Psycholinguistic Aspects of Youth Speech. Consequences and Realities of Postmodernism in Ukraine
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Abstract: The article describes the postmodern features of Ukrainian language education and psycholinguistic term system, which is important for understanding the direction of optimizing the language situation among young people. Then, after careful selection and multimodal analysis, the authors cite about 30 key features of youth speech in the late postmodern era. The urgency of the topic is determined by postmodernist trends that are still observed in Ukraine, as well as their specific impact on youth speech. The authors used a body of fragments of living youth discourse 2018 - 2020, as well as relevant methods of analysis: psycholinguistic, semantic, culturological, pragmatic (establishing practical motives for the use of language units); the method of establishing correlations between cultural, social and speech phenomena, as well as the method of generalization. The authors came to an important generalization: contemporary youth uses their speech in such a way that it can be decoded differently only in the current discourse - among other carriers of postmodern linguistic consciousness. And this is also a manifestation of the general game, performance and even the way of existence of the individual in a real or hyperreal society that is constantly communicating.
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Introduction

Ukrainian society, in particular young people living in a country of “young democracy” and recently gained independence from totalitarian Soviet oppression, is still unable to move to a post-cultural existence. Society has not yet mastered the experience and opportunities of total deconstruction, and therefore has clear signs of postmodernism.

In such conditions, the language and the text have become not only a way of expression, but also a way of existence of personality and culture, their presence in the current time without taking into account regulations, structures and hierarchies. Scientists have written a lot about postmodernism in culture, art and literature, but in Ukraine there is a catastrophic lack of works on the linguistic consequences of postmodernism, which makes our article relevant.

The study of the realities of youth speech in the late postmodern era in Ukraine, as well as other mass cultural and linguistic and social phenomena, should be based, in our opinion, on the main psycholinguistic phenomena - language awareness and speech activity. Relevant to postmodern society, the concept of “discourse” as “a text immersed in life” is their evolutionary consequence. Therefore, we chose the psycholinguistic aspect of the achievement of youth speech, language education, etc.

The purpose of the article is to find out and represent the peculiarities of youth speech based on the analysis of fragments of living conversational discourse.

To achieve this purpose, we have undertaken the following actions: a) revised the basic concepts of psycholinguistics, which have undergone a postmodern semantic shift; b) with the help of analysis of international scientific sources and own inferences identified the main problems of language education in postmodern society; c) generalized the language and speech specifics of the youth conversational discourse.

The material for the study was a mini-corpus of texts of live youth speech, collected by students of Oleksandr Dovzhenko Hlukhiv National Pedagogical University as part of discourse expeditions during 2018-2020.

Prospects for research. In our opinion, a successful solution of partial problems of this article could form the basis of Ukrainian language didactic reforms, which would return to the speech its immanent extracultural functions. This is especially true of educating young people who are most sensitive to mass cultural, constructive and destructive influences: “The destruction of the linearity of the story, the partialization of syntagmatic schemes of narratives, paradoxical sentence constructions convey the psycholinguistic essence of variative content in the speech of...
contemporary adolescents of the postmodern era. Stabilization (normalization) of destructive changes in speech of this cohort of young people requires qualified psychological and pedagogical support of students in adulthood (Tokareva, 2018, p. 40).

**Postmodern realities modify the basic concepts of psycholinguistics**

The problem of the relationship between language and speech has its own history: since the time of linguist Saussure (2001), psychologists Steinthal (1855) and Wundt (2007) historical distinction between the subjects of study has been created between psychology and linguistics: psychology studies the processes of speech and only at this level considers the language in which its ontology is manifested in these processes; linguistics studies language as a system, interpreting it in the material aspect (system of speech skills) or in the ideal aspect, but not interested in the implementation of this system.

