Palchynska Mariana Viktorivna
Doctor of Philosophical Science, Professor,
Professor at the Department of
Cyberpsychology and Rehabilitation
State University of Intelligence
Technologies and Telecommunications
7, Solomianska str., Kyiv, Ukraine
orcid.org/0000-0001-5860-9546

THE INTEGRATIVE POTENTIAL OF SOCIOCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

The relevance of the chosen topic lies, first of all, in the need to find integrative mechanisms that ensure the reproduction of the socio-cultural integrity of society. This integrity is maintained and reproduced, among other means, through socio-cultural communication.

The article aims to study the integrative potential of sociocultural communication. The stated goal requires the implementation of the following tasks:

– to define the concept of "sociocultural communication";

– to investigate the functioning of sociocultural communication within certain sign-symbolic semantic boundaries;

– to determine the role of culture in the semantic organization of communicative relations;

– to highlight the significance of socio-cultural communication in the development of society.

Research methods. The use of the systemic method contributed to a comprehensive and comprehensive understanding of the role of sociocultural communication in the reproduction of society as a system.

The socio-cultural method is focused on understanding society as a holistic socio-cultural system and allowed us to determine the significance of socio-cultural communication in the formation and relay of the sign-symbolic component of social development.

The historical-philosophical method helps to trace the multifaceted nature of the concept of communication and serves as a tool for its most relevant definition in modern socio-cultural conditions.

Results. Based on the understanding of the sociocultural system as a unity of social, cultural, and personal components that relate to one another as system and environment and exist through mutual interpenetration let us investigate the essence of sociocultural communication.

First and foremost, sociocultural communication is communication carried out within the framework of the sociocultural system, which in turn constitutes the unity of the social system, culture, and the individual.

The individual acts as the subject of sociocultural communication on the following grounds: a subject of communication can only be regarded as such if they are capable of internal communication, capable of generating ideas, meanings, and values that are subsequently transmitted in external communication. It is within intrapersonal communication that ideas and meanings are born, which later, in the process of intersubjective communication, take the form of values, conventions, ideologies, and so forth.

Culture, as a program of communicative interactions and interrelations, can function in three distinct ways. Communicative organization may be directed toward the reproduction of communicative interactions and connections in their unchanged form, aiming to preserve their stability. This mode referred to here as traditional exists not only in traditional societies but also in modern, rapidly changing ones, since without the simple reproduction of its core characteristics, socio-cultural communication risks disintegration. Communicative organization may be aimed at transforming socio-cultural interactions and interrelations, driven by the need to adapt to changes in the external environment. This innovative mode, based on the foundation of traditional organization, brings communicative interactions and connections into alignment with social, cultural, and personal transformations. This method leads to communicative interaction and interconnection in accordance with the context of socio-cultural transformations to which modern society is subject. It is noted that the integrative potential of socio-cultural communication can also be aimed at creating fundamentally new meanings and forms of communicative interaction.

Key words: sociocultural communication, communicative interaction, society, culture, personality.

Introduction. The relevance of the chosen topic lies primarily in the need to search for integrative mechanisms that ensure the reproduction of the sociocultural integrity of society. This integrity is maintained and reproduced, among other means, through sociocultural communication. As an integral element of society's functioning as a social system, communication cannot generate meaning, interpret meanings, or produce new knowledge without the participation of conscious individuals.

This article explores how philosophy can be used to analyze contemporary communication challenges, for example, the ethical dimension of communication in the context of virtualization and digitalization of society, and the impact of infocommunication technologies on human interaction. This approach enhances our understanding of the complexity of interpersonal and social communication, and helps to address fundamental questions about the integrative potential of sociocultural communication.

Degree of Scientific Development of the Issue. From various methodological perspectives, communication and its significance for the functioning of society as a sociocultural system have been analyzed by P. Berger, T. Luckmann, J. Lotman, P. Sorokin, T. Parsons, J. Habermas, N. Luhmann, Jaap van Ginneken, C. Mangion, G. Turbanti, J. Storey, M. Shahreza and others. However, under modern conditions, the analysis of sociocultural communication particularly its integrative component requires further research.

