

THEORIES OF COMMUNICATIVE SOCIETY: PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH

Zh.M. Doskhozina

ABSTRACT

The study of communication nature in the context of society not only makes it possible to identify the role of communication in social analysis, but also contributes to understanding and determining the level of communication impact on the formation of priority social institutions. In this regard, the study aims to analyze the system theories of communicative society in the following directions. First, in the specialized areas of socio-cultural practice, that is, the ways of carrying out certain communicative actions in society; second, by the nature of communication, for example, interpersonal or business; third, on the principle of information content of communication processes. The philosophical approach in this context focuses, first of all, on the spiritual activity of the subject of communication, the change of his world views and orientations, concepts and ideas, views and opinions for the benefit of humanitarian values.

Key words: Communication, Society, Interaction, Information, Human Being, Values.

International Information
Technology University,
Almaty, Kazakhstan

Author-correspondent:

Zh.M. Doskhozina,
zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com

Reference to this article:

Doskhozina Zh.M. Theories
of Communicative Society:
Philosophical Approach //
Adam alemi. – 2023.
– No. 4 (98). – P. 50-58.

Коммуникативтік қоғам теориялары: философиялық тәсіл

Аңдатпа. Қоғам бөлінісіндегі коммуникацияның табиғатын зерттеу коммуникацияның социумды талдаудағы рөлін ғана емес, сонымен қатар коммуникацияның басым әлеуметтік институттардың қалыптасуына әсер ету деңгейін түсінуге және анықтауға ықпал етеді. Осыған байланысты, бұл зерттеу коммуникативті қоғамның жүйелік теорияларын келесі бағыттарда талдауға бағытталған. Біріншісі, әлеуметтік-мәдени практиканың мамандандырылған салаларында, яғни қоғамда қандай да бір коммуникативтік әрекеттерді жүзеге асыру тәсілдері; екінші, жүзеге асырылатын коммуникацияның сипаты бойынша, мысалы, тұлғааралық немесе іскерлік; үшіншіден, коммуникациялық процестердің ақпараттық толықтығы қағидаты бойынша. Осы тұрғыда философиялық тәсіл, ең алдымен, коммуникация субъектісінің рухани қызметіне, оның дүниетанымдық ұстанымдары мен бағдарларын, ұғымдары мен түсініктерін, ізгілік құндылықтар игілігі үшін көзқарастары мен пікірлерін өзгертуге бағытталады.

Түйін сөздер: коммуникация, қоғам, өзара іс-қимыл, ақпарат, адам, құндылықтар.

Теории коммуникативного общества: философский подход

Аннотация. Изучение природы коммуникации в разрезе общества представляет возможным выявить не только роль коммуникации в анализе социума, но также способствует пониманию и определению уровню воздействия коммуникации на формирование приоритетных социальных институтов. В связи с этим, данное исследование нацелено на анализ системных теорий коммуникативного общества в следующих направлениях. Первое, в специализированных областях социокультурной практики, то есть, способы осуществления тех или иных коммуникативных действий в обществе; второе, по характеру осуществляемой коммуникации, например, межличностная или деловая; третье, по принципу информационной насыщенности коммуникационных процессов. Философский подход в данном контексте ориентируется, прежде всего, на духовную деятельность субъекта коммуникации, изменение его мировоззренческих позиций и ориентиров, понятий и представлений, взглядов и мнений во благо гуманных ценностей.

Ключевые слова: коммуникация, общество, взаимодействие, информация, человек, ценности.

Introduction

Philosophical approach to communicative culture has developed within the framework of certain ideas about society. Communication refers primarily to the exchange of information among the communicators. What are the main features of the system theory of society? This theory is characterized by the notion of society as an organized, structured, heterogeneous system, which denotes a set of sustainable elements of the social system (institutions, roles, statuses), which are independent of the environment and provide responsibility and sustainability of behavioral and social relationships over time. Interaction between people was seen as a basic constitutive factor of society, and the most important task of social sciences was to study and describe sustainable patterns of interaction that permeated all eras and societies, such as: division of labor, domination, subordination, exchange, rivalry, law, custom, etc. Interaction is also seen as the source of the consciousness's emergence, personality, and all social structures, as the process by which the individual's socialization proceeds. By these reasons the research of communicative theories is defined as relevant for modern society.

