is that the task of the scientist is not only to acquire knowledge, to evaluate it and to report it to the public, but also to prepare new scientists. Therefore, scientists act in several hypostases, while showing various status-role characteristics: a scientist – a researcher, the educator, a scientist – the expert, a popularizer. Clients of scientific discourse are clearly outlined only by its periphery. It is a general

public that reads popular scientific magazines and watches the corresponding TV shows, on the one hand, and the beginning researchers who are studying in chairs and laboratories, on the other hand.

Considering the genres of the scientific language, the authors differentiate discourse them on the basis of two criteria – the unity or integrity of the macro-text and primacy or secondary, and allocate the discourse as the primary monograph, dissertation, the article, and secondary – as the abstract, the review, a thesis. The scholarly colloquial subtext, in which the report and polemical statement is differentiated, does not differ fundamentally the type of thinking, as it was shown in another text, it is a more stronger factor than the form of the person's speech. It deserves our attention to a special study which deals with the monographic preface as a special type of secondary scientific text, which is a meta-text (to know more information about information), in which various types of pragmatic concepts are implemented – introductive ones, exposition and descriptive concepts and others.

The values of scientific discourse are concentrated in its key concepts (truth, knowledge, research), are reduced to the recognition of the world's awareness, the need to multiply knowledge and prove their objectivity, show the personal attitude to the facts and to behave themselves impartiality in the search for truth, to a high degree of accuracy in the wording and show the clarity of thinking.

Such a variety of classifications is a very positive factor. Classification differences in the most cases are not mutually exclusive but complementary by virtue of the principle of uncertainty, and the typology of discourse is chosen by the researcher in accordance with the needs of a particular analysis, since in a real communication the types and subtypes of discourse are mostly superimposed by one another.

Consequently, the concept of discourse is one of the main concepts of contemporary pragmatic Psychology and psycho-linguistics of the text. Despite the fact that the theory of discourse and its typology have long been developed by linguists, there is still no universal definition of this concept, which would include all its aspects; and the unified system of the criteria for the classification of its varieties has not been developed. In such a way there are several classifications of discourse proposed by psychologists, philosophers, culturologists, linguistics.

Discourse is just as dual as the text, since it touches one another on statics, and the other part of the text by its dynamics, but the dynamics are not the way of rationalization of the text, but the dynamics of the living, situational oral speech (or the generated speech), which is the expression of the language as the means of communication.

The relationships between the text and discourse proposed here is by no means indisputable. Typically, discourse is understood as a coherent text (minimal text – a sentence) in conjunction with extra-linguistic factors, which with other factors go beyond the competence of psycho-linguistics. These factors are called *pragmatic* ones. With regard to the text, correlated with the type of any discourse, it is interpreted as an abstract, formal structure that implements itself in the paradigm of discourse. Discourse can be the subject of sociological analysis (for example, interviews).

To begin with, we'd like to note that for a long time in the traditional and recent studies of the media there were ignored the obvious facts that newspapers and television news were a special kind of discourse. The usual approach to the study of media was limited by focusing mainly on the economic, political, social or psychological aspects of the processing of news texts. This orientation was useful from that point of view that it is enabled to identify the main factors involved into the production of news and into the processes of using or influencing these messages to their partner of communication (or to a consumer). Various forms of content analysis have the aim to reach the adequate description of the individual characteristics of the texts of the mass media with the main goal – to identify the features of the relevant contexts (for example, the positive or negative reaction of the audience). The adequacy of this approach was determined rather by the reasonableness of the conceptual apparatus has been used, as well as the sophistication of the statistical processing of the results obtained, rather than the depth of scientific understanding of the texts or messages, just as the texts having been used in mass media.

Otherwise we propose the approach to study the texts, focusing on the study of the very essence of the process of mass communication, such as – on the very speech itself. By this approach, speech communication is not only analyzed in terms, or it is subjected to observation and statistical processing, but also it is studied as a special type of the text by their speech use, which belongs to a specific socio-cultural activity.