The article aims to study the integrative potential of sociocultural communication.

The stated goal requires the implementation of the next **tasks:**

– to define the concept of "sociocultural communication";

– to investigate the functioning of sociocultural communication within certain sign-symbolic semantic boundaries;

– to determine the role of culture in the semantic organization of communicative relations;

– to highlight the significance of socio-cultural communication in the development of society.

Research methods. The use of the systemic method contributed to a comprehensive and comprehensive understanding of the role of sociocultural communication in the reproduction of society as a system.

The socio-cultural method is focused on understanding society as a holistic socio-cultural system and allowed us to determine the significance of socio-cultural communication in the formation and relay of the sign-symbolic component of social development.

The historical-philosophical method helps to trace the multifaceted nature of the concept of communication and serves as a tool for its most relevant definition in modern socio-cultural conditions.

Main Content. Sociocultural communication can be interpreted as an element of social action aimed at creating and maintaining contact between a subject and others for the purpose of transmitting various messages. Its goals and means may vary, including informing, changing another subject's behavior, or achieving mutual understanding.

The above considerations highlight the need to engage in philosophical analysis to better understand sociocultural communication. As noted by Mangion: "The philosophy of communication is a growing branch within both philosophy and communication studies, and although it has been traditionally studied as part of the philosophy of language, it is rapidly achieving an identity of its own. This text hopes to make a small contribution towards making progress in that direction" [10, p. 456].

Referring to Jaap van Ginneken, "industrialization and urbanization had meanwhile led to entirely new needs for information about individuals' constantly shifting psycho-social orientations" [5, p. 289]. Thus, sociocultural communication can be presented "as the process of sharing ideas, information and messages with others" [13, p. 4].

It is important to emphasize that the semantic organization of communicative actions and connections, which is shaped by culture, introduces another dimension to the analysis of sociocultural communication–namely, the content of the communicative process. In most definitions of sociocultural communication, the transmission of information is considered its essential feature. This definition implies the recognition of culture, the social system, and the individual as participants in the communicative process. In this context, society as a social system emerges as the result of integration into

a network of communicative interactions. According to the research Sawyer R., Chen G.-M., in modern society "the compression of time and space, due to the convergence of new media and globalization, has shrunk the world into a much smaller interactive field" [14, p.151].

For the implementation of communicative actions and the functioning of communication networks, meanings, values, signs, symbols, and other semiotic elements are essential. Information and its interpretations within the communicative process must find concrete expression in order to be further transmitted. In both intrapersonal and interpersonal social communication, information and interpretation take on a sign-symbolic form that embodies specific meanings. Thus, communication exists within particular sign-symbolic semantic boundaries: "The relationship of the system to external reality and their mutual impenetrability has, since Kant, been examined many times. From the semiotic point of view, they represent the antinomy between language and the world beyond the borders of language. That space, lying outside of language, enters the sphere of language and is transformed into 'content' only as a constituent element of the dichotomy content/expression. To speak of unexpressed content is non-sensical" [8, p. 38].

Language and other cultural forms of communication play a dual role. On one hand, they organize communicative actions within the possibilities of their functioning in the social structure. On the other, they serve as tools for the semantic construction of reality. Referring to P. Berger and T. Luckmann, social order exists only as a product of human activity; it is created by individuals through a continuous process of externalization [1, p. 83].

Certain features of sociocultural communication can be traced back to the Postmodern era: "Postmodernism has disturbed many of the old certainties surrounding questions of cultural value. In particular, it has problematized the question of why some texts are canonized, while others disappear without trace: that is, why only certain texts supposedly «pass the test of time»" [17, p. 201].

Communicative organization assigns some connections and actions to the communicative structure, and others to the external environment. This process of classification is governed by the system's own norms and values, with language as a system of symbols serving as the primary tool. Culture, first and foremost, performs the function of communicative organization within the sociocultural system. Symbols, as forms identifying meaning, acquire a conventional character in the process of communication. Thus, sociocultural communication is a form of social interaction, in which the subjects individuals, social groups, and others carry out communicative actions within a network of social relations, shaped by culturally conditioned forms. Due to M. Shahreza, it should be noted that "communication is not only limited to the language aspect, but also includes the diverse ways we interact and share information" [15].