In postmodern realities, such oppositions make no sense. The postmodern philosophy imagines the world as multiple, segmented, and plural, and the discourse as universal, but does not accept their structural or functional representations (Nerubasska & Maksymchuk, 2020; Nerubasska, Palshkov, & Maksymchuk, 2020; Onishchuk, Ikonnikova, Antonenko, Kharchenko, et al., 2020; Honcharuk, et al., 2021; Povidaichyk, et al., 2021). Therefore, psycholinguistics is to some extent a compromise discipline, as it studies the anthropological, sometimes personal ontology of language, speech, discourse (discoursology) as phenomena of the same order or rather a single plan of existence, which is divided (in the human world) only on ontogenetic, existential or situational level. The latter is the most important and the only recognizable. Everything else is a world of meanings, which is the subject of skepticism and doubt.

Another important concept is speech. Understanding of speech as a certain type of activity, i.e., speech activity, was first presented by Vygotsky (1996) and developed in works on psycholinguistics by Leontiev (1973). Speech itself and speech activity is the highest mental function of a human being, it has a complex psychological structure and multilevel cerebral organization. Speech activity is studied by various related sciences - linguistics and psycholinguistics, psychology and neuropsychology.

From a linguistic point of view, the most optimal can be called the definition of the concept of “speech”, proposed by Berezin and Golovin (1979, p. 26): “Speech is a sequence (taken from language) of symbolic units of communication on a specific language material (text) in their communicative application”.
However, as the analysis of scientific works in these fields of knowledge shows, the concept of “speech activity” often has different meanings, so it seems ambiguous, which indicates the multifaceted nature of this phenomenon. Let’s compare this definition. In liguodidactics speech activity is defined as “a set of psychophysical actions of the human body, which are aimed at the perception and understanding of speech or its generation in oral or written form” (Olyinik, Ivanenko, Rozhilo, & Skorik, 1989, p. 38).

Thus, the classical definitions of the concepts of language, speech and speech activity shows that language and speech are two components, two parts of speech activity. They are part of the structure of speech activity as internal means (language) and ways (speech) of its implementation (Zimnyaya, 1989).

Postmodernism is characterized by an expanded notion of discourse as speech in the whole set of circumstances, situations, potentials, former individual and social experience. This is both the process and the result, but the main thing is the process.

A comparison of these definitions of speech, modern and postmodern, in our opinion, condenses the whole essence of psycholinguistic features of the language carrier of the postmodern era: speech as a definite process, activity (modernist) and speech as a situational process, even the state and way of involvement in the current multichannel discourse.

We consider it necessary to quote the ironic words of Lecercle that “there may still be something like postmodern linguistics” (Lecercle, 1990). We believe that in the context of such “linguistics”, which is more like a synthesis of psycholinguistics and linguo-culturology, as well as in the realities of the total and unceremonious treatment of postmodernists with language and speech (discourse) more important are not linguistic knowledge, abilities, etc., but a feeling for language, a language improvisation, an intuition and a performance. We propose to modify the usual concept of “the feeling for language”, taking into account pragmatism, subjective, local and even marginal way of dealing with a language.

Traditionally, under the feel for language or linguistic consciousness in linguistics is understood “an intuitive reaction to the form of expression by a person for whom this language is native, as a criterion for the correctness of speech”. From the point of view of psychology, the definition of the concept should be based on the function that certain phenomenon performs in speech activity. Sense of speech is a component of internal programming of speech utterance, namely its controlling mechanism.
According to its genesis, actions by sensation (sense of speech) are product of formed mental activity, “when the situation is not distinguished, but recognized, the action is caused by a trigger signal and a program with actual performance and results” (Leontiev, 1973).

We believe that for now the feel for language should be considered in the context of more general categories – the linguistic consciousness and the linguistic subconsciousness. The concept of “language awareness” is part of the conceptual apparatus of various sciences - philosophy, psychology, psycholinguistics and linguistics, it is of significant interest for language didactics as well.

