

Communication: topology of metadiscourse of social interactions

Maryna Kolinko (ORCID 0000-0002-1043-2742)

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Ukraine)

Halyna Petryshyn (ORCID 0000-0003-3428-8789)

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (Ukraine)

Halyna Chumak (ORCID 0000-0001-5974-9022)

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (Ukraine)

ABSTRACT

The article focuses on the definition and analysis of communication as a metadiscourse of social interactions in terms of the topological methodology. Socio-cultural transformations that shape the model of the global world and change the Ukrainian landscape, the intensification of cross-cultural contacts, international relations, relations of social communities on different levels actualize the problem of communicative interaction. Globalization processes, which involve representatives of different cultures in the general development of civilization, the challenges of military conflicts, in particular the war of Ukrainian people against the Russian invasion, require an adequately constructed discourse. In such contexts, the concept of communication as a metadiscourse, that is, a discourse about the discourses of social interactions, acquires a new meaning.

KEYWORDS

communication, discourse, topology, intercommunication, dialogue, social interaction

Introduction

The Ukrainian realm is becoming an arena of meeting and dialogue of different cultural worlds. The study of mechanisms and techniques of communicative reality, affecting the entire socio-cultural landscape of Ukraine, is relevant from the perspective of possible attempts to manipulate public consciousness during communication. How is the reality constructed by means of discourse? What themes, strategies, and speech tools function in the contemporary communication? It is impossible to get answers to these questions without understanding the basic laws of the theory of discursive communication.

The **purpose of the article**: Systematization and topological "compilation" of theoretical and methodological guidelines for the study of communication as a socially active metadiscourse, identifying the influence of discursive constructions on the ongoing modern sociocultural processes.

Research methods

The philosophical methodology of communication research is represented by quite diverse views and approaches, specified in our articles (*Kolinko, 2019a; 2019b; 2019c*). The linguistic approach, the philosophy of ordinary life, dialogue, and the boundary line and frontiers theory interpret the processes and events of communication from different perspectives. Its relation to cultural environment and location lays the foundations of the topological perspective of our research. The understanding of communication as not a separate out socio-cultural realm, but as a way of socio-cultural existence is expressed by J. Habermas, N. Luhmann, Z. Bauman,

S. Bergman, G. Simmel, M. Castells, M. Maffesoli, and by Ukrainian philosophers E. Bystrytskyi, M. Boychenko, A. Yermolenko, V. Lyakh, V. Palaguta, M. Popovych, L. Sytnichenko, N. Khamitov. Growing interest in communication problems is reflected in the characteristic of the communicative turn, i.e. the topological comprehension of the current theme of communication and understanding, the interaction of language and semantics, the role of communication in organizing social structures and creating a media space.

German communicative philosophy has greatly contributed to the development of the philosophical methodology of communication research. J. Habermas, V. Hölsle, D. Böhler, K.-O. Apel, and P. Ulrich investigate axiological problems of communication, justify the communicative ethics of responsibility, the principles and norms of which would become moral guidelines for human life and would ensure the harmonious interaction of man, society and nature. K.-O. Apel's considerations have the fundamental status here. K.-O. Apel, unlike the neo-Kantians, transforms the Kantian concept of "transcendental" in the linguistic-pragmatic sense with the help of speech act theory. K.-O. Apel argues universal values to be the prerequisites of communication and considers "how ethics is possible under the conditions of scientific and technological civilization with its new challenges and threats" (*Yermolenko, 2022: 24*). Facing modern socio-political challenges, Apel "is looking for an answer to Kant's famous question "what should I do", transforming the response into the question "what should we do together". He shows the limitations of individual monologue ethics, supplementing it with social ethics, which is tested by



discourse ethics at the same time" (Yermolenko, 2022: 24).