The semantic organization of communicative actions and connections, shaped by a given culture, highlights another important aspect of analyzing sociocultural communication namely, the content of the communicative process. As Mangion notes: "Current interest in communication studies is understandable given the proliferation of communication technologies that are part and parcel of today's world. However, while this interest tends to focus on the media applications of communication technologies, the concept of communication that underlies these technologies remains unexamined" [10, p. 12].

Talcott Parsons regarded communication as one of the fundamental functions of culture. He wrote: "Without general recognition and relative stability of meanings, mutual complementarity of expectations is impossible. This applies primarily to the cognitive system of symbols, though not exclusively. Moreover, in this aspect of culture, the normative element is always present in orientation, since adherence to linguistic conventions and belief systems is a condition of communication" [11, p. 178].

According to Jürgen Habermas, communicative action, which is aimed at mutual understanding between subjects and coordinating their activities, has the capacity to resist the intrusion of the system world namely, the market economy and state bureaucracy into the lifeworld. Unlike other types of social action, communicative action, in Habermas's view, possesses a creative and constructive power. Habermas argues that all concepts of action used in social theory can be reduced to four fundamental

types. The concept of teleological action refers to the behavior of an individual who pursues a goal by selecting and applying the most effective means. If the actor takes into account not only their own decisions but also those of others, such goal-directed behavior becomes strategic action. The concept of normatively regulated action corresponds not to an isolated individual but to a particular social group oriented toward shared values. In this type of action, individuals act not based on pre-defined goals, but in accordance with socially accepted norms, values, and the expectations of others.

The concept of communicative action relates to the interaction of at least two language-capable, action-oriented subjects, "…in which actors in society seek to reach common understanding and to co-ordinate actions by reasoned argument, consensus, and cooperation rather than strategic action strictly in pursuit of their own goals" [6, p.84]. The actors aim to achieve a mutual understanding of the action situation in order to coordinate both action plans and the actions themselves: "The pursuit of mutual understanding and coordinated action distinguishes communicative action from teleological action (which serves the goal of only one actor), normatively regulated action (which is subject to shared rules and values), and dramaturgical action (which is guided by motives of self-presentation)" [7, p. 65].

The basis for distinguishing communicative action from non-communicative forms lies in the meaning embedded in the subject's speech acts. Communicative action is carried out with the intention of reaching mutual understanding and coordinating actions with other actors. From this perspective, actions that aim to establish connections with others and convey certain messages or information though seemingly communicative in nature are in fact non-communicative if they treat other actors merely as objects.

Speech acts, however, do not exhaust the entire content of communicative action. It is important to study not only the rules for using signs, the meanings and semantics of texts, and the methods of conveying and interpreting them in the speaking and listening processes, but also the way significant social processes and phenomena are reflected in the text. Moreover, communicative action is of interest in terms of the social content of intentions and conventions.

Communicative action can be organized in such a way that the aspiration for mutual understanding and coordinated activity becomes not only an end in itself but also a means of realizing mutual interests, affirming commitment to shared values, or creating a favorable image of one another.

In Habermas's conception, communicative action appears as a processual and creative form of activity-oriented interaction aimed at developing new goals including universally significant ones such as achieving social harmony (a new historical consensus) as well as seeking the most effective means for attaining them. This, according to Habermas, is the main purpose of this type of communication, which may be conditionally described as communication of goal formation and purposeful collective creativity. It is this form of communication, based on the principle of constructive interaction, that the philosopher associates with the concept of "communicative rationality" [6, p. 216].

