

UDC 070.1:654.198

FEATURES OF INTERACTION OF FACTORS OF SOCIAL AND COMMUNICATION ACTIVITY

MITCHUK Olha,

D.Sc. (Social Communications), Professor, e-mail: o.mitchuk@gmail.com¹;

Haidur Nataliia,

PhD student, e-mail: ricc.natalie@gmail.com².

¹Borys Grinchenko University of Kyiv, Kyiv, 13-B, Marshala Tymoshenko Str., 04212, Ukraine.

²Private Higher Education Institution «Academician Stepan Demianchuk International University of Economics and Humanities», Rivne, 4, Stepan Demianchuk Str., 33027, Ukraine.

The purpose of the study is to determine the features of the interaction of factors of social and communication activities in the context of modern media. It is noted that the audience does not trust the propaganda, but trusts the media, which are carriers of a particular propaganda. The content information of the media is analyzed through the prism of the phenomenon of communication reflux. It is noted that communication in its real functional capacity, pursuing the interests of the future, is reduced for the present, for the current needs of the audience. The audience does not have the opportunity to react to the effects, to structural manipulation, to the processes that may lead to the cessation of the supply of mass media distorted reality that is spreading in society.

Key words: audience, manipulation, media criticism, social and communicative activity, reflux.

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ ФАКТОРІВ СОЦІОКОМУНІКАЦІЙНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ

Мета дослідження – визначити особливості взаємодії факторів соціокомунікаційної діяльності в контексті сучасних медіа. Зазначається, що аудиторія не довіряє пропаганді, натомість довіряє засобам масової інформації, які є носіями якоїсь конкретної пропаганди. Крізь призму феномену комунікаційного рефлюксу аналізуються змістова інформація окремих медіа. Зазначається, що комунікація у своїй реальній функціональній здатності, переслідуючи інтереси майбутнього, знижується для сьогодення, для актуальних потреб аудиторії. В аудиторії немає можливості реагувати на ефекти, на структурне маніпулювання, на процеси, що можуть призвести до припинення подачі масмедіа деформованої реальності, що поширюється в суспільстві.

Ключові слова: аудиторія, маніпуляція, медіакритика, соціокомунікаційна діяльність, рефлюкс.

Introduction. *Relevance of research.* Selection specific content in the media, through which it is possible to follow the rational, intellectual consumption of this content, requires the use of completely different analytical markers. Mechanism of selection depends on the specific situation: the status of the media, readiness of the audience, social constitution of a third-party observer. Media practices serve as the *object* of the study while the *subject* matter lies in the specificity of the interaction of factors of media practice. Setting the purpose of the study is to work out the main factors of media practice, which are based on media influences; necessitates the following tasks: to identify factors of interaction of social and communicative activities; to characterize the factors of social and communicative activity in the context of cognitive abilities of the mass audience.

Novelty of the study. Of course, in addition to a specific form of criticism in the media, the media system is overloaded with typical forms of social and political reflexion

associated with increasing social complexity, or already mentioned above reflux, adapted to the content problem.

Literature review and analysis of recent research and publications. The scientific achievements of media analysts Kostenko N., Bondarenko Y., Verekh N. have recently resembled the analysis of the connection between the media and the media. The introduction of the media, media criticism, media literacy, and violations in the training of journalists limit the functionality of media research. Not every form of criticism in the media takes into account the possible consequences, and this should be done by media criticism based on the use of scientific knowledge.

The scientific achievements of media analysts have recently been reminiscent of an analysis of the connection between the media and mass media. The introduction of mass media, media criticism, media literacy, and the disturbance in the training of journalists limit the functionality of media research. Not every form of criticism in the media takes into account the possible consequences, and this should be done by media criticism, based on the use of scientific knowledge.

The journalist works in the most compressed current rhythm and is interested in the systematic and functional mode of his work. An inexperienced journalist, less sensitive to time, can survive this phenomenon longer, mixing genres, trends, waves, contexts. Journalistic criticism is based on the development of media effects, those which are located precisely in normative structures.