In linguistic and psycholinguistic research, the concept of “language awareness” is used to describe the process of awareness of the native speaker of the language correctness or, conversely, erroneous speech in identifying belonging to a particular language community. As the synonym of this term “the feeling for language” is often used. There are different views on the essence of the concept of “language awareness”. The German linguist Gauger (1978) summarized these studies. He relates linguistic consciousness to the subconscious and identifies it with “language proficiency”, which means the ability of the native speaker to use the appropriate and improvised language tools in a new situation.

Intelligence also contributes to this, but there is no single definition of the term “intelligence” in psychology. Some researchers believe that the intelligence is a concept identical to the system of mental operations, problem-solving style, the effectiveness of individual approach in the process of solving human cognitive functions: from sensation and perception - to thinking and imagination (Bilokonna, 1997, p. 88).

Researchers Eiger and Rapoport, studying the concept of intelligence, concluded that the most common three definitions in which intelligence is considered:

• “as the ability to adapt to a new situation;
• as the ability to work with abstract symbols and relationships;
• as a propensity to learning” (Eiger & Rapoport, 1991, pp. 25-26).

The propensity to learn does not mean the acquisition of multidisciplinary knowledge, but the acquisition of practical competencies that allow one to function effectively in a rapidly changing information-saturated, uncertain environment. This ability does not apply to the period of formal education, but is preserved as a partial result, experience, the need and ability to learn throughout life.

In our opinion, the phenomenon of intelligence is very important for postmodern practices and reflections. Intelligence replaces knowledge, and
the sense of cultural and social context, connotative register of the situation - replaces the logic of the events that are reflected.

This is possible with the dominant role of the emotional intelligence. We are currently viewing its significant development among young people. This phenomenon has become so decisive that it stimulates the change of the educational paradigms: “It has pushed to the background traditional methods and ways of teaching, whereas performance, theatricalization, play, improvisation, self-presentation, projectivity have become very popular and effective” (Suleyeva, Tovma, & Zakirova, 2021, p.1). According to Goleman, emotional intelligence contributes to the flexibility and adaptation of young people in an entropic world. The author argues that a rapid development of the emotional intelligence is an important aspect of human phylogeny (Goleman, 1995). In our opinion, this contributes to the rapid change of socio-cultural epochs and paradigms.

As we can see, classical psycholinguistic and psychological definitions themselves need to be adjusted, as their functions change or manifest themselves differently in the postmodern era.

Postmodernism and problems of language education

Almost half a century ago, Lyotard argued that postmodernism is characterized by replacement of experience and knowledge (fixed in language) with the actual performative use of speech (“language games”). In its most general form, it is a transition from established truth to a dynamic narrative (Lyotard, 2018). A later follower of Lyotard – Lecercle, assessed the position of language in postmodern realities and came to the paradoxical conclusion that the structural hierarchical and normative conception of language no longer makes sense. In the refined sense, “the language is at the dead end” (Lecercle, 1990). However, the author admits that language as an element of multimodal reality and one of the means of constructing hyperreality is in a special status and cannot be rejected or devalued. In our opinion, this is why language and linguistics are one of the central objects in postmodern criticism. It is clear that at the everyday level, young people experience these trends and new regularities. Consciously or unconsciously, they deny normativity, stability, paradigm, clear stylistic certainty, and prefer an improvised discourse, where stylistic facets are erased and stereotypes and normativity are simply not needed.

The creative youth of the Next generation, as well as representatives of creative professions, subcultures and other subjects not limited by social frames, provide scientists with rich material - examples of spontaneous performative language use, and sometimes discourses that can be considered
textual artifacts. However, there are supporters of the so-called elitism. These are young or mature people who need to present or interpret knowledge gained through scientific methods. Elitists are forced to “walk” in their discourses between postmodernism and modernism. In this regard Curry stated: “The analysis of works of certain postmodernists in terms of critique of the authority of psychology, history and language, developed by the very authorities they cite. This suggests that in important aspects postmodernism is modernist” (Curry, 1991, p. 210).