The ideas of communicative rationality are thoroughly developed in the philosophy of J. Habermas. Distinguishing between strategic and communicative action, Habermas notes that the "world of community" is topologically formed "in integrative communication with surrounding individuals <...> within speech community" unlike to the "instrumental world" constituted "in manipulative relations with things and events" (Yermolenko, 1999: 315). The philosopher strives to recognize not an abstract, but a real Other who is nearby, within the limits of cultural integrity, and must share certain common values, but not threaten the existence of others. The inclusion of the Other in this case is possible through communication, negotiations, agreements, and discursive practices.

The theoretical foundations of discourse were established by the representatives of Cambridge and Oxford schools of philosophy in the 1950s, they analyzed the linguistic context of public opinion. The concept, developed by the French structuralists M. Foucault and R. Barthes, is important for understanding of the term "discourse". Michel Foucault introduced the concepts of "discursive practices" and "discursive formations" in his work "The Archaeology of Knowledge" (Foucault, 2002). He investigated the relations between the linguistic level of culture and the social one, using a new conceptual apparatus. According to M. Foucault's concept, discursive formations consist of discursive, that is, language practices in different historical and cultural eras. These constructs expand theoretical knowledge about the regularities of communication and show how communicative metadiscourse is created.

Discursive analysis is represented by the European school of text linguistics (T. van Dijk, W. Dressler, J. Petefi), works of American researchers (U. Labov, T. Givon, W. Chafe). The problem of discourse was investigated by Ukrainian authors V. A. Malakhov, V. S. Lukyanets, V. Dodonova, and V. Zinchenko.

Results and Discussion

Elaboration of the conceptual instruments for analysis of discursive processes and specifics of communicative interactions has become an urgent need for modern socio-philosophical research. Cambridge dictionary interprets communication only as «the act of communicating with people» (*Cambridge Dictionary*). Oxford dictionary defines communication as: «1. the activity or process of expressing ideas and feelings or of giving people information; 2. communications, methods of sending information, especially telephones, radio, computers, etc. or roads, and railroads; 3. a message, letter or telephone call» (*Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*). Most often English dictionaries interpret this term as the communication of information, exchange of ideas. The technological meaning, given in Oxford Dictionary, is very common in contemporary social discourse. Thus, communication is, first of all, a system of connections, as communication is understood not only as an informational process, but also as an emotionally involved process, valuable personal interaction of people. Communication provides social techniques for interaction that fulfill human needs in social relationships and satisfy the desire to influence others.

In the socio-philosophical aspect, communication is taken out of the technological connotation into the social level, its essence and connections are considered within

the framework of a complete social system, the interdependence of the communication mode and certain historical cultural types and social landscapes. It is considered as a social process and system. Without going to the extreme of equating society and communication according to N. Luman, we share his view of communication as a polysemantic and multi-layered concept that defines modern social processes. We rely on the definition of communication as a system of social interactions and a socio-cultural process of information exchange in personal and mass intercommunication using verbal and non-verbal means.

Heuristically advantageous for our study is the analysis of communication as a socially and culturally determined dimension of human existence. Awareness of communication problems as human problems in culture consistently leads to a socio-philosophical interpretation of communication within the topological configuration of human being – society – communication – culture. We should apply a topological analysis of subjective meanings, cultural matrices, and free will of subjects and socio-cultural restrictions for better understanding of communicative processes. This is how a complex network of communicative interactions is built.

According to some concepts, the interpretation of communication as a cultural phenomenon leads to the exaggerated role of cultural dictates in the manifestations of communicative interaction. The authors of this point of view apply cultural criteria to any manifestation of communication. We mean a false construction of a linear connection between the concepts of culture and communication, criticized by J. Blommaert, and which assumes that "everything in communication is determined by culture, and culture is free from explanation by "superficial" methods of communicative behavior" (Blommaert, 2011: 5).

Based on the idea of the "intersubjective essence of a person as a social being" (Boichenko, 2018: 6), it is possible to conceptualize the communicative notion of culture, as suggested by M. Boichenko, through "revealing the communicative nature of all culture: everything that is done by a person owes to communication and in the end, it is directly or indirectly aimed at it" (Boichenko, 2018: 6).