Research methods. The basis of scientific research is the analysis of theoretical studies of this problem, which were conducted by communicators, sociologists, philosophers and philologists. The methodological basis of scientific research is the principles of collection and selection of factual and analytical materials, empirical, comparative, generalized, classification methods, as well as analysis and synthesis and comparative analysis. The classification schemes of such phenomena of information activity are proposed on their basis.

Results and discussion. The media have a concrete effect on what actually is a reality. It should be noted that the way in which the presence and activity of the media are observed, how this mass of content perceived by the mass media through the society – can only be accepted as an assumption. According to Niklas Luhman, media influences remain without consequences [17]. After all, media influence can not be considered something automatically recorded in the minds of the audience – they are likely to be the result of a certain communication reflux [25], monitoring the frame of the media.

Communicative reflux is considered to be an important feature of social communication. It is a question of the fact that the characteristics of a particular mass media are often presented in general, the mass media are usually regarded as a particular social add-on (as indicated by V. Rizun [26, p. 53]), they are suspected of producing essentially three main effects:

- firstly, the effects of manipulation (conscious interpretation of facts);
- secondly, deformation effects (transformation of reality);
- thirdly, the effects of novelty (changing views on society) – quoting to Natalia Aliushin [4].

It is obvious that this is not about functional media descriptors, since the main functions of the media – manipulation of facts, deformation of consciousness and the creation of new societies – surprisingly fit into the key factors of the effects of the media. This parallelism makes it possible to understand the media not as an autonomous, introverted, or autopoietic factor in the social system (see Umberto Maturaini [20, p. 117]), but most likely as an outsider instrument.

The exploitation of media effects does not work in cases when even an insignificant, primitive content transmits rather mediocre knowledge and is likely serves to build the position of a particular observer. At the same time, the legitimacy of those applied

methods of influence on the audience, through which the media construct (produce) media effects, sharply decreases.

The emergence of the media reality in relation to the material factors of the present is often accompanied by epistemologically normative structures as «desirable reality» and «unwanted reality». The effect of the «new society» serves a certain source of indescribable concepts of social change, but the factor of the anthropocentric perspective of human development as elements of society is primarily connected with technological determinism (read by George Pocheptsov [24, p. 248]).

This effect can be stylized as follows: through the media, we live in a new world, which is mostly formed by the media itself, but in relations with this new reality public opinion and public knowledge tend to be deformed, the domination of Baudrillardian hyperrealism becomes notable [5, p. 224], creating the false image of reality, imposed by the unreal, virtual (in the broadest sense of this meaning) world of the media. Propaganda becomes a key factor not only in the mass media practice, but also in the financial control of the media, both by the state (government) and by the media owners (quoting to Petro Verbytskyi: «Creation of information resources and control of these resources at the national level, are largely subordinated to the improvement of needs, expansion of influence and confirmation of the reliability of the power system» [8, p. 290]).

However, at the same time, communication becomes exhausted, its real functional capacity, pursuing the interests of the future, is reduced for the present days, for its urgency, for the actual needs of the audience. As for the classical, traditional mass media, the audience is not able to react to effects, structural manipulation, or processes that can lead to a cessation of the mass media's presentation of deformed reality that is spreading in society.

Media practice differs from media criticism, media critics are different from the science of media, primarily because in different situations we use different analysis tools. When we use the distinction between media criticism and media practice, we mean the difference between descriptive and analytical tools, methodological and analytical requirements for processes.

What is important to note here that in the triangle of «media practice – media criticism – media science» the construction of the semantics of critical structures does not occur directly from the bottom up, from the spatial layers to the academic strata [10, p. 234]. The semantics of critical structures embraces only social systems, not interactive ones.