Methodology

The analysis of communicative society theories represented by its prominent representatives F. Hayek and N. Luhmann. The developed methodological systems by these scientists can capture the trends of the modern time and put the concept of communication at the core of social concepts in general. Both F. Hayek and N. Luhmann paid special attention to the processes of communication at the level of society, and the information is considered as a main direction of communication to help people navigate the system structure of natural and social space.

Also, the author uses methods of synthesis and analysis as well as analytical method for determination of communication meanings in the way of philosophical approach.

Main part

Communicative Theories Review

The socio-philosophical reflection about the nature of society has created preconditions for the formation of communicative theories. The need for a common communication theory was greatly influenced by the emergence of cybernetics in the mid-twentieth century, which discovered feedback-based regulation factor [1]. In cybernetics, an information is seen mainly as messages that reduce uncertainty (reducing the number of possible alternatives) in a communication situation, as well as messages aimed at management and harmonization. Hence, research mostly focuses on pragmatic aspects of information, i.e. the assessment of the information relevance (sufficient or redundant information), values, utilities, adequacies, etc.

Within the framework of cybernetics, it became possible to synthesize mathematical models of information theories with theories of social interaction, which significantly enriched the scientific understanding of communication and translation processes in society. From a cybernetic perspective, a man is described as a self-organizing closed system whose constituent elements (orgs, cells and molecules) are material carriers of energy and information. Information is the cause of all changes in the body and psyche, the factor of their self-organization and management. Cybernetic analysis of the phenomena relationship became the basis for the emergence a new science – synergy in the 60s and 70s years of XX century and which has become the methodological basis of communication analysis in the aspect of management. The discovery of the universal nature of information exchange processes made it possible to apply mathematical models (originally developed for cybernetic modelling) to the analysis of information processes of any nature.

For example, many modern communication theories are based on Claude Shannon's universal model of communication (source - transmitter - transmission channel - receiver - addressee

- source of interference) [2]. However, regarding socio-cultural material, the communication model proposed by C. Shannon had undergone a significant transformation. Information processes within the human community had not always been able to be interpreted as reducing uncertainty than the cybernetic communications model had been. In addition to its relevance, the adequacy, credibility, completeness, novelty, persuasiveness, expressiveness, perception, etc., have proved to be important for socially and culturally significant information.

The concept of communication in the framework of system theory is mainly defined through three synonyms: connection, interrelation, interaction. In the most general sense, communication in system theory refers to any exchange of information between dynamic systems or subsystems of these systems that can receive, store, transform, etc. The system that sends information (whether human beings or machines) is called the sender, and the accepting side, respectively, is called the receiver. Along with the definition of communication in general, the specificity of social communication is also distinguished, although there is no unambiguous approach. Social communication was seen in modern literature as both a process of social communication and as a means of communicating meanings, as a basis for social exchange and as an exchange not only of meanings but also of substance and energy exchange, as an exchange that generates interconnectedness and commonality. However, almost all definitions emphasized the central role of social communication in integrating society.

This is a typical definition where social communication is viewed as the process of interaction between the subjects of socio-cultural activity (individuals, groups, organizations, etc.) for the purpose of transmission or exchange of information through the cultural symbolic systems (languages), techniques and means of their use. Communication acts as a basic mechanism and an integral part of the socio-cultural process, providing the

possibility of forming social ties, managing and regulating the common life of people areas of interest, the accumulation and transmission of social experience. However, socio-cultural communication is only a means of socio-cultural interaction between the subjects and their collectives, thus determining its basic social function. In a certain plan, each social action could be seen as communicative, containing and expressing certain information. At the same time, only actions carried out with a special purpose of communication, i.e., having a motivational basis, orientation to the transfer of information and carried out using an appropriate symbolic system are communicative [3, p. 315-316].