Niklas Luhmann also attributes creative potential to communication, but on a fundamentally different methodological level. Whereas many sociological and especially socio-psychological theories tend to equate society with consciousness (understood as deliberate and conscious interactions), Luhmann, on the contrary, posits that the communication system (society) and the psychic system (consciousness) are closed and autonomously functioning formations. Due to João Costa, "This definition gives us the key notion that the system–environment distinction is the fundament to the creation of a system. The systems appear and are therefore observable as a result of this distinction, by which the observer can assign the place of observation either inside the system or in the environment. In other words, this distinction is the key constitutive step of social systems–systems come to exist as distinct from environment" [Costa, p.27]. As a result, carriers of consciousness individuals do not "enter" society, that is, the communication system. Society, as an *autopoietic* (self-creating and self-reproducing) system, is communication itself. Thus, it is not individuals, but communication that creates society.

In social communication, it is not individuals who are elements, bearers, or subjects of communication, but rather information itself. In the communication system as conceived by Luhmann, "…there is no place not only for individuals, but also for culture, which is replaced by another communicative

component – language" [9, p. 93]. However, such a radical exclusion of individuals with their consciousness, psyche, and actions as well as culture from society renders the very concept of society meaningless. It is culture that forms the crucial link distinguishing society not only from biological systems, but also from other informational systems. Carried to its logical conclusion, Luhmann's theory presents society as a global informational-communicational system. In his theory, the social system appears as self-communicating communication a system that communicates with itself, as a non-individual and non-cultural entity, resembling a computer-like mechanism.

It should be noted, in Niklas Luhmann's theory of society, the concept of *form* is used to designate the boundary of the system. As previously noted, this form marks the line that differentiates the system from its external environment. However, such a radical exclusion from society–not only of individuals with their consciousness, psyche, and actions, but also of culture–renders the very concept of society meaningless. It is culture that constitutes the crucial link distinguishing society not only from biological systems, but also from other informational systems. Carried to its logical extreme, Luhmann's reasoning leads to the view of society as a global informational-communicational system. In this model, the social system appears as self-communicating communication a system that interacts with itself, existing as a non-individual and non-cultural entity, resembling a computer.

Luhmann explains changes within social systems by the constant distinction made in communication between message and information, and between information and interpretation. At the same time, the operations of consciousness (of individual persons) and the operations of communication occur independently of one another. In other words, individuals are not subjects, sources, or carriers of communication; therefore, they do not belong to the system, but rather to its environment. If we consistently develop the logic of Luhmann's systems analysis, the system becomes a network of relations (communications) without substance or elements (although Luhmann considers information to be a system element, a message that contains information is itself a form of connection–otherwise, its meaning is lost). Luhmann calls for abandoning the concept of social action (including communicative action), arguing that communication deals not with actions but with events within the system. Communication thus emerges as a supra-individual system.

In Luhmann's theory, as mentioned earlier, the concept of *form* is used to mark "…the system boundary, distinguishing it from the environment" [9, p. 82]. Communicative action, meanwhile, is an aspect of social action that characterizes it as an act aimed at establishing and maintaining contact between the acting subject and others, with the goal of transmitting and understanding messages. The purposes and means of communicative action may vary from informing and influencing the behavior of another person to achieving mutual understanding, or, conversely, to misleading.

In contrast to Luhmann, we argue that individuals are the transformative force within the social system and its environment (although, of course, this force remains merely potential without mutual connections). Communication, understood as a social system, cannot produce meaning, interpretation, or creativity such as the generation of new ideas and knowledge without the participation of conscious individuals. Culture and social systems serve as the conditions (sources or enabling frameworks) that either support or constrain the creative and transformative actions of individuals. The person cannot be merely part of the environment of communication; they are not only a reflective agent but also a communicative one.

For the realization of communicative actions and the functioning of communicative networks, meanings, significations, signs, symbols, and so on are necessary. Messages, information, and interpretations in the communicative process must acquire concrete form in order to be operated upon and transmitted. Firstly, in both intrapersonal and interpersonal or social communication, messages, information, and interpretation acquire sign-based, symbolic form. Secondly, these signs and symbols carry specific meanings and significance. Thirdly, communication is carried out according to established or agreed-upon rules, procedures, and technologies. Thus, communication exists within certain semiotic-symbolic, normative, and meaningful boundaries. Culture, as a system of values and norms, defines the forms and limits of the communicative process. The communicative boundary is the boundary of what is possible–beyond which lie things devoid of meaning and significance.