Since scholars who study social communications are related to a particular field of science, they can not afford the use of self-identification and self-organization capabilities in multiparadigm – unlike literary critics can. The science of social communication exists in the context of various scientific «schools». After all, the support of specific scholars, institutions, the creation of scientific articles, participation in conferences, the circulation of specialized literature, forced mediocrity, etc. – this creates the space of artificial association, the flow of tacit knowledge, implicit theories, discrete consensus. It represents a certain power of the science of social communication.

However, the categories of scientific nature mentioned above may also be a definite obstacle to the development of the science of social communications. Media critics, existing in articles and other texts on social communications, operates with media effects that are «smuggled» through the texts. Thus, the scientific sphere becomes connected with the media sphere.

The formulation of consensus in the triangle of «media practice – media criticism – the science of media» is more intense when certain theoretical bases in the science of social communications become more questionable, on the basis of which a conceptual apparatus of media effects is created. The generalized effects achieved by the media, in terms of normativity, have an undeniable advantage: they allow unconditional participation of the media when it comes to moral judgments. Media effects can be considered a critical media

bar, metaphor for natural disaster. Mass media live in floods, murders, rapes, which mass media are overwhelmed. Any modern «information bomb» does not at all lead to an explosion of the media, it is a simple annexation of the part of the life of the audience.

The frames of this metaphor are quite obvious: the media often represent something alien, unnatural to man, even dangerous; thus, a passive, weak in nature, person may appear to be a passive observer for the incarnation of content in his consciousness. The media are active – people are passive, the media are strong – people are weak, the media are trying to do something to the audience, the audience has no practical value from the media. It is a matter of the fact that both a simple audience and media analysts, and social scientists studying, can only observe the influence of the media on society.

Media effects are closely linked to media influences, which is usually carried out on the culture of audience behavior. Media influences are a factor in the imagination of a broad audience about the functions of the media, but at the same time, the influence of media analysts acts as a fertile ground for media criticism [23, p. 75]. Consequently, media influences act as a theoretical and empirical prerequisite for a certain rethinking of those meanings, to which either the broadly presented viewer – the reader – the listener or the narrow specialist is not indifferent. And the more senses can be rethought with the help of media, the greater the understanding of facts, theses, theories, including irrelevant or axiomatic ones.

Media influence can not be understood as something stable or unambiguous. Media influence is based on media metaphorization of any content: it is a chaotic sequence of content layers of messages, manipulation of facts, propaganda of ideas, it seems to be an explicit brainwashing. An empirical response to the question «what was the media effect», «for what it was created», «who is calculated», etc., should be sought within the limits of media practice. The combination of two important media concepts – «fact» and «media influence» – may indicate a partial or complete compromise on controversial issues. The fact is fixed and the media influence interprets the fact to let the audience understand: what is reported is still a fact or not. Many heterogeneous content elements are associated with each other, and these elements are interpreted (see Michelle Cullon and Bruno Liaart [3, p. 64]).

An array of knowledge that carries the media itself cannot be developed without the use of media criticism. To apply the abovementioned communication reflux, we must reduce the share of criticism in the mass media, but there is no barrier for operational constructivism at all. Under the phenomenon of immediate media influence, which is considered problematic for us because of the obscurity of content presented in such cases, is usually masked by metaphors. Literally, media content is not liquid, it needs sharp analytical work, and because the metaphorical content of the media is not only closely related to content convergence, it often acts as synonymous with it [11, p. 142].

Tetiana Kuznetsova notes that the influence on the media and on communication in general is still burdened with an ontological factor of content [15] – hence, media literacy can be considered as a «moving metaphor», since it not only uses content or is based on the content, but also attracts huge audience strokes.

The audience in question, feeling the impact of the media and media influences at the time merges into one environment. The causes and consequences of the relationship posed between them are psychologically uneven. This is about the behavioral function generated by the media. What will be the intentions, goals and plans of the audience, scale and range of their behavior in the future.

Mass media monitoring records the direct relationship between the increase in the brainwashing effect and the funding of the media. But another question arises: will the media continue to learn to mitigate the negative effects of media influences? The mass media itself has no effect on media critics, because institutionalized, science-intensive criticism of the media does not work in the event of such relationships.