The classic literature on communication also attempts to give a wide range of different interpretations of the concepts of interaction and communication. Interaction and social communication are regarded as one-order, though not identical. For example, V. Konetskaya in the textbook "Sociology of communication" writes: "Communication is a socially conditioned process of exchange of thoughts and feelings between people in different spheres of their cognitive and creative life, which is realized mainly by means of verbal means of communication. Communication is a consciously conditioned process of transfer and perception of information in the framework of interpersonal and mass communication on different channels with the help of various communication means (verbal, non-verbal, etc.)" [4, p. 8-9].

M. Kagan asserts that in communication we deal with a one-way process, information flows only one way, and according to the laws established by the communication theory, the amount of information decreases during its movement from sender to recipient. In communication information circulates between partners, as both are equally active and therefore the information does not decrease, but increases, enriches, expands in the process of its circulation [5, p. 146]. It should be noted at once that the word "exchange" in the above definitions of communication is an obvious metaphor. In fact, and M. Kagan is right in this, if we

exchange ideas, exchange words, we do not lose our words, we mutually enrich ideas of each other. It is more correct to say that we want to share our thoughts and our feelings with someone.

That is a very important point separating the activity approach from the mechanistic one. In the mechanistic paradigm, communication refers to a one-way process of encoding and retrieving information from the source and receiving of the information by the recipient. In the activity approach, communication is understood as a joint activity of the participants of communication (communicators), during which a common (up to a certain limit) view of things and actions with them. Whereas a mechanistic approach is characterized by considering a person as a mechanism whose actions can be described by certain rules, the context of the external communication environment considered here as noise and interference, another approach is characterized by continuity and contextuality processes. Overall, the activity approach is closer to reality and more humane. At the same time, it is not harmful to use mechanistic metaphors (exchange of information) for some applications of communication theory, without forgetting the conditionality of the term.

The main thing that unites the viewpoints in the literature about communication is the reference to sociality as the most important characteristic of this phenomenon. Communication is considered as a generic concept, serving for characterization of different forms of interrelationship in the living and non-living nature and focusing on "linking" and "contact" of two or more things between them. Thus, communication is regarded as a purely social phenomenon that reveals the mechanisms of structuring, organizing and functioning of human society, the ways and forms of including the individual in the socio-historical context. Communication serves as a connecting element of the system "human – society". Hence, strictly speaking, communication is inherent only in human society. In this subsection, in a general way, at the level of the characteristics of contacts in the human

community, the concepts of "interaction" and "communication" will be used as synonyms.

F. Hayek's Communicative Mechanisms

In the communication theory, F. Hayek pays special attention to the role played by the transmission of information (or factual knowledge) in the functioning of "spontaneous, extended orders", by which he understands the market, law, language and morality. According to F. Hayek, totalitarianism is an inevitable consequence of the attempt to transfer to society the principles by which so-called "conscious orders" - factory-type organizations or armies created for a predetermined purpose according to the respective plan. However, the development of society is a complex process of evolution and interaction of "spontaneous orders" - social institutions, moral traditions and practices that are formed without anyone's intention and are not able to coordinate from a single center. The coordination of the activities of individuals within the framework of "spontaneous orders" is realized by observing the universal rules of conduct with the simultaneous granting of a certain sphere of autonomy to the individual. The guarantee of such autonomy, which allowed the use of "diffused knowledge" - the diversity of knowledge and skills of individuals - were institutions of individual ownership and private enterprise, political and intellectual freedom, the rule of law. The wide distribution of those institutions, according to F. Hayek, had been the result of an evolutionary selection that had led to the growth of the number and wealth of the groups that had been guided by them.