What does it mean? This means that the texts used in the space of mass media should be analyzed in terms of their own structural organization. Such structural analysis is not limited to a linguistic description of the semantic structures of isolated words, phrases or even sentences, as in the case of structural Psychology. In our opinion, the texts are characterized by more complex features (such as the relations between the sentences, the characteristics of the general thematic structure, the schematic organization of the text, as well as a number of stylistic and rhetorical parameters).

Texts are used in the mass media, have been submitted by writing or orally in the form of a monologue or a dialogue, received a comprehensive description in this approach. Similarly, we can adequately (we'd like to say, from a sociological point of view) describe the structure and the functions of headings in the texts of newspaper articles, the stylistic and thematic organization of the texts itself. Similarly, texts in the form of interview can be examined from the perspective of changing their roles, for the partners of communication, using different strategies, etc.

Also new is such the approach to the objects, that as we see that many factors and conditions for the presentation of the texts having been used in mass media (from economic conditions to social and institutional procedures for the production of news texts), which can now be clearly correlated with various structural characteristics of these texts. The same applies to the processes of the perception (consumption): understanding, memorizing and reproducing the information contained in the texts which can now be studied in terms of the condition of their textual and contextual (cognitive, social) features of the process of communication.

The words “contextual”, a “context” are used here not in their own psycho-linguistic sense. In psycho-linguistics under the context (from the Latin “contextus”, which means a combination, a communication) is understood the fragment of the text, which contains selected semantic units for the analysis. In psycho-linguistics, micro- and macro-contexts are distinguished. The micro-context is the minimal textual environment of the unit in which it implements its meaning. Macro-context is a text's environment of the studied unit, which allows us to set its function in the text as a whole. Selection of key words of the text is possible only with the use of macro-context.

From the psychological point of view it is necessary to distinguish clearly between the linguistic context and extra-linguistic one (Latin “extra” is the prefix corresponding to the Ukrainian “outside”, “above the context”). From a methodological point of view, in psycho-linguistics the context implies a theoretical construct, which postulates that the linguistic abstracts from the actual speech situation are affirmed as contextual one only by those factors that (due to their influence on the participants of the linguistic event) systematically determine the form, conformity and meaning of the statements.

The theoretical and linguistic concept of “context of expression” is based on the pre-theoretical (extra-linguistic) concept of “context”, which within the framework of its psycho-linguistic paradigm is indeterminated and intuitive. In the context of sociolinguistics under the extra-linguistic context we'll understand the situation of communication with all its components (spatial and temporal ones).

The context is explicit (from English “explicit” is exact, definite, fully expressed) and implicit (from English “implicit” is implied). The implicit context is one of the varieties of presupposition (from Latin “prae” is in front, before + suppositio – it is assumptions, predictions). Since the concept of presupposition is of some interest to psycho-linguistics, it should be considered in more details.

The prototype of a contemporary concept of “presupposition” is the notion of “supposition”. The original scholastic doctrine, well-known as the “opposition”, argued that for a deep understanding of the meaning of the word, first of all, it have to be understood that this (superficial)

meaning implies. Despite the diversity of different approaches to the concept of “presupposition” (logical, linguistic, psycho- linguistic, sociological), two main methodological approaches that can be conventionally called semantic and pragmatic ones are of the greatest interest. In turn, in the semantic approach to the analysis of presuppositions, two directions are singled out. The first comes from the logical-philosophical concept and reaches the English linguistic philosophy. The representatives of the second line, while remaining within the extract of the psycho-linguistic analysis, although with a bias towards philosophy, consider presuppositions as the sentences which logically follow from the press-positioned sentence and their negotiation.

The language “bridge” that connects the experience of the individual with the spiritual culture of all mankind is discourse, and the existence of the phenomenon of aesthetic experience “to”, “posture” and “regardless” of discursive practices is impossible.