It is also important to compare the concepts "communication" and "intercommunication" as categories. According to a certain point of view, the basic category is communication, which is carried out in the form of intercourse between people as an exchange of symbolic messages. The opposite interpretation of the relation between the concepts of "communication" and "intercommunication" gives priority to the intercommunication, structurally divided into communication (exchange of information), interaction (organization of interaction and mutual influence), perception (sensory perception as the basis of rapport). Thus, communication is a kind of mediator between individual and socially significant information. In both cases, regardless of external differences, the main thing is the mechanism that transforms the individual process of sending and receiving messages into a socially significant process of individual and mass influence.

In the sociological literature, communication and intercommunication are often considered as related, but not synonymous concepts. Communication is understood as a dynamic information interaction of social subjects with each other and the surrounding world. Intercom-

munication is personal interaction of people with the exchange of information of a cognitive or affective-evaluative nature. Intercommunication is necessary to satisfy a person's need for contact with other people, it is manifested in a person's constant desire to influence his partner in a certain way, therefore, its main functions are contact and influencing. Intercommunication is defined as influence, exchange of ideas and views, and also as agreement or potential or actual conflict. Intercommunication as a form of social intercourse is the basis of communication as a way of transferring social experience. So, the concepts of communication and intercommunication have both common and distinctive features. Their common feature is their correlation with the processes of exchange and transmission of information, as well as the connection with language as a means of information transmission. Distinguishing features are due to the difference in the content of these terms in different sciences, when different aspects of these concepts are brought to the fore. In our research, we will assume that the characteristics of interpersonal interaction are mainly represented by social intercommunication, and communication has the additional meaning of information exchange in society and constitutes a system of interactions. Based on the content priorities, intercommunication is interpreted as a socially determined process of exchanging thoughts and feelings between people in various spheres of their activity by verbal means of communication. Communication in the general sense is transformed from the process of information transmission between subjects into a joint process of constructing new meanings, interpretations, behavioral norms and rules.

Communication actively helps to model a personal image of the sociocultural world. A member of communication understands the existence of the Other, includes it in himself, transforms the existence through interaction with the Other, therefore, in the modern world, communication acquires anthropological meaning and becomes an essential dimension of human existence in the common process of communication, activity, empathy, co-creation, in rapport with other people. The communicator observes and evaluates the reality-in-making for its ability to meet the goals and objectives, for compatibility with the existing parameters of life. The communicator is not only an individual subject of speech action, but also its condition and result, actor and actant of communication. The communicative environment creates the communicator, who, in turn, develops the communicative environment. Exchanging of information and transformation of communication participants are closely related and create a single social environment.

Any social interaction forms its own communicative space with its own structure. The topological schemes proposed for the analysis of communicative space are based on the general idea of spatial order. The perception of communicative space in the structure of consciousness is a complex process that reflects communicative interactions in everyday life, political, professional, scientific spheres, geographical and virtual space, contributing to the active development of various cultural landscapes. Filling the communicative space with different content has another side in the phenomenology of consciousness. It is about organizing the content of communicative consciousness into a certain spatial

structure. The concept of communicative space denotes a complex heterogeneous dynamic system in which the positions of cultural subjects are manifested in dialogues and polylogues, including functioning of appropriate communication channels and general information field with the corresponding meaning, systems of images of communicators, and barriers to the transmission of information and meanings. In addition, the communicative space is characterized by contextual components: the time of the communicative action, general contextual cultural attributes, linguistic features, etc. The topological research methodology is actualized in this perspective of conceptualization of communication phenomena through the establishment of relations between them and the environment.

The skills of productive communication are formed through communicative practices improved by modern communication technologies. Most often, they refer to the field of everyday life, because new meanings and senses are generated in the process of direct interaction "here-and-now". Information can be communicated in monologue, dialogue, and polylogue forms. Monologue form is dominated by communicative action aimed at the one-way transmission of information from the sender of communication message to the receiver. A monologue originates from the act of speaking. In our opinion, dialogue creates the basic structure of communication, and monologue is its variety. A monologue is often called the "inner speech" of a dialogue. It is the dialogic form that requires the interaction and intercommunication of the subjects of communication. The subjects of communication generate their own text after receiving and interpreting the message. In dialogic communication, it becomes important to develop agreed decisions. A dialogue is a way of direct entry of subjectivity into the network of intersubjective relations, and communication as such does not necessarily involve the subjectivity of the parties to the process (for example, it can be people who clearly perform certain imposed functions, that is, devoid of subjective initiative).