Also, F. Hayek researched the genesis of values. "Our values and institutions are not just determined by some past events but are formed as an integral part of the process of unconscious self-organization of some structure or model" [6, p. 21]. F. Hayek criticizes the so-called "engineering" view of society, according to which it is assumed that humanity is able, within the framework of the original rational plan, to consciously

guide its own evolution. This intellectual ambition, which F. Hayek calls "constructivist rationalism", played a very negative role for the fate of personal freedom and quality of human life especially in socialist countries, where this view of society became dominant. According to F. Hayek, in the dispute between socialism and the market order, it was no more or less a matter of survival. Following the socialist path would destroy most of modern humanity.

Throughout his academic career, F. Hayek as a principled opponent of all three the most influential anti-liberal economic-political projects of the XX century as socialism, Keynesianism and the welfare state doctrine, advocated against the intervention of statehood in the economy. From an economic point of view, according to F. Hayek, the key advantage of the market system over the planned was the ability of the former, through the price mechanism to use such a volume of information, which could not be obtained and processed in the central planning system. "It is easy to control or plan a simple situation when one person or a small organ can consider all significant factors, but if such factors become numerous that they cannot be calculated or integrated into a single picture, then decentralization is the only solution... Since no conceivable center is always aware of all the circumstances of the ever-changing demand and supply of various products and is not able to communicate this information promptly to interested parties, a mechanism is needed, automatically recording all significant effects of individual actions and expressing them in a universal form, which would at the same time be both a result of the past and a benchmark for future individual decisions. This is the price system in a competitive environment, and no other mechanism can replace it. Observing the movement of a relatively small number of prices, as the engineer observes the movement of arrows, the entrepreneur gets the opportunity to coordinate his actions with those of others" [7, p. 33].

Central socialist planning will never be able to respond as quickly as a market

mechanism to constant fluctuations in supply and demand. Moreover, according to F. Hayek, there was a lack of information on consumer preferences and the commercial production technology needed to calculate the same-spring prices and quantities of goods. The main advantage of free markets is that prices contain all the information needed for consumers and firms to make rational economic decisions at much lower costs than any other system. Here too, governments cannot improve market results, and the notion of "market failure" or "imperfect competition" from the point of view of F. Hayek (except for what happens by government decree in cases where governments grant legal rights and power to trade unions) is totally meaningless.

"In difficult circumstances, order and adaptation to the unknown are more effectively achieved through decentralized solutions, and that the diffusion of power contributed to the possibility of creating a comprehensive order. But such decentralization leads to the fact that more and more information is being considered. For the same reason, the fullest use of diffuse knowledge is achieved only through the flexible dispersion of specific resources among the multitude of individuals who can decide about their use - dispersion, conditioned by human being freedom and individualized property" [6, p. 134-135] - says F. Hayek.

So, the market as a communicative mechanism, according to F. Hayek, is the only available way to get information that allows individuals to judge the comparative advantages of a particular resource use, of which they have direct knowledge and use which, regardless of their intentions, serve the needs of people far away, unknown to them. The diffusion of this knowledge is its essential characteristic, and it is impossible to assemble and hand it over to the authorities.

How to achieve effective communication? What are the conditions and criteria for distinguishing effective communication? Here is how these conditions are defined for F. Hayek's self-organizing systems: "In order to encourage the self-formation of

certain abstract structures of interpersonal relationships, we need to maintain some very general conditions as a support, without preventing individual elements from finding and occupying their place in a broader order. The most we can do to facilitate this process is to introduce only those elements that are subject to binding rules. The more complex the structure we seek to emerge, the more rigid the boundaries for our intervention. This is inevitable" [6, p. 145].