The problems of language learning are not only in the skepticism of students who enjoy the benefits of postmodern society, but also in the skepticism of the theorists of postmodernism. For example, Green believed that postmodernism had neither clear values nor established ideas, so it could not become an educational concept (Green, 1997, p. 20). Other reasons are considered by Burbules, who is convinced that education always contains norms, hierarchies and certainty to which “postmodernism has a disturbing sensitivity” (Burbules, 2009).

The modernist educational tradition states: “We teach young people things that will be useful to them”. In our opinion, the carriers of postmodernist consciousness claim: “No one can know what is useful to whom at this or the next moment. And what is the meaning of useful in general?” This opposition brings the most harm to young people - high school and university students in acquiring language skills. This problem has become so global that it has affected international standards of language testing and certification. Thus, Fahim and Pishghadam studied the influence of postmodernism on linguodidactics and proved once again that postmodernism is not an element of fashion, style or philosophy of life that affects only certain areas of society, but a total phenomenon. Some compilers of remote electronic platforms for language learning by mass users, developers of tests for certificates of language proficiency (mostly English) were forced to take into account the innovative speech patterns caused by postmodern philosophy. For example, contamination of styles, the possibility of subjective interpretation of linguistic phenomena, the growth of ambiguity and relativism (Fahim & Pishghadam, 2011).

It is clear that authoritative and reputable services for distance learning and language diagnosis still remain in modernist positions. However, these positions in countries that have not yet lived through and evolutionarily mastered the postmodern experience (this applies to the linguistic and sociocultural realities of Ukraine, where the authors of this article live) are increasingly facing divergence “linguodidactics - language usage”. This is clearly illustrated by the lively current mass youth discourse.
If we conduct a large-scale analysis of late postmodernism, at least in the humanitarian dimension, we should treat it as a schizophrenic state of society, which is characterized by disrespect for the traditional values, the power, non-recognition of the authority of teachers. These global phenomena are forcing not only linguistic didactic revision, but also revision of language and information policy, even in highly developed countries: “The government is unable to overcome linguistic and political conflicts and solve linguistic and political problems in a civilized way; strengthening human self-expression, which is generated by the postmodern realities of life of ordinary people and political actors, as well as caused by the use of political technologies that contribute to the carnivalization of protests; “blindness by the play of symbols”, when flashmobs, performances and theatricalization are used to show the shortcomings of the power, its incompetence, unwillingness to work for the benefit of the people and the state; the virtualization of political life that takes place during elections, when the struggle of ideas and programs is replaced by the struggle of political showmen for the number of viewers / readers, likes, messages on social networks” (Vdovychyn & Savoyska, 2019). Control, regulation, reporting, which have always been attributes of both quality education and policy - are now the main reasons for non-conformist attitudes of young people. Such non-conformism at the level of language education begins with non-recognition of the importance of language norms (it is worth analyzing social media correspondence on literacy and speech culture) and ends with recognition of language and one’s own spontaneously formed idiolect and lifestyle as a form of self-expression and existence.

If we talk about the basic forms of social consciousness and practice - economics, politics, culture and art, it is believed that the civilized world has practically passed into the post-era. It is often called poststructuralism. However, all over the world, where consumerism, uncertainty, locality and self-expression “here and now” are of the greatest value at the level of mass consciousness, there are still very strong postmodern tendencies in education. This has especially affected the practical linguodidactics and adds work to psycholinguists, sociologists, linguoculturologists. For example, last year a number of linguists studied the problems of teaching English as a foreign language. The researchers have noticed that graduates are dissatisfied with the lack of choice of textbooks (they are approved by the Ministry), attention to the structural aspects of the language, the timetable (regularity) of learning. On the other hand, young people with low and medium levels of academic aspirations show a formal attitude to organizational issues and a selective attitude to pragmatic aspects (Kantharaj & Manimozhi, 2021).
example, most graduates are not focused on learning a language, but on gaining the skills to pass a test (usually it includes listening, reading, and grammar tests). This trend has already spread to language didactic accents and pedagogical style of teachers.