The nature and efficiency of interaction is affected by the presence or absence of meaningful contact. It is a key concept that characterizes the quality of communication. Communicative interaction is not always realized as consciously motivated, aimed at mutual understanding and agreement (corresponding to M. Weber's classification of rational- purposeful and value-rational social actions). The exchange of ritual actions, imitation, custom behavior make sense in everyday and other practices, but do not imply mutual understanding as mandatory.

The form of polylogue provides multilateral communication. Such communication is characterized by the intension to dominate in the communicative initiative and is connected with its most effective implementation. It is the polylogue that leads to the creation of a discourse, and we will analyze further its social status, meaning and characteristics. Society is formed by practical human activity, any productive, social or linguistic activity. Language simultaneously reflects and determines social actions. It is important to note that language and society are not independent agents as they are combined in the discourse. Discourse is focused on reflection and discussion of any actions, thoughts and statements of participants in communication. It is a dynamic linguistic

and, above all, semantic space where social meanings are produced and tested. Discourse is a way of communication. As a system of interactions, it comprises not only the actions of communication subjects, but also their reflections, closely related to their communicative practices. Therefore, communication can be considered as a metadiscourse of awareness, justification and generalization of everyday human interactions and communicative practices.

In the context of our study discourse has an ontological status as a space for certain communication development, and it has epistemological status as a methodology of discourse analysis. The theoretical foundations of discursive analysis were established in the middle of the last century by representatives of the English school of philosophy, who proposed analytical tools for the linguistic contexts of social consciousness. Summarizing the positions of modern approaches, we will consider a component involved in the interaction of people and the cognitive processes of their consciousness. as a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic, pragmatic and other factors, a text taken in the context of event. Discourse is speech interpreted as a purposeful social act, a component involved in the interaction of people and the cognitive processes of their consciousness.

One should agree with the Polish researcher O. Hnatiuk considering that "discourse defines and at the same time limits what is "real", "true" and "natural". Even when a person claims that one does not create a discourse, a close analysis of the message enables to identify recurring themes, arguments, thoughts, sources and relationships that constitute the boundaries of functioning that facilitate or limit the activity of this individual" (*Hnatiuk, 2005: 59*). Discourse forms the field of communicative practices, which can be considered in real and potential aspects. The real dimension refers to the current language activity and its results, the potential dimension is a set of signs and symbols that serve this communication.

Existentialists figuratively characterize modern communication as "alienation in the world." They believe that true communication is characterized by a tragic twist, because the world of objectivity constantly threatens to destroy the fragile world of existential interactions. This understanding is explained by the development of individualism and attention to human uniqueness. Society's desire to take into account the interests of every person is a progressive direction of the development of modern humanism. The other side of the atomization of social relations is "communication crisis" as avoidance of real relations, the organization of a person's life as self-isolation from the community, failed communication, which can lead to the disintegration of all social ties as extreme form of mutual alienation. As a result, individuals develop a sense of loneliness, a sense of meaninglessness of a short and unnecessary human existence in the world. Philosophers called this situation a "communication crisis". A common cultural code is lost, there is no common language and all that lead to a general total misunderstanding. Subjects of modern language communication often use a clearly defined axiological-confrontational arsenal of communicative tools, which are primarily aimed at contrasting their position with the position of their opponents. Then the information connecting these subjects in a single process of interaction has a definite manipulative character.

Modern social communication often becomes an arena of fierce confrontation of interests, realization of power ambitions and destructive goals of certain social groups, which leads to manipulative communication practices. A society, gripped by a crisis of humanism, cannot come to an agreement with itself, rejects a dialogue with other societies, and uses the language of aggression. People, speaking one language, actually communicate in different languages. An axiological frame is created, which affects the general negative nature of the discourse, and the discourse of the "fortress state" is produced.

