

EVOLUTION OF PSYCHOLINGUISTIC THEORIES IN WORD-MAKING PROCESSES

Kateryna Diukar

Ph.D., Senior Lecturer, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine

e-mail: Ekaterinadukar@i.ua, orcid.org/0000-0001-5364-1985

Summary

This article analyzes the evolution of linguists' views on the psycholinguistic nature of the grammatical structure of language, in particular the word-formation system, from single observations and individual thoughts of scientists to specialized studies of monograph and dissertation level. The question of singling out grammar, including word-formation, as a self-sufficient object of research in the context of the formation of psycholinguistics as an autonomous scientific branch is considered. Attention is drawn to the fact that Ukrainian academic community is less interested in psycholinguistic aspects of word-creation of an individual than their foreign colleagues. The problem of analysis of word-formation innovations from the point of view of modern psycholinguistic concepts is touched upon. A special interest of psycholinguists to consider children's speech word-creation, as well as derivational features of an individual's speech during ontogenesis is highlighted. Mention is made of the empirical side of considering word-formation as a complex psycholinguistic process of verbal unit generation and reception. It is indicated on the remarkable promise and importance of this scientific field for further research, especially in the aspect of expanding the theoretical and methodological basis for further empirical study and description of the psycholinguistic nature of wordsmithing.

Keywords: communicative act, language, speech, thinking, consciousness, psychology of language, word-formation process.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/4602>

1. Introduction

The rapid development of innovative technologies and, above all, the intellectual globalization of the world pose a serious challenge to the identity and historical normalization of existing sign systems. We mean, first of all, that the language and, accordingly, its speakers do not have time to verbalize the realities, phenomena, events, etc., by means of the national codes themselves. Modern speech practice, in our opinion, often has the character of reflection, an attempt to integrate certain semantics into the structures fixed by the system. There is no doubt that the observed trend is rooted in changes in worldview, in particular language, the picture of the world of the individual, caused by the dynamics of the psyche.

It is now a widely acknowledged fact that the human brain operates at extremely high speed as a result of the high volume of processed information, the flow of which is not diminishing but rather increasing and widening. In the globalized information flow, people often experience, on the one hand, a general marriage of nominative units adapted as much as possible to the national language code, both in terms of content, the other is the need for repeated verbalization to be understood from one's own subjective beliefs. Regardless of the reasons for the search for ways and means of implementation in the communicative act of the nominative formulation, the key role in this process is assigned to the grammatical formulation of the

language, the key role in this process is given to the grammatical design of the language, in particular word-formation and shaping, which enables us to decode the different levels of prosody and the tightness of words, and to perceive and create these verbal fragments in the future.

In view of this, of particular interest is not only the very nature of language as a materialization of thought, as a representation of those processes that take place at the level of awareness or intelligence, but also the mechanisms and regularities of formation, corriging and actualization of the base of word clichés depending on the needs of a particular communicative act. Thus, today the attempts of domestic and foreign representatives of the scientific community to understand, first, the psychological mechanisms of creation and implementation of derivative expressions of the national language become of great importance, secondly, to explain the nature of formation and production of models and forms at the level of an individual medium, and thirdly, to describe the processes of reception and interpretation as the essential elements of people's mental activity. In this context the relevance of our work is caused by the foremost specificity of the object itself – the psycholinguistic nature of derivation, as well as the necessity to understand the level of elaboration of the problems, the level of the development of problems related to the psycholinguistic dimension of word-processes, representatives of academic schools in different countries and the need to identify discursive moments and gaps in the study of the subject matter. Considering the above, the article's aim is to establish the evolution of linguistic theories of word-formation from the sporadic attempts of scholars to establish the link between thinking, the main goal of the study was to establish the link between thinking and speech and the grammatical structure of the language to the comprehensive studies of derivation as a mirror image of the total mental processes of the individual's brain activity.

