

UDC 658.821

PLURALISM OF APPROACHES TO THE INTERPRETATION OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

Author – Daria Moroz¹, Stud of gr. ПМЕН-22МП

Scientific supervisor – Bilopolyi V.V.², Cand. Sc. (History), Assoc. Prof.

Language consultant – Olena Liapicheva³, Cand. Sc. (Philol.)

¹pman05.moroz@365.pdaba.edu.ua,

²bv11.5@ukr.net <bv11.5@ukr.net,

³liapicheva.olen@365.pgasa.dp.ua

Prydniprovsk State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture

Modern social, political and economic problems that arise due to the rapid development of mankind require the same rapid solution and coordination. One of the most important factors in addressing these issues is the dialogue between citizens and government, which helps to shape the relationship between these political actors.

For the first time, the use of some aspects of communication in the political governance of polis states was considered in the works of Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle. Later, in the Middle Ages, the relations between the authorities, power structures and people were also studied. Using the heritage of ancient philosophers, Thomas Aquinas expressed his views in the works “On the Dominion of Lords” (1265–1266) and “Summa Theologica” (1266–1274), and later, Niccolo Machiavelli wrote a work in which he clearly expressed his thoughts on how the relationship between the rulers of states and their people should look like (“The Prince”, 1513).

The term “communication” was rooted in political science only in the XX century, before it was used as a technical term. The new understanding of communication is caused by the need to indicate the formation of democratic practices, openness of world political processes.

Communication takes place at different levels: intrapersonal, interpersonal, intra-group, inter-group, institutional, social, global. Each of these levels has several communication networks.

Political communication in the most general sense is the process of transferring political information from one individual (group) to another individual (group) [1].

Polish scientist T. Goban-Klas gives seven typical definitions of communication, which reveal different aspects of this process, as well as its functions: communication as transmission (broadcasting, transfer) of information, ideas, emotions, skills; communication as understanding of others; communication as influence and mutual influence; communication as

association (community building); communication as interaction; communication as exchange; communication as a component of the social process that expresses group norms, exercises public control, distributes roles, achieves coordination of efforts, etc. [3, p. 42–43].

The most important in the study of political communication is the problem of identifying the object of study through the attribute of political. Political communication is understood as the process of transmission, exchange of political information, which structures political activity and gives it a new meaning, shapes public opinion and political socialization of citizens, taking into account their needs and interests [4, p. 162].

In a broader context, R.-J. Schwarzenberg defines communication as the process of transferring political information circulating from one part of the political system to another, between political and social systems, as well as between political structures, social groups and individuals [5, p. 42]. In political communication, any referents are perceived as communication resources. Behind any communication, behind any information exchange there is an exchange of resources: information is exchanged for power, power is exchanged for money, money – for means of production. Communication today is the main resource of power, because neither money, nor production funds, nor power do not exist by themselves, outside of communication. If in the past the unit of exchange of things was money, today it is communication.

Researchers identify three main ways of communication: socio-political institutions, mass media, informal contacts. Translating this classification of different ways of interaction into the language of “communicology”, we can divide them:

- a) communication, which is considered as a structure or system;
- b) mass communication;
- c) interpersonal, interorganizational communications.

Political communications can also include special communicative situations or actions (elections, referendums, etc.).

In political communication, which is in a state of permanent socio-cultural dynamics, there are two traditional mega elements - mechanics (form) and sociotics (content). From the point of view of mechanics, political communication consists of a constant exchange of meaningful information between the governing and the governed, the rulers and the ruled, which is carried out in the forms of direct and feedback, and the first usually dominates the second in terms of extensive indicator. As for the sociology of political communication, its content is the counterpoint of the administrative relations «state-society» and is fixed in a fairly common: «political communication is a semantic aspect of the interaction of political subjects through the exchange of information in the process of struggle for power or its implementation» [2, p. 124].

In the process of political communication, the mass media set certain stereotypes of perception of social processes and norms of political dialogue between the government and society, and thus unite the audience of consumers of political information, transforming it from a simple set of members of society, sometimes physically and geographically distant from each other, into a coherent community – a community. Tracing the current trends in the development of political communication, it should be noted that today, both in Ukraine and in Western countries, we can observe a significant decrease in public support for political institutions and political figures.

The functioning of political communication in modern realities is directly related to urbanization and globalization, the development of political processes and practices, the growing role of information technology and its widespread use in everyday life. Modern society is in the information stage of its development. New information and communication technologies are being introduced in almost all spheres of human activity. The growing importance of information and communication determines the development of the world political space [6].

The dominance of information technology not only transforms the socio-political, economic and cultural structures of modern society, but also changes the type of communication, which is associated with the specifics of information exchange in society. It should be noted that the French sociologist Claude Lévi-Strauss in the 50s of the XX century, expressed the opinion that the social sciences «are going to the Copernican revolution, which will be reduced to the interpretation of society as a whole through the use of communication theory» [8]. Thus, in the analysis of global political and communicative processes, the fundamental bases are the theory of communication and the theory of information society. These theories reveal supranational mechanisms and vectors of development of socio-political life of society.

So, communication is inherent in all spheres of society – economic, political, legal, cultural, social, etc. The importance of communication is manifested in the fact that it connects elements within the system and provides interconnection between different systems of the whole society. Political communication acts as a dialogue between the government and society, which is carried out through the media and aims to increase the integration of society.

References

1. *Politychni instytuty i protsesy v suchasniy Ukrayini* [Political institutions and processes in modern Ukraine]. *Suchasna ukrayins'ka polityka. Polityky i politolohy pro neyi* [Modern Ukrainian politics. Politicians and political scientists about her]. Vol. 10, Kyiv, 2007, p. 197. (in Ukrainian).
2. Schwartzberg R.-J. *Sociology Politique*. 1988, p. 42.
3. Мак-Квейл Д. Теорія масової комунікації. Пер. з англ. О. Восьна, Г. Сташків. Львів : Літопис, 2010. 538 с.

4. Valevskiy O. L. *Derzhava i reformy v Ukrayini: analiz derzhavnoyi polityky v umovakh transformatsiyi suspil'stva : monohrafiya* [State and reforms in Ukraine: analysis of state policy in the conditions of transformation of society: monograph]. Kyiv : NADU Publ., 2007, 315 p. (in Ukrainian).

5. R.V. Voytovych, L.V. Honyukova, N.M. Darmogray and oth. *Politychni instytuty ta protsesy v umovakh transformatsiyi ukrayins'koho suspil'stva : navch. posib.* [Political institutions and processes in the conditions of transformation of Ukrainian society: teaching. Manual]. Odesa : ORIDU NADU, 2006, 414 p. (in Ukrainian).

6. *Transformatsiya partiynoyi systemy : ukrayins'ky dosvid u yevropeys'komu kontekst* [Transformation of the party system : Ukrainian experience in the European context]. Edited by Yu. Yakymenko. Kyiv : Razumkov Center Publ., 2017, 428 p. (in Ukrainian).