People's distrust of universal constructs should be recognized as another problem. "In public consciousness, the idea of unity is associated with the thought of forced integration of the plurality. Moral universalism ... is interpreted as a denial of metaphorical ambiguity, but not as a condition for it. The unity of the mind is still interpreted as repression, but not as the source of the diversity of its voices" (*Yermolenko, 1999: 278*). However, no matter how decentralized we see an effective society, it "is unable to do without that relative point used to form the projective unity of the intersubjectively created common will" (*Yermolenko, 1999: 279*). It is possible to overcome this situation if dialogic forms of communication are used and mechanisms of trustful communication are formed.

It is interesting to analyze communicative structures with contextually determined positive or negative evaluation, referring to J. Habermas' theory of communicative action. The philosopher distinguishes communicative and strategic actions and types of behavior. Both communicative and strategic actions are socially oriented. However, if strategic action is determined from the outside and regulated by intentionally given norms and sanctions as communication is instrumental in nature, then the essence of communicative action is the participants' need to find and apply rational grounds able to convince other subjects and persuade them to agree. The goal of strategically oriented action is not mutual understanding, but only the realization of one's interest, achievement of success, which can lead to conscious or unconscious deception, manipulative interaction and systematically distorted communication. This form of communication was defined by K. Jaspers as "communication of existing", and M. Buber defined as "unreal communication of a monologue world".

We would like to focus attention on the importance of communicative action. Active actors of communication are focused on coordinating their interests with others by achieving common understanding of the situation and creating the atmosphere of trust. Their goal is to create social connections and maintain social order. In contrast to strategic action, it is communicative action that contributes to the atmosphere of significance of the words and thoughts of interacting actors. J. Habermas is certain that rational understanding between people is impossible if there is no normative base, if they do not perceive each other as equal partners and if they do not respect and recognize the uniqueness of communication partners. However, this attitude towards the Other is eliminated by trusting the Other. Such attitude can facilitate social harmony in society. That is, by adequate assessment of the communication partner, namely, by treating them with more or less trust, you expect the proper outcome of this interaction. In our opinion, J. Habermas explores an ideal model of communication, which is very far from the real

one. At the same time, he assumes that features, inherent in real society, correspond to the communicative rationality, which he considers as an effective way of establishing productive social relations. Mutual understanding, trust, recognition, argumentation, consensus are not only theoretical concepts, but real aspects of human communication. These are integral elements of human interaction that lead to the consent of individuals, social communities, and groups. The term "universal pragmatics" was coined by Y. Habermas and shared by K.-O. Apel, and the idea behind it aims to develop a comprehensive program of universal significance of communicative interactions, "communicative competence" that offers a strategy for, if not prevention, then at least diagnosis and treatment of faulty processes in social communication.

Communication efficiency depends on the mutual exchange and interaction patterns of social subjects. The problem of social boundaries and social uncertainty is a relevant theme within our research. A promising scientific investigation is the research of Ukrainian scientists T. Yereskova, O. Mazuryk, O. Aleksandrova, H. Tymofieieva, and V. Zavadskyi about the "state of social uncertainty as a model of interaction between social subjects" (*Yereskova et al., 2020: 244*). They emphasize the importance of social uncertainty as a pattern of Ukrainians' existence, adapted to life at war, and its role in shaping their everyday, political, and informational space.

Liminal discourse, the theme of borders, boundaries, is of crucial importance in topological explorations of communication. Topology draws our attention to unexpected forms of connection and continuity, taking into account the processes of social division, filtering and separation. There is an urgent need to adequately reflect the changing modalities of elusive boundary subjectivity and systems of inclusion/exclusion that are observed at different levels of communication. The space "between" exists in the dynamics of overcoming, inclusion in the network of relations and dialogical connections. The distance between us and them as "in-between" boundary space exists in the dynamics of overcoming, inclusion in the network of relations and dialogical connections. Many modern intellectuals are concerned with the danger of monologue thinking and world perception (M. Buber, P. Ricoeur, B. Waldenfels).