2. Grammar in psycholinguistics: a historical overview

In a similar or analogous way, the above questions are of interest to the academic community since the beginning of the 19th century. The basis for scientific study of the problem was laid down by W. von Humboldt (*Humboldt, 2000*), who, by differentiating between language and speech, tried to explain the nature of their connection to thinking. Calling this approach metaphysical, I. Baudouin de Courtenay (*Baudouin de Courtenay, 2017*) argued on the psychic nature of language and appealed to the reality of brain activity, as represented by the language of the individual. Furthermore, the scientist was the first to identify the morpheme as a unit at the psychological level. F. de Saussure (*Saussure, 1998*) argued for the importance of analogy in the processing of words in the language and believed that derivation did not take place at the moment of word creation, as the individual components of the word are already present in the brain's memory, and are the result of a disorderly mental operation similar to calculus. In fact, the scientist has reached the psycholinguistic level of conceptualization of the language phenomena and their perspective of integration into the language system. His ideas were developed in the works of L. Scherba (*Scherba, 2004*), whose research, especially in the field of vocabulary, was carried out in the early stages within the limits of the psychological concepts that were available at that time. It was thanks to the scientist that the notion of the *psychophysiological organization of the individual* emerged in the scientific community, and that it is formed and implemented due to the language experience.

The founder of the psychological direction in Ukrainian linguistics is O. Potebnya (*Potebnya, 2019*), whose last works on lexicology were mostly concerned with different aspects of Slavic word-formation. With the differences in views on the relationship and interaction between the elements of the triad *thought – speech – language*, the researchers came closer to

an understanding of that there are complex psycho-physiological processes that accompany not only the language, but also certain acts of speech and understanding of that speech. Having formulated this idea, O. Dittrich (*Dittrich, 1913*) raised the question of the consumer to introduce the psychology of language as a separate scientific discipline. 1913 F. Kainz (*Kainz, 1969*) in his work *Psychology of Language* realizes this idea, trying to create a clear theoretical and methodological basis for the psychological analysis of linguistic phenomena. It should be noted that the term *psycholinguistics* was introduced into the scientific community by American psychologist N. Pronko (*Pronko, 1946*) in 1946, but the formation of the discipline dates back to 1951, particularly with the creation of the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology, and its residual autonomy in 1953 and a workshop of the same committee in Bloomington (USA). The work resulted in the consolidation of theoretical foundations and the elaboration of promising lines of empirical research in psycholinguistics (*Osgood et al., 1954*).

3. Modern understanding of the psycholinguistic character of word-formation

The evolution of different tendencies of psycholinguistic studies is described in the work of O. Leontiev (*Leontiev, 2014*), who in particular studied the psychological basis of derivation. Since the creation in 1958 The Psycholinguistics and Mass Communication Theory Department of the Institute of Language Studies of the USSR became active in the study of the concept of *the psychological reality of word-formation processes* (*Shahnarovich, 1974: 132*). It should be noted that after Ukraine gained the status of an independent state, the domestic scientific approach in this field became more and more limited, while abroad, especially in Europe, it became more and more popular.

With the branching of psycholinguistics as a science into separate fields we can state a stable interest of scientists, mostly foreign, to study various aspects of the psycholinguistic nature of human speech, in particular word-formation, within the framework of multidisciplinary studies. It should be noted that Ukrainian linguists have tried to investigate this topic only in the last decades. Thus, A. Zagnitko (*Zagnitko, 2007*), examining modern linguistic theories in complex, turns also to general ideas about psycholinguistic aspects of word-formation and grammar. Summarizing the views of the psycholinguists, the scholar focuses mainly on the creation of new words on the meaning of familiar to the speaker by means of highly productive derivational instrumentation through analogies to the grammatical constructions often created by the individual (*Zagnitko, 2007: 77*). In this context, the researcher actualizes the notion of *folk etymology*, which is associated with the well-known to philologists' quasi-story *Puski beati*. A. Zagnitko's conclusions are based on the achievements of the St. Petersburg school of psycholinguistics, in particular on the works of L. Sakharny (*Sakharny, 1985*). The psycholinguist tried to find out in an empirical way the mechanisms of word creation, especially of new words, and to find out the factors of actualization of derivational links in a language for reproduction of ready-made verbal samples and production of occasional ones.