The most theories call the discourse “an inalienable communication agent” – it is the bearer and re-transmitter of meanings, ideas, values, images, thoughts, interpretations and other mental and virtual formations. The discourse is also interpreted as a power resource through which social institutions and individuals carry out self-presentation, as well as legitimization, design and promotion of certain images of the reality. The discourses do not reflect a certain abstract external world that is outside a human being, but they themselves create the world and this world looks completely real or true for the subject who speaks.

The foregoing power of discourse lies in the person’s ability to create diverse (social, cultural, political, etc.) identities. However, the set of possible identities is limited and depends on the range of discursive resources, which are available to the individual, which, in turn, is related to his/her social status and culture. Thus, discourse becomes a password for identifying a person, means of him/her realization and the material embodiment of discourse (they are texts in any form: written or oral words, symbols, images, artifacts). The most powerful, in our opinion, discursive resource is capable for bringing people around certain cultural value and ideals. According to our mind, precedent text is the foundation of collective discourse and a criterion for social identification of the person, because each individual acquires by the other subjects a set of texts created by the culture which is the inexhaustible semiotic resource for self-reflection and self-presentation in the paradigm of discourses. In such a way we define case-law texts as rather significant for one or another person in the cognitive and emotional sense, having a person-specific character, that is well-known and wide-ranging environment of this personality.

Thus, contextual use of the terms, that is the discovery of hidden meaning, which implies the concept of a supposition, is related. The medieval doctrine of the supposition indicates the presence of the closest semantic environment of the main value. And with the notion of presupposition there is an indication of peripheral meanings which form a kind of configuration, characteristic features of the semantic field of a certain word. The discursive analysis can lead to a new understanding of those processes of production and use of messages that are rightfully considered the most significant in the study of mass communication.

The concept of discourse is often associated with the types and forms of speech, the principles of constructing a message, its rhetoric, the characteristics of the speech of the individual and groups of people.

The blurredness of the term “discourse” is due to two reasons: the history of formation, when in semantics of “memory” tokens contain signs of their previous use, and the uncertainty of the place of the concept of “discourse” in the system of existing categories and modes of the language expression.

The discourse is a type of communicative activity, an interactive phenomenon, a speech stream that has various forms of the expression (oral, written, para-lingual). They are represented within a specific channel of communication, which is regulated by the strategies and tactics of the participants; the discourse shows the synthesis of cognitive, linguistic, and extra-language (social, psychic, psychological) factors, which are determined by a specific circle of “forms of life”, depending on the subject of communication, has the result of the formation of various speech genres.

Discursive technique is the totality of speech-thinking actions of the partners of communication connected with cognition, comprehension and presentation of the world by a speaker and with the comprehension of the linguistic picture of the world of the addressee or of the listener.

**Conclusions and perspectives of further researches.** So, we proposed *psychological factors* of the discourse's actualization. They are:

1. *Psycholinguistic presupposition* in the process of communication, quasi-communication or understanding the text is a special kind of logical mastering of information, cognitive explication of frames by means of actualization of a common fund of knowledge of participants in communication about the world, its organization, the place of a person in it and others. Psycholinguistic presupposition in a case of human implementation of communication or quasi-communication in the cross-cultural environment is characterized by common experience, a common thesaurus, updating of common preliminary information about a certain phenomenon, event, state of affairs, etc., which communicants have. Thanks to psycholinguistic presupposition, discourse creates a zone of intersection of cognitive spaces of communication of participants, which are also narrow from the point of view of their expanding into the process of communication or quasi-communication.

It was shown that in the Internet communication psycho-linguistic presuppositions are cognitive in their content. The existence of all possible presuppositions of the person forms its outlook, makes it possible for a broader communicative space. The absence of joint presuppositions makes it impossible for people to understand each other, makes their communication more and more difficult. In this case, on the contrary, people who have joint presuppositions without any complication understand the information, which for representatives of other linguistic culture may seem completely "opaque", difficult for understanding.