By boundary (form), what is meant is not a spatial outline of communicative processes, but rather the area of intersection of communicative actions and communicative networks. Communicative actions of individuals that fall outside the bounds of these networks are situated on the other side of the system–in its external environment. Within the forms and boundaries of the socio-cultural system, communicative actions and connections are organized in a specific way. It is this particular mode of organization that enables us to distinguish the system from its environment and to identify the system itself.

Language, the symbolic world, and other cultural forms of communication play a dual role. On the one hand, they organize communicative actions within the limits of their functionality in the social structure. On the other hand, they serve as means of constructing meaning and reality (as emphasized by phenomenological sociology). In this sense, we can agree with P. Berger and T. Luckmann that "social order exists only as a product of human activity; it is created by individuals in the process of constant externalization" [1, p. 74]. Communicative organization classifies some connections and actions as part of the communicative structure, and others (as forms of freedom restriction) as belonging to the external environment. The mechanism of this classification is the system of norms and values of a given system, and the instrument is language as a system of symbols. In other words, "the function of communicative organization of the socio-cultural system its structuring and restructuring is fulfilled by culture" [12, p. 113].

The system of social relations itself, can be Whatever motives a person may be guided by in their activities hidden (unconscious) or explicit and regardless of which scientific language is used to describe them, all of this is captured in culture. Culture can be understood as "a text in which human motivation is recorded and fixed" [13, p. 322]. Should be focus attention, in this context sociocultural communication is understood not as the transmission of a message or information, but as the transfer of meanings that is, the semantic content of information. Moreover, all elements of the communicative process: message, understanding, interpretation, utterance, text, discourse, knowledge, opinion, sign, symbol, language, and others embody, in one way or another, a single core: meaning.

As already mentioned earlier, the concept of "meaning" also holds a key position in Niklas Luhmann's theory, where it signifies a special form of ordering social communication. Communication, in this view, constitutes the semantic reconstruction of society. Meaning allows us to identify the horizons within which the organization of social systems becomes possible. Communication is thus not understood as the "transfer" of information, but as an ever-emerging semantic surplus, which can potentially address any participant, both on the individual and collective levels. The semantic structuring of the social system ensures the necessary coherence, and through it, the integrity of society.

It is important to note that the distinction between message, information, and understanding, as formulated in Luhmann's theory, significantly broadens the horizon of socio-cultural communication analysis, as it emphasizes the difference between message and information [9, p. 223].

Communication begins with a message and ends with understanding. Both poles are anchored in the individual. Therefore, communication should be considered a sequential transformation of meaning. Interpretation is an integral component of both the message and understanding. Any message, before being sent, is interpreted by the communicator–it contains the communicator's interpretation. The message is also interpreted by the recipient. In a message, meaning is assigned by the communicator (meaning-giving) and defined by the recipient (meaning-reading). Since both message and understanding "belong" to subjects the communicator and the recipient–are oriented toward the subjects of communication, and are subjectively motivated (meaning-giving and meaning-reading), they constitute the content of communicative action.

Understanding in the communicative process acts as the content of communicative action, representing the unity of interpretation (as a meaning-decoding operation) and comprehension (as the transformation of the message into a coherent system of personal meaning).

Results. Based on the understanding of the sociocultural system as a unity of social, cultural, and personal components that relate to one another as system and environment and exist through mutual interpenetration let us investigate the essence of sociocultural communication.

First and foremost, sociocultural communication is communication carried out within the framework of the sociocultural system, which in turn constitutes the unity of the social system, culture, and the individual. This definition implies the recognition of culture, the social system, and the individual as participants in the communicative process.

The essence of sociocultural communication should be determined through the consistent identification of the purpose, functions, and roles played in this process by the individual, the social system, and culture. The individual acts as the subject of sociocultural communication on the following grounds: A subject of communication can only be regarded as such if they are capable of internal communication, capable of generating ideas, meanings, and values that are subsequently transmitted in external communication. It is within intrapersonal communication that ideas and meanings are born, which later, in the process of intersubjective communication, take the form of values, conventions, ideologies, and so forth.