As for the audience, the problem of its resistance to media influences is not as clear as it can be imagined. While influence is less realized, opposition is possible, opposition from a certain part of the audience, the media itself has no meaning until it becomes stronger. Sociologists [13, p. 320] emphasize that auditorium resistance is taken into account by the media themselves, who are looking for opportunities for increasing influence.

In the sociology of social communications, the history of the media influences study is short enough, the material for ample analytics is very small [13, p. 328]. And this is not because media influences are weak instruments – both psychological and empirical.

It's about the fact that any content (text, visual, musical, etc.) that underlies media influence focuses on influence. Influence moves to the consciousness of the audience with the help of a variety of factors (psychological, sociological, geographic, etc.), having the expectation that these factors will end productive. The media's withdrawal from any influence is motivated rather by its cognitive weakness, the inability to create stable facts.

The same thing happens in the science of the media, the theory of social communications, because the scientific accuracy and bases of any thoughts on the activities of the media should be based on stable, logical judgments. Unfortunately, the scientific discourse itself in our scientific field has ceased to be considered a stable fact, it has been re-thought and differentiated. This is partly due to the fact that among scientists there is no common understanding of the outline of the media site and the assessment of the components of media influences (see Denis McQuail [18]).

But as long as the whole range of media influences is not used, criticism in the media will ignore controversy and clashes of interests. The attitude towards efficiency, towards the factors of time, which are transformed by media critics, will play a decisive role in this case. This happens due to a number of reasons.

Firstly, the science of social communication is the movement of scientific discipline to a certain autonomy of this branch of science. But the autonomy of social communication itself does not arise in a bare place; autonomy is never obtained from the very beginning, from a clean sheet of paper. The ideas embodied in the essence of scientific autonomy must evolve, become a certain initial mass, which should be based on specific theories, model examples, observation methods, a network of scholars, and so on. The autonomy of the scientific branch is the diversification of ideas and views on the scientific problem; in this context, the scientific branch is a certain self-limitation, which captures not only the scientific convergence of objects and subjects of research, but also the absorption of sciences. For example, sociology becomes the subject of studying social communications of audience interests, expectations and tastes, content analysis of materials contained in the media, sociology ceases to be a pure science of society. The economy is interested in social communication as a factor in management, the basis of the commercial activity of the media; the economy has ceased to be a pure science of capital.

A modern view of scientific variegatedness suggests a heterogeneous community of scientific approaches to the selection and analysis of particular problems. As for the science of social communication, the variety of problems associated with the functioning of the media allows scholarly scholars to integrate science into policy analysts of politicians, sociologists, psychologists, economists, and others.

All this gives grounds to properly initiate effective criticism of the activities of the media, legitimizing the science of social communication both in its axiological sensitivity and through the demonstrative interaction of elements of other sciences in order to determine the characteristics of the media.

Secondly, the appearance of essentially new phenomena (for example, the so-called new mass media), which, thanks to the media, have a great social resonance. Society seems to be in an imaginary future, modern society in general is extremely inclined to the thirst

for the future, to the perception of the future, modern society is exposed to the risk of creating scenarios of the future due to the current uncertainty and unpredictability [5].

The unambiguous and correct answer to the question of whether the society will have an impact on journalism and social communication in general is impossible. The influence of the media is, on the one hand, the stage of development of society, and, on the other hand, it is the masked, through the content in the media, answer to the question of what may happen to society (predicted, in particular, by Marshall McClain [19]) Consequently, the problem of media influence has encountered the concept of progress. The diversity of semantics of media influences undermines the simple semantics of progress. In any case, in the opinion of Bruno Latour, it can not be argued that something new is better than the old one, since such statements may be the result of media influence: rapid influence is transmitted from the «matter of thought» to «the matter of facts» – but already in the form of a concrete social form (see: [16, p. 21]).