Boundary can be interpreted as borderline, revealing the meanings of frontier existence, problems of migration and political boundaries. Communication leads towards the research of processual, polysemantic and involved metaphorical contents of the boundary phenomenon. The concepts of "boundary", "border", "frontier" as characteristics of the socio-cultural, political, ubiquitous existence of "between" are mainly associated with the modern world as they are determined by its rules, but today, the processes of glocalization attract the attention of scientists again, and in certain contexts they lead from secondary spatial forms to actual patterns and key elements of postmodern research. The essential characteristics of communication lead to two vectors of analysis, as we specified the article "Intercultural communication: from differentiation to inclusion": "Its topology is built in two directions: cultural space (topos as a place of communication, a socio-cultural parameter of analysis) and linguistic space (topos as an element of an

argumentative scheme, the inclusion of which is determined by the theme and purpose of communication)" (*Kolinko, 2019b: 194*).

Topology offers a determination of complex multi-layered social phenomena, and unstable non-linear modern social processes. Topological analysis is gaining more and more relevance as a methodology of advanced social research. The term "topology" is quite polysemantic, which hinders the clarity of its definition and application as a philosophical category, and is a setback for the development and use of an appropriate methodological strategy. In a broad sense, topology studies the properties of spaces of various types. Its origin is connected with the mathematical language of algebraic (combinatorial) topology. The subject of topology is the phenomenon of continuity, shape connection and the possibility of structural deformations. In the topological dimension, invariance and internal change are closely related. Communication is considered as a socio-cultural field, and the communicative interactions of different cultural groups are the relationship of subsets-subfields. Knowledge of the topological foundations of communication creates an effective social mechanism that connects the individual interests of communicators with the realities of a common communicative environment. Boundaries are necessary for the existence of communicative phenomena in the moving space of the fluid present. Topoi are used in the cognitive aspect as communicative categories, meaningful discursive models and parameters for the distribution of social positions. They are the basis of a systematic vision of communicative phenomena and their combinations, important components in constructing a meaningful framework for their research. They organize the space of knowledge, reflecting formal and logical connections between various phenomena. At the same time, topoi provide "maintenance" of meaning, its fixation, at first they make up "part of the meaning", and then realize the possibilities of semantic expansion, eliminate the dictates of traditional thinking, and offer new angles of communicative interaction. Today, the vector of the semantics of the topos becomes humanistic, the communicative environment of a humans is understood as factors of their existence.

Post-industrial culture has significantly developed the variability of communicative spaces. The degree of interest has considerably increased in modern communication as knowledge and intercultural competence of various socio-cultural communities have expanded due to the intensification of international contacts, the development of mass education, the Internet, and mass media. Science and art contribute to the improvement of communication, socio-cultural expression, social cohesion, producing the metatext of cultural discourse. U. Eco and M. Foucault interpret architectural discourse, R. Barthes and J. Baudrillard suggest fashion as a type of discourse. Artistic forms (literature, music, dance, painting, etc.) become topological means of communication and interaction. The discursive foundations of power provide an opportunity to criticize established forms of management and preserve the democratic organization of society. On the contrary, the absence of a power discourse, the suppression of a criticism towards existing orders creates archaic forms of aggressive societies that we observe in Russia, Iran,

North Korea, and certain countries of Africa and Latin America.

Michel Foucault adopted the term 'discourse' to denote a historically contingent social system that produces knowledge and power. Discourse for him is a body of statements (spoken and written) that are organized in a regular and systematic way, correlates with one object and is realized as a discursive practice. Discursive, that is, language practices in different historical and cultural eras consist discursive formations. Michel Foucault, who deeply studied the culture of certain historic periods, showed that certain ways of expression, argumentation and wording are present in various scientific disciplines. We deal with the discursive statements of various scientists from different fields as they have hardly ever communicated with each other. Hence, some fundamental composition techniques of their texts are focused on identical key terms, ways of structuring them, which, in turn, affect argumentative patterns, including the use of identical metaphors, and so on. This is an extremely productive idea for the study of the foundations of communication, as it expands theoretical knowledge about the patterns of communication and explains how a communicative metadiscourse is created.