Conclusions. In social systems, communication is primarily understood as connections intended for messages, information, and its interpretation. Based on this understanding, the role of social systems in sociocultural communication can be outlined as follows: the social system is a network of communicative interactions among individuals. If social systems constitute a network of communicative interactions and the associations formed on that basis, then culture organizes these interactions through norms, values, and standards.

Sociocultural communication represents a unity of the actions of subjects in interpreting messages and identifying in these messages the information of mutual interest, which is consistent with the values and norms of a specific culture. As for other models of communicative interaction, they possess either a destructive or blocking potential (inhibiting both destructive and constructive actions).

Sociocultural communication has the potential necessary for the integration of society if it is based on an organization that directs communicative interactions toward mutual support among subjects and communicative connections toward the exchange of information aimed at solving public issues within the framework of equitable dialogue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berger P. and Luckmann T. The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Penguin Books, 1966. 250 p.

2. Bermúdez J. L. Thinking without Words. Oxford University Press. 2011. 202 p.

3. Costa J. Health as a Social System. Luhmann's Theory Applied to Health Systems. An Introduction. Health, Communication and Society. 2023. 183 p. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839466933

4. Giacomo T. Philosophy of Communication. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022. 372 p.

5. Ginneken Jaap van. Kurt Baschwitz A Pioneer of Communication Studies and Social Psychology. Amsterdam: University Press, 2018. 354 p.

6. Habermas, J. The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985. 465 p.

7. Habermas, J. On the Pragmatics of Communication, ed. M. Cooke, Cambridge: Polity Press. 2002. 464 p.

8. Lotman J. Semiotics, Communication and Cognition. Editor Paul Cobley. Berlin: Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG,1 2004. 96 p.

9. Luhmann N. The Reality of the Mass Media/ Translated by Cross K. Stanford. Stanford University Press. 2000. 159 p.

10. Mangion C. Philosophical Approaches to Communication. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2011. 464 p.

11. Parsons T. The Social System. London: Routledge, 1991. 636 p.

12. Philosophies of Communication: Implications for Everyday Experience. Editors M. Cook, A. M. Holba. NY: Peter Lang Inc, 2008. 168 p.

13. Philosophy of Communication Editors. B. G. Chang and G. C. Butchart. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012. 688 p.

14. Sawyer R., Chen G.-M. The Impact of Social Media on Intercultural Adaptation. *Intercultural Communication Studies*. 2012. vol. 21, no. 2. pp. 151–169.

15. Shahreza M. Communication in Terms of Philosophy. Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4593956 2023.

16. Sorokin P. Social And Cultural Dynamics. A Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics, Law and Social Relationships. London: Routledge, 2017. 720 p.

17. Storey J. Cultural Theory and Popular Culture. 10th Edition. Routledge, 2024. 328 p.

REFERENCES

1. Berger P. and Luckmann T. (1966). The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Penguin Books, 250 p. [in English]

2. Bermúdez J. L. (2011). Thinking without Words. Oxford University Press. 202 p. [in English]

3. Costa J. (2023). Health as a Social System. Luhmann's Theory Applied to Health Systems. An Introduction. Health, Communication and Society. 4. 183 p. [in English]

4. Giacomo T. (2022). Philosophy of Communication. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 372 p. [in English]

5. Ginneken Jaap van (2018). Kurt Baschwitz A Pioneer of Communication Studies and Social Psychology. Amsterdam: University Press, 354 p. [in English]

6. Habermas, J. (1985). The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Boston: Beacon Press, 465 p. [in English]

7. Habermas, J. (2002). On the Pragmatics of Communication, ed. M. Cooke, Cambridge: Polity Press. 464 p. [in English]

8. Lotman J. (2004). Semiotics, Communication and Cognition. Editor Paul Cobley. Berlin: Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG,196 p. [in English]