F. Hayek stressed, that the function of the price system is realized only in the conditions of competition. By competition, he means: 1) full freedom to buy and sell goods at any price for which there are willing; 2) equal access to any branch of the economy on equal terms. This requires, first, that the law prevent any attempts by individuals or groups to restrict this access openly or secretly. Any attempt to control the price or quantity of goods deprives competition of the ability to coordinate the efforts of individuals, since price fluctuations in these cases no longer reflect changes in the situation and cannot provide a reliable guideline for individual activities. According to F. Hayek, the action of competition requires not only the correct organization of institutions such as money, the market and information channels (and in some cases private enterprise in principle cannot provide this), but above all the appropriate legal system. Legislation should be specially designed to protect and promote competition.

What are the conditions for effective communication in spontaneous, expanded settings? F. Hayek writes: "Most of the defects and inefficiencies of such spontaneous arrangements are due to attempts to interfere with their functioning, either by directly impeding the work of their inherent mechanisms or by trying to somehow improve their results... Deliberate intervention, aimed at smoothing out inequality and motivated by concern for the interests of an arbitrarily chosen party of this order, risks disrupting the work of the whole, while the self-regulation process will give an arbitrarily selected member of this group a better chance of success (and

a wider range of options available to all) than any rival system can do" [6, p. 148].

"The process of formation of the expanded economic order is quite different. This order is formed and can only be formed by the development of such a mode of communication, which made it possible to transmit not an infinite number of messages about specific facts, but only information about certain abstract properties of various specific conditions. For example, competitive prices, which must be harmonized to achieve global order. Prices shall bear information on prevailing, as it is determined, substitution rules, or equivalence, between a variety of goods and services, the use of which is at the disposal of some interested parties" [6, p. 152].

N. Luhmann's Communicative Research

A great contribution to the development of the modern system theory of society was made by the German philosopher Niklas Luhmann. In his works, social systems are considered for the first time from three different levels: interaction, organization and society [8, p. 206]. The innovation of his work is also the introduction of the theory of communication, which, in the view of N. Luhmann, is the elementary operation responsible for the education of society. At the same time, every communication taking place in the world belongs to society, and society is defined precisely through communication: there is no society outside communication.

Another important theoretical decision made by N. Luhmann was to consider social systems like biological systems in terms of autopoiesis, i.e. self-replication. N. Luhmann borrowed the term "autopoiesis" from the famous Chilean biologist Humberto Maturana. This term means that the system (and in this case the biological systems, according to N. Luhmann, are like social systems) is able to produce and reproduce all its parts from itself. In this sense, social systems only exist as long as they continue to operate, and at the end of operations, the system disappears - that's what death means in biological systems. This argues

that society, like other social systems, does exist. And that's the end point of society, the end of communication. Here is how N. Luhmann defines communication: "The concept of communication denotes not just the action of a message that transfers information, but a special autopoietic operation that connects three different selections, namely information, message and understanding into a single emergent unity, to which further communication can be adjoined" [8, p. 207]. This position is achievable only from the perspective of the external observer, which is "cybernetics of the second level".

What does N. Luhmann mean by "cybernetics of the second level"? The limitations of the system, he said, could not be taken from its internal perspective, but were taken from the perspective of another system, from the perspective of an external observer. The evolution of autopoietic systems is that they can produce quasi-effects of external observation. Differentiating within themselves, they create subsystems from which it becomes possible to control or "cybernetics of the second level". In cybernetics of the second level, the cognitive observer is involved in the process of cognition (self-knowledge) of the system. Multi-dimensional communication between functional subsystems within the system, which is growing with the evolution of the social system, enables the system to be equipped with second-order cybernetics. The growth of these subsystems increases communication and the importance of observing the system and, consequently, increases its viability. Although N. Luhmann does not connect qualitative changes of society with the development of modern means of communication, but in his interpretation all aspects of social life (actions, inaction, interventions) are only forms of communication, and the theory is turning to the realities of communication processes in society.