V. Palaguta, defining a new type of discursive-spatial subjectivity, writes that "there is no internal and homogeneous in it, it is mixed with external and foreign; single and homogeneous is replaced by multiple and heterogeneous, continuous is replaced by discontinuous, fluent is replaced by gaps and failures" (*Palaguta, 2010: 267*). According to V. Palaguta, the discursive space implies "both the multiplicity of places and fields, as well as the multiple variability of acts of assigning Our - the Other, and, ultimately, acts of constituting subjectivity itself, which indicates a certain choice of a certain subjectivity, made by the modern subject" (*Palaguta, 2010: 267*). In discursive sociality, one speech act cannot unequivocally determine the type and properties of the subsequent act: it rather sets the conditions to continue a dialogue, and to communicate according to the norms and rules. The type of relations in the new ontology does not allow unambiguous determinism, it is mainly characterized by blurred relative dependencies determined by strategies, rules and norms of "language-in-interaction". The mode of producing and following a certain communicative scenario is regulated by the rules of discourse, but does not guarantee the expected result. Discursive action requires creative mutual activity of the interlocutors.

Discourse is a continuous movement embodied in discursive practices, it is widespread in society and at this level is a more specific subject of analysis. Communicative behavior in a discourse is flexible and dynamic, since a change in communication tactics, its conditions and circumstances require both meaningful regulation and restructured behavior in communicative interaction. The discursive space of modern communication is also characterized by a tendency to deregulate discursive practices, which makes them open to transformation.

The network nature of modern society encourages the acceleration of the process of formation and distribution of meanings, their circulation in social space; it reveals ambivalent possibilities for mutual understanding, consensus, dialogue, and for creating of "quasi-communication", simulation and simulacra of social

communication. New language strategies are being developed, they are closely linked with socio-cultural aspects of communication and form the discursive space of cross-cultural co-existence. Ukrainian researcher S. Domnich emphasized the transformation of speech practices into strategies of socio-cultural communication as a result of the realization of "personal goals, directions, desires, they become such communicative strategies in which the interaction of language - speech - speech practices (discourse) occurs, since it is the person who combines these strategies" (*Domnich, 2015: 14*). Communicative strategies are elements of discursive practices.

It is necessary to define the difference between communicative strategy and communicative tactics. Communicative strategy is subordinated to the overall communicative goal and uses both verbal and non-verbal means of communication. Communicative tactics embody individual communicative intentions in the process of communicative practices. The concept of "practice" is used in a wide variety of ordinary and theoretical contexts, becoming popular in various types of social discourses. Their variability depends on the positions of the communicators and their movement within the sociocultural field, transition from one field to another, the perspective of combining the fields of the interacting parties. Then a change in the existence conditions of the discourse subject is recorded, that is, the conditions of construction / understanding of a language statement.

The development of speech strategies of intercultural communication is based on the ways of manifestation of topological nomination procedures, the development of dialogue and the "assembling" of a separate discursive "places" of multicultural members in the system of the common communicative space in the language practices of boundary sociality. This procedural mechanism is suggested in our scientific research (*Kolinko, 2018, 2019a, 2019c; Kolinko, Petryshyn, 2022*). Numerous variants of the typology of speech strategies are based on different classification features, which depend on the goals of the studied form of communication and the objectives of research activity. The choice of strategies depends on how the communicative event is conceptualized and in what sociocultural context it happens. Appropriate strategic forms of language behavior are used in various types of communication, they not only correlate with the goals and intentions of the communicating personalities, but also consider the cultural background of the situation. Possible deviations from the theme, inconsistency with the formal patterns of the conversation, violation of the logic of statements, indicating the cancelled rigid structural requirements of the conversation, lead to synergistic uncertainty of the course of communication, when its predicted ending is not marked as a specific point, but as a horizon that captures its meaningful openness and variability.

