

Research of Social Psychology in Pragmatics Research

Meng Zhang

Jilin International Studies University, Changchun, Jilin, 130117, China

Keywords: Pragmatics study, Social psychology, Human characteristics

Abstract: Language use is closely related to social psychology. Existing pragmatics research lacks a systematic study of this close connection. The establishment of social psychopragmatics can fill this gap. From this perspective, language use is a social behavior, contextualized behavior, negotiation behavior, and psychological behavior. From the perspectives of interpersonal relationship, social identity, personal motivation, psychological tendency, social psychological strategy, etc., various connections between language use and social psychology can be presented, which can deepen the understanding of daily communication terms, especially social terms.

1. Introduction

Pragmatics research is related to language use and understanding. These two processes are inevitably affected and restricted by many psychological factors. The intermediary for people to use and understand language is mind in society. At the same time, as a part of cognitive context, social psychological representations not only influence the mental representations formed by the process of language use in different ideologies, but also affect the process of pragmatic reasoning, leading to various variations of reasoning. From this perspective, social psychology and cognitive psychology have a guiding significance for studying the process of people using and understanding language. So far, linguistic research related to psychology, such as psycholinguistics, cognitive pragmatics, and social psycholinguistics, has not systematically analyzed people's pragmatic behavior from the perspective of individual psychology and social psychology. The theoretical framework of interdisciplinary research between social psychology and pragmatics, including its theoretical basis, research methods, subject attributes, and research objects.

2. Psychological Perspective

In addition to some of the attributes of language itself, which restrict people's use of language, language use also has selectivity, collaboration and adaptability. These three attributes are an organic unity, and any language use behavior cannot be separated from these three. Attributes. In other words, language use is a dynamic process of making language choices based on collaboration and adapting to many contextual factors.

The process of people using language is a collaborative process. Collaboration means that in verbal communication, both parties have an expectation of communicative information. It is the prerequisite for successful communication and the economic and simple reason for daily conversation. The process of people's use of language is subject to conventional procedures, but the vast majority of language use is non-conventional, and the use and understanding of this kind of discourse is subject to the principle of joint salience (principle of joint salience), Solvability premises (solvability premises) and sufficiency premises (sufficiency premises) influence and restriction. However, people are not always rational in the process of language use. They are often unconsciously affected by social psychology such as prejudice, interpersonal relationships, altruistic behavior, aggressive behavior, and herd behavior; people are also An emotional animal whose behavior is sometimes inevitably affected by individual psychology such as emotions and motivations. Therefore, it is not enough to study verbal communication from the perspective of a rational person. It is also necessary to consider the influence of individual psychology and social psychology on the cooperativeness of language use, so as to reflect the true face of daily

communication.

The process of using language is a process of continuous adaptation between language selection and contextual factors. Whether language use can properly adapt to the context determines the success or failure of communication to some extent. Linguistic adaptation theory is a generalization of the ideal state of language use, but whether communicators in reality can successfully adapt to the context is restricted by many psychological factors. Individual cognition, emotions and motivations, abilities and personality, social perception, self-awareness, socialization, social attitudes, social roles, etc. all affect the behavior of compliance. Therefore, looking for psychological factors that influence and restrict people's adaptive language behavior outside the ideal model of language use will fundamentally guide people's verbal communication and reveal the true psychology of people using language in essence.

The process that people use language is a process of making language choices continuously with different levels of consciousness based on internal and external reasons of language. Language selection is affected and restricted by individual psychological factors such as memory, perception, cognition, emotion, ability, personality, etc. at the micro level, and many social psychology at the macro level. For example, we are all familiar with the situation: Because we are in a bad mood and say something that should not be said, we will use this metalanguage to explain afterwards: "I was in a bad mood just now, and I said something too much. Please everyone Don't go to your heart." It can be seen that emotions do affect our language choices. For another example, among young people today, popular phrases such as "I served YOU", "little CASE", and "MM Meimei" can be described as 60 "heard more and more". This is inconsistent with teenagers who like to be different, good at imitating, and easy to imitate. Influenced by external social factors and other social psychological factors have a direct relationship, of course, this also shows the orientation of their values. So, how do individual psychology and social psychology affect and restrict people's language choices? How do people's language choices reflect their individual psychology and social psychology?