This happens not only because of the old anthropocentric perspective, but, above all, because of the lack of reflux – we return to this phenomenon again. Reflux detects the control of media influences. The interaction of various content and their organizational affinity (for example, within a single mass media, or media groups belonging to the same owner, or just in the media of the same technical type) made these content the usual rhetoric, substantially narrowing the way of self-determination of the audience.

The concept of interaction involves the community of plans, the achievement of specific goals, the preparation and selection of appropriate measures to achieve these goals [9]. But the media is a big «Alter», which realizes its plans, achieves its own goals unilaterally, this – «Alter» does not respond to the audience's requests, even when the final destination is determined.

The reflux in social communications leads to the fact that the audience can sensitize itself with the content that is provided by the media. But «Alter» of the media remains the same, since the audience «It» exists because the media are at a distance. And in the absence of «Alter» «It» has inexhaustible resources of conduct.

But basically, «Alter» does not require a careful attitude towards the audience and its needs and expectations. «Alter» is not interested in the current understanding of the audience, it is attracted by the indicator of ultimate success. Communication is simply a sociological, quantitative fact of receiving messages or an array of information. If there is no acceptance – the failure of assumptions occurs. Carl Popper believes that the media attributes the mapping of the audience's behavior, and the media themselves mark this audience [22, p. 164].

Of course, the audience is not just «It», but the media is only «Alter», they are deaf and blind, because they do not know who they are communicating with. Transparency of the communicational situation can only arise with the understanding of some assumptions. From the side of «Alter», this can mean uniformity of the environment. It is assumed, for example, that the message is addressed to women, and not to men, adults, or children who are not educated enough. Thanks to the sociological research of the audience, the specification of telemetry, the study of clicks, the use of statistical data, etc., it is possible now to obtain confirmation of assumptions, to correct their content, to adjust it to the taste of this audience.

Media monitoring is often accompanied by its level of self-observation. This is an observational observation. The British sociologist David Holmes recorded (in 2005) the observation of the science of social communications by the observation of sociologists working on the activities of the media. He noted that the fact that the media mass is uncertain means that the individuals included in this mass are also uncertain. According to the scientist, broadcasting content makes it possible to scale the audience association with what it wants to see in this content (see David Holmes: [2]). In other words, observational observation makes us realize how different people live in different worlds.

The indeterminate stratum of the audience is a significant feature of modern media. Media can treat it with care, sympathize it, turn to it as to a friend, to a wise companion, to a contemporary observer. Journalists may excuse it of its intersection, offering it something spicy, but it will not be able to manifest itself as a personality, since the behavioral attributes and motives of the behavior of this stratum, the processes of content reception and its processing by the media will be unclear. Work on an uncertain stratum of the audience is a well-known way of pointing out the sources of media effects, since it is this audience that manipulates the media, distorting the consciousness and understanding what is actually going on around.

Criticism in the media functions in a relaxed perspective: aware of the process of social planning, the system's recommendations of the audience, having an understanding of what the media offers to an ordinary person, making it the way it is. The society of the play is instructive in this respect – in fact it refers to the specifics of the transitional period of homogenization.

Selflessness of the whole spectrum of media (they are called «high-qualitative» (in the point of view of Nonna Varek [7]), however, can not testify in favor of the fact that the audience is growing in a «cognitive» way – that is, being well-informed, strongly competent and responsible. Moving categories of mutual (the media about the audience and vice versa) assumptions are developing toward differentiation of interests. Because the structure of media in the domain of communication relations is increasingly diverse, but the audience can not be easily and seamlessly co-adapted to the specific interests of the media.

This means, on the one hand, partial waiving of the requirements of communication universalization, on the other hand – expansion of the field of relationship between the media and the audience. The media activity does not simply imply a broad consensus; the media transform societies into communities that have lost their internal unity.

Mass media operate with dysfunction. The progressive evolution of media proposals revealed the conviction that reality for each audience corresponds to its own selection rules. But this is a reality with a variety of constructing arguments existing to justify itself.