9. Luhmann N. (2000). The Reality of the Mass Media/ Translated by Cross K. Stanford. Stanford University Press. 159 p. [in English]

10. Mangion C. (2011). Philosophical Approaches to Communication. Bristol: Intellect Books, 464 p. [in English]

11. Parsons T. (1991). The Social System. London: Routledge, 636 p. [in English]

12. Philosophies of Communication: Implications for Everyday Experience (2008). Editors M. Cook, A. M. Holba. NY: Peter Lang Inc. 168 p. [in English]

13. Philosophy of Communication (2012). Editors B. G. Chang and G. C. Butchart. Cambridge: MIT Press, 688 p. [in English]

14. Sawyer R., Chen G.-M. (2012). The Impact of Social Media on Intercultural Adaptation. Intercultural Communication Studies.vol. 21, no. 2. pp. 151-169. [in English]

15. Shahreza M. (2023). Communication in Terms of Philosophy. Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4593956 [in English]

16. Sorokin P. (2017). Social And Cultural Dynamics. A Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics, Law and Social Relationships. London: Routledge, 720 p. [in English]

17. Storey J. (2024). Cultural Theory and Popular Culture. 10th Edition. Routledge, 328 p. [in English]

Пальчинська Мар'яна Вікторівна
доктор філософських наук, професор,
завідувач кафедри соціально-гуманітарних наук
Державного університету інформаційних технологій та зв'язку
вул. Солом'янська, 7, Київ, Україна
orcid.org/0000-0001-5860-9546

ІНТЕГРАТИВНИЙ ПОТЕНЦІАЛ СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Актуальність обраної теми полягає, перш за все, у необхідності пошуку інтегративних механізмів, що забезпечують відтворення соціокультурної цілісності суспільства. Ця цілісність підтримується та відтворюється, серед інших засобів, через соціокультурну комунікацію.

Метою статті є вивчення інтегративного потенціалу соціокультурної комунікації.

Означена мета потребує реалізації наступних *завдань*:

− дати визначення поняттю «соціокультурна комунікація»;

− дослідити функціонування соціокультурної комунікації в певних знаково-символічних смислових межах;

– визначити роль культури у смисловій організації комунікативних зв'язків;
– виокремити значущість соціокультурної комунікації у розвитку суспільства та особистості.

Методи дослідження. Використання системного методу сприяло комплексному та всебічному розумінню ролі соціокультурної комунікації у відтворенні суспільства як системи.

Соціокультурний метод орієнтований на розуміння суспільства як цілісної соціокультурної системи, дозволив визначити значущість соціокультурної комунікації у формуванні та ретрансляції знаково-символьної компоненти суспільного розвитку.

Історико-філософський метод допомагає простежити багатоаспектність поняття комунікація та слугує інструментом для його найбільш релевантного визначення у сучасних соціокультурних умовах.

Результати дослідження. Виходячи з розуміння соціокультурної системи як єдності соціальних, культурних та особистісних компонентів, що пов'язані між собою як система та середовище та існують через взаємне проникнення, дослідимо сутність соціокультурної комунікації.

Культура як програма комунікативних взаємодій реалізується певним способом організації соціокультурної комунікації й може бути спрямована на відтворення взаємозв'язків в їх незмінному вигляді, на збереження їх стабільності. Такий спосіб існує не тільки у традиційному, але і в сучасному, швидко мінливому суспільстві, оскільки без простого відтворення своїх основних характеристик соціокультурна комунікація піддається руйнуванню. Також комунікативна організація може бути спрямована на зміни соціокультурних взаємодій, що обумовлюється необхідністю адаптації до змін зовнішнього середовища. Даний спосіб призводить до комунікативної взаємодії і взаємозв'язку відповідно до контексту соціокультурних трансформацій, яким підпорядковується сучасне суспільство. Зазначено, що інтегративний потенціал соціокультурної комунікації може бути спрямований й на творення принципово нових смислів та форм комунікативної взаємодії.

Ключові слова: *соціокультурна комунікація, комунікативна взаємодія, суспільство, культура, особистість.*