These mass linguodidactical phenomena fully correspond to the pragmatic, deconstructive and pluralistic philosophy of late postmodernism. In this case, the subjects of education try to replace the pedagogical method with a way of life or style. In our opinion, a digital demotivation has largely contributed to this: instant access to current knowledge devalues education, and erudition is replaced by the emotional intelligence. The latter helps in the right moment to easily produce trendy postmodern linguistic-discursive ways of self-expression: irony, language play, intertextuality, etc.

Linguistic and speech metamorphoses of youth discourse

We have conducted numerous observations and recordings of both isolated language units and fragments of educational and extracurricular discourses of senior school and higher school students. This allowed us to compile a mini-corpus of such texts and find living discursive evidence of signs of postmodernism in the youth communication; collect and classify innovative metamorphoses and situationally determined linguistic phenomena. Through linguo-cultural logic, semantic and psycholinguistic analysis, we have made general explanations of the linguistic and speech phenomena of the youth discourse. The following are the main linguistic and speech features of Ukrainian youth postmodern discourse and their pragmatic, psycholinguistic or culturological reasons:

1. Fast pace of speech - communication in social networks, trying to communicate faster, achieve an effect, save time.

2. Atypical sentence structure (interrupted, incomplete, understandable only in the context) - fragmentary and cinematic thinking, fast switching, situation-oriented.

3. Elementary, sometimes primitive semantic structure of the sentence - the avoidance of analysis, the easiest way to achieve a pragmatic goal or its absence.

4. Occasionalism, paradoxicality of discursive units - spontaneity of discourse initiation, denial of normativity.

5. Rapid thematic or connotative switching - rapid change of the current situation, the defining role of the extralingual context.

6. Mixing normative and non-normative units within one statement - a manifestation of nonconformism, a means of irony and language play.
7. Significant prevalence of errors and violations of language norms at different levels - reduction or absence of language control, devaluation of classical ethics.

8. The presence of hints, subtexts, omissions - attempts to provoke, manipulate the interlocutor.

9. Total use of connotative and expressive means - assessment of the situation, demonstration of freedom of choice and equality with the interlocutor.

10. Implicitness of statements - a demonstration of the natural property of postmodernism to speculation, establishing the completeness of information from the context.

11. Active use of profanity - a way of self-identification and delineation of social or subcultural status of the communicative situation, demonstration of the devaluation of cultural, etiquette and other traditions of the high social register.

12. Free use of personal idiolect in various social situations - dismantling of social hierarchies, emphasis on egalitarianism, denial of elitism.

13. The expression of hidden or undisguised topical rhetoric, specificity and the present - indicates that the extralingual factors determine the intentions of discourse, but there is no clear line between discourse and life (discourse is life).

14. The use of terminology in everyday life - a means of outrage, denial of professional or cultural differentiation of society.

15. The use of metaphors, epithets, other paths of low registers - a speech manifestation of emotional intelligence, which ironizes, improvises, evaluates, but does not attach importance to the environment.

16. The rapid emergence of expressive and outrageous neologisms and phraseologies that function intensively but quickly lose expression - not only due to the rapid pace of events, changes in “fashion trends”, but also reduced sensitivity to the linguistic and non-linguistic innovation, attitude to language as a universal flexible potential, which should be used quickly and as much as possible.

17. The use of slang and jargon, even from destructive antisocial groups – enhancement of the contrast, demonstration of coexistence of diversity and multimodality. At the same time, the speaker expresses irony about the traditional assessment of socially opposite phenomena.

18. Naive manifestations of intertextuality, often with individual component or connotative variations - a psycholinguistic guideline
“Everything has already been said, and I know or have heard everything, but it no longer matters”.