Consequently, psycholinguistic presupposition in the process of communication or quasi-communication is an implicit component of the meaning of the message (statement) that is real, therefore, this message (statement) can not, in general, be perceived as semantically abnormal one or inappropriate in a certain area of communication or quasi-communication.

2. The second factor was *psycholinguistic semantic presuppositions*. We analyzed it as a certain semantic component of the message (statement, judgment), the inaccuracy of which in a particular situation makes the message abnormal or inappropriate.

3. We proved, that in the space of communication or quasi-communication there were actualized pragmatic *psycho-linguistically marked presupposition*, which were a component of the message, the speech genre, and discourse (or a text), were directly related to subjective factors of communication (orientation in different situations of communication or quasi-communication, actualization of social, cognitive, gender, etc., characteristics of people in one communicative act), the absence of which converted a message, speech genre, discourse (or a text), communication in general into inappropriate – such as insincere, unnatural, provocative, that did not conceal positive conditions, which made a success in a whole.

In our further researches we'll have the purpose to analyze the structure of psycholinguistic presupposition, psycholinguistic semantic presuppositions, pragmatic psycho-linguistically marked presupposition as on the theoretical, so on the empirical levels.

### СПИСОК ПОСИЛАНЬ

- Гончарук, Н. & Онуфрієва, Л. (2018). Психологічний аналіз рівнів побудови комунікативних дій. *Psycholinguistics. Психолінгвістика. Психолінгвістика*, 24(1), 97-117. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-1-97-117>.
- Івашкевич, Ед. & Коваль, І. (2020). Психологічні принципи організації дедуктивного процесу на уроках англійської мови в закладах середньої освіти. *Проблеми сучасної психології*, 50, 31-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-50.31-52>.
- Максименко, С., Ткач, Б., Литвинчук, Л. & Онуфрієва, Л. (2019). Нейропсихолінгвістичне дослідження політичних гасел із зовнішньої реклами. *Psycholinguistics*.

*Психолінгвістика. Психолінгвістика*, 26(1), 246-264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-26-1-246-264>.

- Михальчук, Н. & Онуєфрієва, Л. (2020). Психологічний аналіз різних типів дискурсу. *Проблеми сучасної психології*, 50, 188-210. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-50.188-210>.
- Mykhalchuk, N. & Bihunova, S. (2019). The verbalization of the concept of “fear” in English and Ukrainian phraseological units. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 19, 11. Варшава (Польща). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2043>.
- Mykhalchuk, N. & Ivashkevych, E. (2019). Psycholinguistic Characteristics of Secondary Predication in Determining the Construction of a Peculiar Picture of the World of a Reader. *Psycholinguistics. Психолінгвістика. Психолінгвістика*, 25(1), 215-231. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-25-1-215-231>.

## REFERENCES

- Goncharuk, N. & Onufriieva, L. (2018). Psychological analysis of the levels of construction of communicative actions [Psychological analysis of the levels of construction of communicative actions]. *Psycholinguistics. Psykholinhvistyka. Psiholingvistika*, 24(1), 97-117. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-1-97-117>. [in Ukrainian].
- Ivashkevych, Ed. & Koval, I. (2020). Psykholohichni pryntsyipy orhanizatsii deduktyvnoho protsesu na urokakh anhliiskoi movy v zakladakh serednoi osvity [Psychological principles of organization of deductive process in English lessons in secondary schools]. *Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii*, 50, 31-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-50.31-52>. [in Ukrainian].
- Maksymenko, S., Tkach, B., Lytvynchuk, L. & Onufriieva, L. (2019). Neiropsykholinhvistychnе doslidzhennia politychnykh hasel iz zovnishnoi reklamy [Neuropsycholinguistic study of political slogans in outdoor advertising]. *Psycholinguistics. Psykholinhvistyka. Psiholingvistika*, 26(1), 246-264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-26-1-246-264>. [in Ukrainian].
- Mykhalchuk, N. & Bihunova, S. (2019). The verbalization of the concept of “fear” in English and Ukrainian phraseological units. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, Warsaw (Poland), 19, 11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2043>. [in English].
- Mykhalchuk, N. & Ivashkevych, E. (2019). Psycholinguistic Characteristics of Secondary Predication in Determining the Construction of a Peculiar Picture of the World of a Reader. *Psycholinguistics. Психолінгвістика. Психолінгвістика*, 25(1), 215-231. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-25-1-215-231>. [in English].
- Mykhalchuk, N. & Onufriieva, L. (2020). Psykholohichniy analiz riznykh typiv dyskursu [Psychological analysis of different types of discourse]. *Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii*, 50, 188-210. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2020-50.188-210>. [in Ukrainian].