4. The psycholinguistic basis of word-formation in the reception of Ukrainian academics

Currently the psycholinguistic theory of neologization, developed by the foreign researcher S. Togojeva (*Togojeva, 2000*) in 1986, is directly appeals to the connection of word-formation processes with mentality and intelligence. Unfortunately, Ukrainian linguists have not presented any similar research of monograph or dissertation level on the mentioned problems. However, there was an attempt to analyze the psychological background of

M. Wingranowski's wordsmithing on the basis of the Neographics Laboratory *Neolex-Rivne* (Vokalchuk, and Braun, 2010). The described situation, presumably, is explained by the exclusion of the human factor from the structural-semantic analysis of neoderivatives (Popova et al., 2017). It is difficult not to agree with this conclusion of the researchers, because in psycholinguistics word-formation is analyzed primarily from the point of view of the human factor. The complexity, in fact, also lies in the absence of absolute relevance between the spoken and perceived message within the boundaries of the communicative act itself.

It should be noted that at the Hryhorii Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav a scientific and practical conference *Psycholinguistics in the Modern World* is held regularly, during which the above-mentioned issues are often discussed (Kalmykova, 2018). B. Norman, a Belarusian researcher, has used a large amount of language material to explore the mechanisms of activation of verbal processes in the mind of a speaker and a listener (Norman, 2011: 127). The most studied nowadays both in Ukrainian studies and studios abroad is the formation of verbal activity, in particular verbal competence, in ontogenesis (Kalmykova et al., 2008). Looking back on the above facts we can state that psycholinguistic approaches to teaching various aspects of word-formation can hardly be called a little-researched scientific field, however, there is a lack of domestic research at the monograph or dissertation level, which would provide a substantive, systematic and consistent overview of the subject matter.

5. Conclusions

The proposed analysis of the achievements and prospects of psycholinguistic parameterization of word-formation processes is just a separate attempt to summarize the views of experts on the relationship between grammar, speech activity, thinking and consciousness, which indicates the need for further development of this direction not only and not so much on the theoretical and methodological level, as on the practical one. Taking into account the importance of the theoretical and methodological basis for empirical research in the field of psycholinguistics, especially in the aspect of human speech, because it is a field of the first order, this is a field aimed at experiment, study of phenomena in dynamic, inventory of existing linguistic theories and approaches to word-formation as a component of people's mental activity, that it is, on the one hand, the result of the process of an individual's active brain processes, and on the other hand, accompanies them, mirroring certain states and changes in competence at the level of the linguistic picture of the world or idiostyle, provides grounds for stating the stable interest of the academic community. In the long term, it is worth turning to the following aspects of the themes developed: to find out the place of grammatical, in particular word-based, system in the psycholinguistic scientific paradigm; to establish the main derivation categories and definitions that are operated by scientists; to reveal discursive and variant aspects in psycholinguistic theories of derivation; to identify the points that have not fallen into the category of those developed by the academic community; to point out the perspective and relevance for the further study of psycholinguistic parameters, mechanisms and tools of word-formation.

References

- Boduen de Kurtene, I. A. (2017) *Obshchee yazykoznanie. Izbrannye trudy [General Linguistics. Selected works]*, Moscow: YUrajt, 343. [in Russian].
- Dittrich, O. (1913) *Die Probleme der Sprachpsychologie und ihre gegenwärtigen Lösungsmöglichkeiten*, Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 148.