3. Language Understanding

Pragmatics research has always been closely related to context. People use language to adapt to various contextual factors, and to understand language depends more on relevant contextual factors. Here we mainly discuss the "interference" of individual psychology and social psychology to the context in the process of understanding discourse, especially the "interference" to the cognitive context. Sperber and Wilson put forward the concept of "cognitive context". According to relevance theory, context is a psychological construct, a series of hypotheses that exist in people's brains, so context is also called cognitive context, and its hypothesis is also called cognitive context hypothesis. In language communication, what plays a major role in utterance understanding is a series of hypotheses that constitute the listener's cognitive context, rather than specific situational factors. Later, some scholars reinterpreted cognitive context and proposed that cognitive context includes contextual knowledge (specific occasions) involved in language use, language context knowledge (working memory), and background knowledge (knowledge structure). This pragmatic category also includes the collective consciousness shared by social groups, that is, the "method of doing things, thinking or belief" in social cultural groups. Collective consciousness is stored in the personal knowledge structure in the form of "social representation", Make the individual's language behavior suitable for the social, cultural and political environment. In this definition, "background knowledge" is related to the individual psychology of language users, while the collective consciousness mentioned in the definition is related to the social psychology of language users. According to our observations of daily verbal communication, individual psychology often affects people's understanding of words, that is to say, different listeners may have different understandings of the same sentence, and this phenomenon may be different. Individual psychology is related to different social psychology, so we believe that individual psychology and social psychology affect people's cognitive context. Therefore, we want to figure out how individual psychology and social psychology intervene in cognitive context and influence people's

understanding of discourse.

The extraction of the implicit meaning of speech needs to call the cognitive context of the language user. As we have said before, the cognitive context is related to the individual psychology and social psychology of the language user, so the implicit meaning must also be affected by the individual psychology and The influence and restriction of social psychology. For example, there is a metaphor like “love is a dog”. Different people have given their different understandings of this metaphor. For example, love must be loyal, love can easily hurt people, etc. The researchers gave a total of more than a dozen possibilities Understanding. So why does the same sentence have so many different meanings? This is related to people's different individual psychology and social psychology. So, which individual psychology and social psychology are involved in implicit reasoning? How do individual psychology and social psychology affect implicit reasoning? Pragmatic reasoning is actually a process of understanding implicit meaning or language overload information. Spable and Wilson once discussed the omission of the middle term of pragmatic reasoning. They believed that the basic logic of reasoning can be deductive, but the entry of terms is based on experience and hypothetical. These experience-based items used in the process of pragmatic reasoning are not only related to the social psychology of language users, but also related to their individual psychology. For example, there is such an example: a child plays a rubber ball at a nerd's house, the nerd's study room is full of books, the child accidentally hits the ball to the back of the book, and the nerd just sees the ball, the child Question: “What about the ball?” The nerd replied: “Behind Tolstoy.” The child could not understand the meaning of the nerd because he did not understand “Tolstoy”. The reason why the child cannot understand the words of a nerd is related to the ability factor in his individual psychology, because he has not the ability to carry out the corresponding pragmatic reasoning, and naturally he cannot understand the implicit meaning of the words. Therefore, our research question is: How do individual psychological and social psychological factors intervene in pragmatic reasoning as items of cognitive reasoning?

4. Conclusion

In the development process of pragmatics research, social pragmatics, cognitive pragmatics, formal pragmatics, experimental pragmatics, cultural pragmatics and other sub-disciplines were also born, but they still did not consider the people who use the language. As its research subject. The socio-psychological perspective of pragmatics research is a brand-new research field, involving a wide range of areas, and is destined to be a complex and huge project, but it will fill the gap for the development of pragmatics. As a new research perspective, its potential research topics cannot be described and foreseen from a microscopic perspective. For example, issues such as individual psychology and social psychology and verbal politeness, individual psychology and social psychology and conversation, etc., are all waiting for us in the future. Solve in research. We are expected to reveal the role played by the psychology of the “user or interpreter of symbols” in the process of language use, and answer “Why do different people have different language behaviors in the same context?” “Why the same sentence Different people in the same physical context may have different understandings?” and other research questions. Only by combining predecessors' pragmatic research that emphasized signs and the current research on people who use signs, can we complete the “pragmatics” research task that Charles Morris proposed to us.

References

- [1] Wu Yaxin. The Psychological Perspective of Pragmatics Research. *Journal of Shanxi University*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 65-68, 2008.
- [2] Ji Mengyue, JiMengyue. A Pragmatic Study of Code-switching in University Campus. *Journal of Chinese Literature*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 73-75, 2009.
- [3] Bao Jijia. A Study of Code-switching in Amy Tan's Novels: From the Perspective of the Construction of Chinese-American Identity, *Psychology Research*, vol. 2, no. 12, pp. 21, 2016.

[4] Adaptation Theory, Adaptation Reading, English Reading, etc. Exploring the Enlightenment of Adaptation Reading Mode on English Reading. *Accounting Audit*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 12-15, 2017.

[5] Wang Jingyi. The key issues and main paths of identity construction research from the perspective of pragmatics. *Crazy English*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 51-53, 2018.