

**Dubtsova Olga**

Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor at the  
Department of Pedagogy, Foreign Philology and Translation of  
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

## **COMMUNICATIVE FAILURES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF PSYCHOLINGUISTICS**

1. The paper reveals causes of communicative failures from a perspective of the intersubjective approach to communication incorporating basic assumptions of psycholinguistics.

2. Understanding communication as an intersubjective phenomenon being fully compliant with the main provisions of psycholinguistics provides new opportunities for the study of communicative failures.

3. An intersubjective act of communication, employed as a unit of analysis, is defined as «an inter-action, structurally including at least two verbal or/and co-verbal utterances: one initial and the other responsive, embedded in the complex dynamic psychic experiential context 'shared' by the communicants focusing attention on the same verbal/co-verbal utterance as a perceptual stimulus which triggers parallel conscious/nonconscious inference processes involving cognition, volition, and affect to issue a command of a meaningful goal-oriented communicative and/or (immediate or postponed) social action» [1, p. 65].

4. Within the framework of the intersubjectivity paradigm a communicative failure is seen as an inability of a subject to make any inference or making a faulty inference. Inference is interpreted as «contextually motivated semantic structure, emerging in an intersubjective act as a result of complex parallel conscious and

nonconscious multi-level inter-subject linkage processes recruiting the multi-level cognitive, volitional and affective elements of the psychic experiential context of the intersubjective act» [1, p. 67].

5. The inferential analysis has been applied to reveal the nature and causes of communicative failures. Carrying out the inferential analysis a researcher becomes a participant of an intersubjective act assuming the role of an observer and interprets communicative actions of other participants making inferences about the addresser's intended meanings and the addressee's inferences, embodied in their verbal and non-verbal communicative actions, and, eventually, identifies the causes of communicative failures, taking into account perceptual, cognitive, affective, and volitional aspects of interaction underpinning the motivation of these communicative actions.

6. Inferential analysis handles American cinema discourse represented by the genre of a situation comedy that models live communication, supplying instances of communicative failures subjected to analysis.

7. The results of the inferential analysis yield four types of communicative failures: perceptual, lingua-cognitive, cognitive and affective-volitional. Communicative failures have been identified in accordance with the element of the physical or mental experience of the participants of the intersubjective act, which plays a privileged role in causing the failure.

8. Perceptual communicative failures result from obstacles in physical context of the intersubjective act causing a distorted perception of the utterance.

9. Lingua-cognitive communicative failures stem from the inadequacy of a lingual perceptual stimulus (the addresser uses a language, unknown to the addressee or creates a nonce word/phrase for a single occasion).

10. Cognitive communicative failures are caused by the specificity of the communicants' cognitive experience influencing the content and structure of encyclopedic knowledge evoked by the communicants' verbal/non-verbal communicative actions in an intersubjective act (the addresser's verbal/non-verbal utterance evokes no

concept in the addressee's mind or activates a concept different from the one intended by the addressee).

11. Affective-volitional communicative failures arise from feelings, emotional states and attitudes that are inseparable from the communicants' interests, needs and desires determining their inferencing processes.

## REFERENCES

1. Martynyuk, A. (2017). «Now that the magic is gone» or toward cognitive analysis of verbal/co-verbal communication. *Cognition, communication, discourse*, 15, 51–72. doi: 10.26565/2218-2926-2017-15-04.