**Івашкевич Ернест**

кандидат психологічних наук, старший викладач  
кафедри практики англійської мови та методики викладання  
Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет, перекладач  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7219-1086>

DOI <https://doi.org/10.35619/praprv.v1i18.294>

## ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ ЧИННИКИ АКТУАЛІЗАЦІЇ ДИСКУРСУ

**Анотація.** В статті було виокремлено психолінгвістичні чинники актуалізації дискурсу. Такими чинниками є, в першу чергу, актуалізація психолінгвістичної пресупозиції в процесі комунікації або квазі-комунікації, або розуміння особистістю текстового матеріалу, на нашу думку, є особливим різновидом логічного опанування інформацією,

когнітивної експлікації фреймів за допомогою актуалізації спільного фонду знань учасників спілкування про світ, його організацію, місце людини в ньому тощо. Визначено, що психолінгвістична пресупозиція у випадку здійснення людиною комунікації або квазі-комунікації в середовищі характеризується спільним досвідом, спільним тезаурусом, актуалізацією спільних попередніх відомостей про певне явище, подію, стан речей тощо, якими володіють комуніканти. Завдяки психолінгвістичній пресупозиції дискурс створює ніби зону перетину когнітивних просторів учасників комунікації, яка звужується або розширюється у комунікативному або квазі-комунікативному процесі.

Зазначено, що в комунікативному просторі психолінгвістичні пресупозиції когнітивно передують висловленню. Існування усіх можливих пресупозицій особистості формують її світогляд, уможливають більш широкий комунікативний простір. Відсутність спільних пресупозицій унеможливорює взаєморозуміння людей, значно ускладнює їх спілкування. При цьому, навпаки, носії спільних пресупозицій без будь-яких ускладнень розуміють інформацію, яка для представників іншої лінгвокультури може здаватися абсолютно «непрозорою».

Доведено, що, психолінгвістична пресупозиція в комунікативному або квазі-комунікативному просторі є імпліцитним компонентом смислу повідомлення (висловлення), який є реальним, тому дане повідомлення (висловлення) загалом не може сприйматися як семантично аномальне або недоречне у певному просторі комунікації або квазі-комунікації. Визначено, що в комунікативному просторі нерідко мають місце психолінгвістичні семантичні пресупозиції, які ми аналізуємо як певний семантичний компонент повідомлення (висловлення, судження), неістинність якого в певній конкретній ситуації перетворює повідомлення на аномальне або недоречне.

Доведено, що у просторі комунікації або квазі-комунікації нерідко домінувальною є прагматична, психолінгвістично маркована пресупозиція, що є компонентом повідомлення, мовленнєвого жанру, дискурсу (тексту), яка безпосередньо пов'язана із суб'єктивними чинниками спілкування (орієнтацією в ситуаціях комунікації або квазі-комунікації, актуалізацією соціальних, когнітивних, гендерних тощо характеристик учасників комунікативного акту), відсутність або незнання якого перетворює повідомлення, мовленнєвий жанр, дискурс (текст), комунікацію загалом у недоречні – нещирі, неприродні, провокаційні, такі, що не відповідають умовам їх успішності тощо.

**Ключові слова:** психологічні чинники актуалізації дискурсу, психолінгвістична пресупозиція, психолінгвістичні семантичні пресупозиції, прагматична та психолінгвістично маркована пресупозиція.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 30.04.2022 р.