- Gumbol'dt, Vil'gel'm fon (2000) *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniiyu* [Selected works in linguistics]; per. s nem. yaz. pod red. i s predisl. G. V. Ramishvili, 2. izd., Moscow: Progress, 396. [in Russian].
- Kainz, Friedrich (1969) *Psychologie der Sprache: Bd.II Vergleichend-genetische Sprachpsychologie*, Stuttgart : Enke, 760.
- Kalmykova, L. O., Kalmykov, H. V., Lapshyna, I. M., Kharchenko, N. V. (2008) *Psykholohiia movlennia i psykholinhvistyka: Navchalnyi posibnyk dlia studentiv vyshchyykh navchalnykh zakladiv* [Psychology of Speech and Psycholinguistics: Training manual for students of higher education institutions], Kyiv: Feniks, 245. [in Ukrainian].
- Leont'ev, A. N. (2014) *Izbrannye psihologicheskie proizvedeniya* [Selected psychological pieces]: v 2-h t, Moscow: Kniga po Trebovaniyu, T 1, 392. [in Russian].
- Norman, B. YU. (2011) *Osnovy psiholingvistiki: kurs lekcij* [Foundations of Psycholinguistics: A Course of Lectures], Minsk : BGU, 131. [in Russian].
- Osgood, C. E., Sebeok, T. A. (Eds.), & Gardner, J. W., Carroll, J. B., Newmark, L. D., Ervin, S. M., Saporta, S., Greenberg, J. H., Walker, D. E., Jenkins, J. J., Wilson, K., & Lounsbury, F. G. (1954). *Psycholinguistics: a survey of theory and research problems. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 49(4, Pt.2), 203.
- Popova, T. V., Raciburskaya, L. V., Gugunava, D. V. (2017) *Neologiya i neografiya sovremenogo russkogo yazyka: ucheb. Posobie* [Neology and Neography of the Modern Russian Language: Textbook], 3-e izd., ster., Moscow: Flinta, 168. [in Russian].
- Potebnya, A. A. (2019) *Mysl' i yazyk. Izbrannye raboty* [Thought and language. Selected works], Moscow: YUrajt, 238. [in Russian]
- Pronko, N. H. (1946) *Language and psycholinguistics: a review. Psychological Bulletin*. Vol. 43, 189–239.
- Psykholinhvistyka v suchasnomu sviti – 2018* [Psycholinguistics in the Modern World – 2018]: Abstrakty XIII Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii; vidp. red. L. O. Kalmykova, Pereiaslav-Khmelnyskyi, 212. [in Ukrainian].
- Saharnyj, L. V. (1985) *Psiholingvisticheskie aspekty teorii slovoobrazovaniya: uchebnoe posobie* [Psycholinguistic aspects of the theory of word-formation: Textbook]. Leningrad: LGU, 1985. 97 s. [in Russian].
- Shahnarovich, A. M. (1974) *Lingvisticheskij eksperiment kak metod lingvisticheskogo i psiholingvisticheskogo issledovaniya. Osnovy teorii rechevoj deyatel'nosti: kollektivnaya monografiya* [Linguistic experiment as a method of linguistic and psycholinguistic research. Fundamentals of Speech Activity Theory: A Collective Monography]; pod red. A. A. Leont'eva (1974), Moscow: Nauka, 129–134. [in Russian].
- Shcherba, L. V. (2004) *Yazykovaya sistema i rechevaya deyatel'nost'* [Language system and speech activity], izd. 2-e, Moscow: Editorial URSS, 432. [in Russian].
- Sosiur, Ferdinan de. (1998) *Kurs zahalnoi lingvistyky; per. z fr. A. Korniihuk, K. Tyshchenko*, Kyiv: Osnovy, 324. [in Ukrainian].
- Togoeva, S. I. (2000) *Psiholingvisticheskie problemy neologii: monografiya* [Psycholinguistic problems of neology: a monography], Tver': Tverskoj gos. universitet, 155. [in Russian].
- Vokalchuk, H. M., Braun, A. I. (2010) *Leksychni novotvory Mykoly Vinhranovskoho z pohliadu psykholinhvistyky* [Lexical innovations by Mykola Wingranowski from the perspective of psycholinguistics]. *Slovotvorchist shistdesiatnykiv. Lina Kostenko. Mykola Vinhranovskiyi : zb. nauk. pr. Ostroh: Vyd-vo Nats. un-tu «Ostrozka akademiia», V. 3, 97–105. [in Ukrainian].*
- Zahnitko, Anatolii (2007) *Suchasni linhvistychni teorii: monohrafiia* [Modern linguistic theories: a Monography], vyd. 2-he, vypr. i dop, Donetsk: DonNU, 219. [in Ukrainian].