It is clear that the «constructivist» effect is achieved through media influence. The diversity of the audience as a result of «cultural differences» for some time was a convenient explanation for the differences in the audience. But the Internet, the new media, as discussed above, solved these differences and made such a cognitive «multiplier». It turned out that you can live in the same world, but this life is differently interpreted. At the same time, the very meaning of life can not be reconciled, because the audience differences, distortions, contradictions, the individuality of the psychic system of everyone who is in this audience, in social communications can be considered as cognitive communication.

The anomaly of the content perception by the audience can be attributed to certain psychic systems as an explanation of the excessive pressure from the media on the audience. But the themes of media and media coverage of some topics are still limited by standards – albeit journalistic standards, editorial standards, owners' requirements for management, management requirements for journalists, etc.

At the very best, the audience can compare content and trends offered by the media, but the audience can not resist these content and trends. The audience may try to justify their own point of view on media outings – for example, because of their mentality or socio-cultural traditions.

The problem, of course, lies not only in the different points of view on the same content, different attitudes or interpretations of one message in the media. There are not even the least effective cases when an audience can influence the competitiveness of the media or force them to perform self-correction of the content. Professor Valerii

Ivanov believes that in the mass media's sociology, the quantitative arguments may be interesting, except for statistics [12, p. 98].

In the classical media, the process of accepting or rejecting any content can be corrected or controlled, but it will not cover socially complex issues. Negative interactions between the audience and the media can not be interrupted, this negativity can only encourage persuasion, but it will not open the way for further «coordination» of certain views and actions, as generally limited to narrow interactive contexts.

As already mentioned above, within the framework of the «new media», especially in interactive systems, the situation is different. If the audience accepts the content of the message, then counting on the imaginary community, similarly building reality, accepting most of the rules of the specific community. If an audience rejects the message, it rejects the community through another, distinct design, the nature of thinking, mentality and the image of the world.

But that's how it builds its own audience identity. This is how the identity of the audience emerges, as well as the ability to protect that identity. Substantiation and explanation by the audience of the deviation of imposed ideas and values, the identity of the audience, the actual construction of the audience of reality – and criticism in the media can be found in classroom audiences.

People who do not cope with the multipliers of the normalization of identity, claiming differences in the construction of reality, images of the world, have a small choice: some of the world's media can be considered accurate, some are not, some structural content is real, others are not, some messages adequate, others – inadequate, some identities are valuable, others are superfluous, etc. The interested audience can correct their own vision, it can turn off the imagination, but even such an audience will not be able to assimilate with the ideas of the media.

The media provides only the legitimacy of comparing the content that is transmitted by them, with their own vision of the problem. Audience compares media content with its luggage of knowledge. The media does not introduce psychological systems of influence on the audience on the theoretical plane, and, despite the ontology of their content, rely on confusion in the attitude of the audience to different realities.

One way or another, the individual auditorium «no» to the relevant media is a certain form of refusal to participate in communication. In this case there is no social resonance.

Conclusions and prospects. Can media criticism protect the practice of mass media from errors in communicating with the audience? If we take into account the typical Western media practice (and western sociological approaches to the study of the functioning of the media) the epistemological and absolutism of the media, if it is critical to observe how the media function, it is possible to find the appropriate non-relativistic and normative realism of opacity of the Ukrainian mass media.

This realism raises some very specific questions that fit into the discourse of the problem of communication reflux. Media criticism reveals manipulative techniques inherent in the media, deformation of the media, etc., but in reality it does not protect the audience or the imagination of the audience. The feeling of any criticism – and media criticism as well – is not implied either in immunology or in the environment of communication.

The media criticizes systemic phenomena in society in order to better adapt to future communication conditions. Possibilities of mass management by the media are very limited – in fact, therefore, the phrase «journalism is the fourth power» is considered to be erroneous. The media never really managed the political system of a democratic society.