In turn, Monakhova studied the issue of postmodernism in Ukrainian linguistics on the basis of contemporary writers, so she has fully and variously illustrated the main linguistic manifestations of postmodernism, concentrated in artificially created literary text. She points out that it is common practice to use colloquial, rude and terminological vocabulary: “Authors of texts deliberately combine these functional styles, using them in opposition, putting them in one sentence. In this way the semantic dissonance of the whole text is achieved, which testifies to irony. We can assume that the speaker’s intention was to provoke a strong emotional reaction from the reader, and the strategy of text creation in this example is defined as postmodernism” (Monakhova, 2015, p. 93). It turned out that the postmodernist literary discourse is almost indistinguishable from the everyday one.

We believe that such linguo-stylistic and linguo-behavioral eclecticism is aimed not only at self-expression through language play, skepticism. Authors, like ordinary citizens, try to feel free and individualistic in unrestricted speech performance. This testifies to more global, often subconscious psycholinguistic and linguistic-cultural mechanisms: attempts to balance elitist and egalitarian forms of discourse, to be a parceled, fragmented and spontaneous component of the general mass outrage and equality and at the same time involved (the phenomenon of “the equality of different”, here the term is ours). It is also a way of linguistic self-identification as the most accessible tool for preserving one’s “self” in the world of uncertainty and chaos (the subconscious attitude “among continuous texts I am also present as a text”).

Conclusions

Scientists still doubt the existence of postmodern linguistics, but they readily agree with the term “linguistic postmodernism”. It is specific in the sense that it is possible to study a language far beyond linguistics, and with a pragmatic goal: achieving important life and social goals in various fields. The results of our study allowed us to classify the types of linguistic metamorphoses and explain them by psycholinguistic, culturological and pragmatic reasons, which generally complements the idea of the connection between the “linguistic turn” of the twentieth century and postmodernism. A generalized formulation of such connection was given by Roberts: “The new postmodern approach was based on the growing confusion of images created by contemporary consumer wealth, on the inappropriate comparison
of the old and the new signs and symbols” (Roberts, 2004, p. 14). In this regard, we can propose such an intermediate and compromise definition of “the language awareness”. It is one of the types of everyday awareness, a means of forming, preserving and processing linguistic signs and meanings, which it expresses according to the minimum sufficiency of the rules of their combination. Language awareness and linguistic expression of the postmodern era are the main tools of human self-expression, a means of maintaining the illusion of managing elements of heterogeneous and disordered reality, and even a way of existence (“I am the text”, “the world as a text”).

Metaphysical reflections on the subject of our study allow us to formulate the main problems of language education of Ukrainian young people. The young people of the postmodern era oppose their interests and intentions with the methods and goals of education that is essentially classical. Explicit or covert psychological and value opposition between the teacher and the student has always existed, but in the postmodern society there are additional, at first glance, peripheral parameters that have finally defragmented and devalued the modernist paradigm of education. If we talk about the acquisition of language competencies by young people, then we see not a denial of the subject of the study, but deconstruction, which changes the ontological features, functions and ways of using the language.

The most common feature of youth speech in the period of late Ukrainian postmodernism is the extrapolation of universal cultural features of postmodernism to one’s own idiolect and language behavior. We understand this as a kind of speech and self-expression, and involvement in the global discourse with destructed axio-semantics: sarcastic evaluation, evaluative and culturological, connotation (color, charm, jargon and other skeptical attitudes to social and cultural roles). At the same time, the speaker often distinguishes oneself from one’s own discourse according to the pragmatic guideline “I just said that, and there it is”, “Just kidding”. The speaker is guided by cultural and pragmatic guidelines “to follow the fashion”, “to go with the stream here and now”. Without conducting deep psychoanalytic or existentialist research, we can assume that in the ordinary speakers postmodernist metamorphoses of speech play a protective role against the information and social pressures of a globalized society, risking to lose their subjectivity (their “self”) in uncertainty and diversity. There are subconsciously existential guidelines “I exist because I communicate” or “I exist when involved in total discourse”, etc.
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