The real communication of N. Luhmann is presented as a mechanism of transmission of the results of reduction of complexity, which are developed within

subsystems of the social system according to their inherent "code". Thus, the result of the activity of the system of science is such a reduction, which is expressed in the concept of truth. The main subsystems of society, such as scientific, political, economic and family produce the exchange of information through the "truth", "power", "money", "love" codes. A positive criterion for the rationality of the system is its successful adaptation to the environment. The rationale from this perspective is that it serves the function most effectively and thus stabilizing the system.

The communicative society theory of N. Luhmann is inspired primarily by the empirical factor of the extraordinary growth of communication technologies and capabilities. The process of globalization certainly symbolized nothing less than the new technical quality of the development of communication's means: globalization was only "global" communication at a new technical and social level. It made sense, therefore, to define what was meant at that level and to restore the way in which the means of communication operated in modern society. It may be recalled that the New European civilization emerged in parallel with the development of fast and long-range means of communication: sea transport, railway, car, air transport. Subsequently, physical means replaced electronic signals - via telephone, telegraph, radio, television, wireless communication. The post-industrial era is marked by the explosive development of superfast and ultra-distant means of communication.

Among the most important is electronic mail, which by the end of the twentieth century had already exceeded the volume of classic mail messages. The impact of rapidly expanding cellular services is even more visible. Tele-image transmission, broadband and mobile Internet promise to be the qualitative end of the communications revolution of the era of globalization. Equipped with a car, mobile phone, compact computer with an Internet connection, access to extensive global networks of transport and electronic communications, the modern inhabitant

of the planet acquires incomparable communication resources. The explosion of business and semi-business contacts replacing the traditions of "long-term" friendship, that contains such quantitative growth of personal communication intensity, which in general changes the communicative profile of the person. The modern man can simultaneously engage and maintain contacts with tens and hundreds of people, including representatives of a variety of languages, cultures and social situations. This, of course, requires an entirely different degree of openness and communicative competence (including linguistic knowledge) on the part of the individual in the traditional society, who had a lifetime deal with a certain set of persons and functions. New opportunities for communication are destroying boundaries that were based on the dimension of past means of communication that have not crossed national boundaries.

Thus, the management of technological processes spread over different continents is becoming organizationally as possible and feasible today as was previously in the case with local management. Presence in different markets is now as natural as it was natural to operate in national markets. The global dimension of communication has given firms access to rich markets and, at the same time, to low-cost labor markets, leading to both the expansion of transnational corporations and fundamental changes in the labor market.

Discussions

The author has considered in general how the conditions of communication are understood within the framework of the system theory of society. So, what were the criteria for effective communication in that theory? If the system of market prices is presented as a semiotic text, the information it contains appears as some meaning that remains invariant with all the transformations of the text. That could be understood as a pre-text message implemented in the text. This assumes that,

ideally, the content does not change either qualitatively or in volume: the recipient decodes the text and receives the original message. The market price as a text appears only as a "technical packaging" of the message in which the recipient is interested.

Behind this view of the functioning of the market as a communicative mechanism is the conviction that its goal is adequate transmission of some message. The system works "well" if the message received by addressee is completely identical to that sent by the addressee and "bad" if there are differences between these texts. These differences are qualified as "errors", which are avoided by special mechanisms of the structure. It was no coincidence that F. Hayek compared the mechanism of market pricing with the movement of the arrows of the device, which is observed by an engineer.

Thus, to fully guarantee the adequacy of the transmitted and received message in the market conditions, artificial (simplified) price language and artificially simplified communicators, with a strictly limited amount of memory, are necessary. The established mechanism would be able to address only a limited range of human information needs. Should this artificial model be considered a model of communication per se, an ideal to which all other models of communication should approach? Artificial market-based pricing mechanisms did not separate communication as such, but rather one of its functions - the ability to communicate adequately because of achieving excellence in its reality, communicative structures lost the ability to service other functions inherent in their natural state, such as creative function, i.e. the ability to generate new messages.