The audience does not trust propaganda, while the audience entrusts the mass media, which are the bearers of some particular propaganda. Media holders can not promote their ideas without the use of mass media. All this means that with the growth of mass media, increases its variety, the ability to attract various structures and individuals to

the dissemination of specific content. The audience through the media does not receive direct «values», the mass media do not directly improve the society. But due to media and media criticism that analyzes their activities, societies become more transparent, more open, which allows us to hope for more accurate observation by the society itself, by its actions, in terms of its development prospects.

1. Appadurai, A. (1996), *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis, 229 p.
2. Holmes, D. (2005), *Communication Theory. Media, Technology, Society*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, 272 p.
3. Callon, M. & Latour, B. (1981), *Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Macro-Structure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them to Do So*, 303 p.
4. Aliushyna, N. «Problems of communication effectiveness in the life of a society», NADU pry Prezydentovi Ukrainy [NAPA under the President of Ukraine], PDF.
5. Baudrillard, J. (1999), «Requiem for the mass media: [trans. Fr.]», *Poetika i Politiki: Almanah Rossiysko-frantsuzskogo Tsentra Sotsiologii i Filosofii i IS RAN [Poetics and Politics: An Almanac of the Russian-French Center for Sociology and Philosophy and the IAS of the Russian Academy of Sciences]*, ISO; Alatea, SPb, Moscow, pp. 193–226.
6. Bondarenko, J.S. (2017), *An Alternative Press of Modern Germany (Features of Functioning, Editorial Policy, Place in the National Media System)*, Abstract of the PhD diss. (Sciences of Social Communications), Ivan Franko Lviv National University, 19 p.
7. Wareh, N.V. (2014), *Formation of Ethno-cultural Stereotypes in High-Quality British Press: Structural, Functional and Informative Features*, Abstract of the PhD dis. (Sciences of Social Communications), O. Gonchar Dnipropetrovsk National University, 20 p.
8. Verbitskyi, P. (2017), «Corporate monopoly on information as a factor of the information strategy of the state», *Zbirnyk prac NDI doshkilnoyi osvity [Compilation of Works of the Research Institute of Preschool Studies]*, LNBu, Lviv, no. 7 (25), pp. 288–298.
9. Interaction. Wikipedia, available at: <https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interaction>.
10. Zelinska, N.V. (1995), «The publicistic nature of Ukrainian scientific prose (attempt of a retrospective review)», *Zhurnalistyka [Journalism]*, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, no. 2, pp. 230–239.
11. Zolyak, V.V. (2007), «Convergence as a universal discovery of the coincidence of common features», *Zbirnyk Prats Naukovo-Doslidnoho Tsentru Periodyky Lvivskoi Naukovo Biblioteki im. V. Stefanyka [Collection of Works of the Research Center of Periodicals of the V. Stefanyk Lviv Scientific Library]*, Lviv, no. 15, pp. 139–145.
12. Ivanov, V.F. (2003), *Sociology of Mass Communication: a Textbook*, Cherkasy State University, Cherkasy, 193 p.
13. Kostenko, N. & Makeev, S. (2014), «Conclusion: To the sociology of mistrust», *Society Without Trust*, in Golovaki, E., Kostenko, N., Makeyev, S. (Eds.), IS NANU, Kyiv, pp. 319–330.
14. Kostenko, N. (2014), «Media dynamics: trends and deviations», *Vectors of Changes in Ukrainian Society*, in Vorona, V. M., Shulga, M. O (Eds.), IS NANU, Kyiv, pp. 326–348.
15. Kuznetsova, T.V. (2010), *Axiological Models of Mass Media Information: Communicative-conceptual Approach*, Abstract of the PhD dis. (soc. sci.), Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kuiv, 31 p.
16. Latour, B. (2014), *Reassembly of the social: Introduction to Actor-network Theory*, Publishing House of the Higher School of Economics, Moscow, 384 p.
17. Luman, N. (2005), «The reality of the media», in Kiliadiushov, O.V. (Ed.), *Electronic publication : Center for Humanitarian Technologies*, available at: <http://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/basis/3001>.
18. McQueil, D. (2010), *Theory of Mass Communication, Chronicle*, Lviv, 538 pp.
19. McLuhan, M. (2007), *Understanding Media: External Extensions of Man*, Kuchkovo field, M., 464 p.
20. Maturana, U. (1995), «Biology of cognition», *Yazyk i Intelkt [Language and Intellect]*, Progress, M., pp. 95–142.
21. Mihailin, I.L. (2009), «Information image as a communicative category», *Zbirnyk Kharkivskoho istoryko-filolohichnoho tovarystva [Collection of the Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society]*, New series, vol. 13, pp. 137–150.

22. Popper, C. (1994), An open society and its enemies. T. I. In the captivity of Plato's charm, Fundamentals, Kyiv, 444 p.
23. Potiatynyk, B. (2004), Media: Keys to Understanding, PAIS, Lviv, 312 p.
24. Pocheptsov, G.G. (2000), Communicative Technologies of the Twentieth Century, Refleebch; Wackler, Kyiv, 352 p.
25. Reflux. Wikipedia, available at: <https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reflux>.
26. Rizun, V.V. (2003), Masses: Texts of Lectures, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, 116 p.

УДК 070.1:654.198

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ ФАКТОРІВ СОЦІОКОМУНІКАЦІЙНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ

Мітчук Ольга,

д-р наук із соц. комунік., проф., e-mail: o.mitchuk@gmail.com¹;

ORCID – <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1011-7320>

Гайдур Наталія,

аспірант, e-mail: ricc.natalie@gmail.com².

¹Інститут журналістики Київського університету імені Бориса Грінченка, вул. Маршала Тимошенка 13-Б, м. Київ, 04212, Україна.

²Міжнародний економіко-гуманітарний університет імені академіка С. Дем'янчука, факультет журналістики, вул. С. Дем'янчука, 4, м. Рівне, 33027, Україна.

Вступ. Процес відбору певного змісту в масмедіа завжди супроводжується доцільним розумовим його сприйняттям та необхідністю застосування відповідних аналітичних індикацій. Масмедіа впливають на реальність, але відстеження соціокомунікаційної діяльності засобів масової інформації, те, як сприймає зміст інформації суспільство, і досі є здогадкою.

Актуальність дослідження. Відбір конкретного контенту в ЗМІ, за допомогою якого можна прослідкувати за раціональним, інтелектуальним споживанням цього контенту, вимагає використання певних аналітичних маркерів. Мета дослідження – опрацювання основних факторів медіапрактики, в основі яких лежить медіа вплив – обумовлює необхідність виконання таких завдань: виявити фактори взаємодії соціально-комунікативної діяльності; охарактеризувати фактори соціально-комунікативної активності в контексті пізнавальних здібностей масової аудиторії.

Методи дослідження. Основою наукового дослідження є аналіз теоретичних досліджень цієї проблеми, які проводили комунікатори, соціологи, філософи та філологи. Методологічною основою наукового дослідження є принципи збору та відбору фактичних та аналітичних матеріалів, емпіричних, порівняльних, узагальнених, класифікаційних методів, а також аналізу й синтезу та порівняльного аналізу. На їх основі запропоновано класифікаційні схеми таких явищ інформаційної діяльності.

Результати. Аудиторія не довіряє пропаганді, а довіряє ЗМІ, які є носіями якоїсь конкретної пропаганди. Особливості взаємодії факторів соціальнокомунікаційної діяльності викликає конкретні питання, які вписуються в дискурс проблеми комунікаційного рефлюксу. Медіакритика виявляє маніпулятивні прийоми, властиві ЗМІ, деформацію ЗМІ тощо, але насправді вона не захищає аудиторію чи уяву аудиторії. Але завдяки критиці ЗМІ суспільства стають прозорішими, більш відкритими, що дозволяє сподіватися на точніше спостереження з боку самого суспільства, його дій, перспектив його розвитку.

Ключові слова: аудиторія, комунікація, маніпуляція, медіаефекти, медіакритика, рефлюкс.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 09.11.2015.