Conclusion

To conclude the analysis of philosophical approach to communication problems, the author again briefly highlights the specifics of this approach. First of all, communicative forms, which exist in society have a defined purpose. They represented

as a way of organization and optimization of a certain type of subject activity - production, science, pedagogy, art etc. All participants of the common action need communication as a necessary means of ensuring its effectiveness and believe the supporters of process and activity. However, the importance of communication as a facilitator of collective substantive action varies greatly depending on the importance of labor division and hierarchy system. So, according to F. Hayek and N. Luhmann, when a joint action does not have a predetermined algorithm and requires the fundamental equality of all its participants, such as in free market competition, communication becomes essentially the only regulation, in which and through which people coordinate their goals and actions.

References

- 1 Винер Р. Индивидуальный и общественный гомеостазис // *Общественные науки и современность*. – 1994. – № 6. – С. 127–130.
- 2 Лачинов В.М., Поляков А.О. Информодинамика или путь к миру открытых систем. – СПб.: СПбГТУ, 1999. – 431 с.
- 3 Культурология. XX век: Энциклопедия / Гл. ред., сост. Левит С.Я. – СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. – Т. 1. – 447 с.
- 4 Конецкая В.П. Социология коммуникации. – М.: Международный ин-т бизнеса и управления, 1997. – 302 с.
- 5 Кagan M.S. Мир общения. – М.: Политиздат, 1988. – 319 с.
- 6 Хайек Ф. Пагубная самонадеянность. – М.: Новости, 1992. – 304 с.

7 Хайек Ф. Дорога к рабству // *Вопросы философии*. – 1990. – № 10. – С. 25–36.

8 Луман Н. Тавтология и парадокс в самоописаниях современного общества // *Социологос: Социология. Антропология. Метафизика*. Вып. 1. – М.: Прогресс, 1991. – С. 194–216.

Transliteration

1 Viner R. Individual'nyj i obshhestvennyj gomeostazis [Individual and social homeostasis] // *Obshhestvennye nauki i sovremennost'*. – 1994. – № 6. – С. 127-130. (in Russ)

2 Lachinov V.M., Poljakov A.O. Informodina-mika ili put' k miru otkrytyh system [Informodynamics or the way to a world of open systems]. – Spb.: SPbGTU, 1999. – 431 s. (in Russ)

3 Kul'turologija. XX vek: Jenciklopedija [Cultural Studies. XX Century: Encyclopedia] / Gl. red., sost. Levit S.Ja. – SPb.: Universitetskaja kniga, 1998. – T. 1. – 447 s. (in Russ)

4 Koneckaja V.P. Sociologija kommunikacii [The sociology of communication]. – M.: Mezhdunarodnyj in-t biznesa i upravlenija, 1997. – 302 s. (in Russ)

5 Kagan M.S. Mir obshhenija [The world of communication]. – M.: Politizdat, 1988. – 319 s. (in Russ)

6 Hajek F. Pagubnaja samonadejannost' [Fatal conceit]. – M.: Novosti, 1992. – 304 s. (in Russ)

7 Hajek F. Doroga k rabstvu [A road to slavery] // *Voprosy filosofii*. – 1990. - № 10. – С. 25–36. (in Russ)

8 Luman N. Tavtologija i paradoks v samoopisanijah sovremenogo obshhestva [Tautology and Paradox in the Self-descriptions of Modern Society] // *Socio-Logos: Sociologija. Antropologija. Metafizika*. Vyp. 1. – M.: Progress, 1991. – S. 194-216. (in Russ)

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHOR

Zhanat Doskhozina

Assistant professor, PhD, International Information Technology University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1416-8600

Жанат Мэлсовна Досхожина

ассистент профессор, PhD, Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, email: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1416-8600

Жанат Мэлсовна Досхожина

ассистент профессор, PhD, Международный университет информационных технологий, Алматы, Казахстан, email: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1416-8600