Language is only a condition of communication, language provides codes, but there is exchange of messages, meanings, and ideas in discourse. Discourse is an important characteristic of the productive existence of a certain community, world order, as well as a marker of the attitude towards the Other - other person, other group, community, or culture. Rejection of discursive practices indicates the threatening character of the society development; it means rejection of civilized rules of interaction.

We can observe "re-assembling" of socio-cultural configurations in the modern world, which induce to apply the methodology of distinction in the study of tendencies of the movement towards openness, uncertainty, unpredictability of communicative options, otherness, normalization of changes in order to emphasize the significance of social interactions on the boundary lines. At the same time, the conceptualization of the modern international political order, understanding the threat of war, genocide, aggression from non-democratic societies (Russia, Iran, North Korea) and the risks from the eastern nuclear states striving for global influence (China, India) define a strategy of rational communication with a relevant understanding of the concepts of "us" and "other", inclusion/exclusion rules, establishing the level of density and intensity of contacts. The social reaction of the international civilized community to these threatening processes is an active political, legal, socio-cultural and military discourse, the idea of solidarity within local, regional and global political spaces, the identification of national states as defenders of democracy or sponsors of terrorism, arguments in favor of rethinking and reformatting the rules, and cooperation of international organizations.

Conclusions

The performed analysis allows to come to the conclusion that discourse is a way of existence of communication. Its discursive foundations lie in the direction, given by connections and relations of the communication elements according to its goals, subject matter, and socio-cultural environment. Interaction with the external cultural space provides a topological mechanism of "coherence" and "distribution" of the semiotic components of the discourse. The theoretical and methodological analysis of the discourse offers a set of tools that reveal the displacement and juxtaposition of topos, "collect" meanings, knowledge, ideas and "distribute" them. Following the rule of discursive limitation, the speech acts of the interlocutors provide answers and reactions determined by the content and form of the discourse. But the relevance of individual acts depends on the change of specific direction and purpose in the communication process.

We distinguished the forms of communicative exchange: monologue, dialogue, polylogue. The productivity of dialogue and polylogue forms of communication in the construction of responsible and democratic public discourse is emphasized.

The understanding of conflict communication is based on the discourses of boundary and concept of us-other. It is in the topological marking of boundaries that social relations become most exposed and aggressive. What communicators are silent about in the "center", inside their world, is revealed and spoken at the moment of meeting the other or transforming into the other.

Summarizing the above stated, we should note that the norms, values and institutions of a society take their established form in the processes of social interaction. It is communication in all its forms (verbal and non-verbal), types (formal and informal), and varieties (interpersonal, intergroup, intercultural) that fully reveals the specifics of the communicative space. Communication structures and systematizes the communicative process. It is not limited by the technique of the communicative act, but elucidates

the anthropological meaning of a holistic social phenomenon.

The mechanism of communicative interactions, the orientation towards mutual understanding is the basis for the reproduction of the most important structures of life. The effective communication depends on the "coherence" between text generating and text interpretation. It is communication that leads to the formation of established interpersonal and social structures, "an ordered normative environment", according to J. Habermas. The analysis of communicative and strategic action makes it possible to diagnose socio-cultural problems and determine their essential features, for example, to reveal the hidden violence of the system. Communicative discourse contributes to the integration of society and the self-realization of an individual, but discursive practices become effective only when a significant number of communicators agree with the rules and of logic this discourse and use its methods, patterns, and thinking. The key to successful communication is understanding the information received and produced according to this pattern of interaction. Communicative actions aimed at mutual understanding with interlocutors create space for discourse. Discourse develops a common theme, being a coherent text in a set of linguistic and sociocultural factors in the context of a certain communicative event. Changes of the rules and unestablished procedure for the reception of messages narrow the field of application of discursive practices. The more discourses are produced by communication, the more disagreements and contradictions are inherent in it. The communicative paradigm, developed in the works of J. Habermas, O. Höffe, K.-O. Apel, V. Hölsle, offers axiological perspectives of understanding communication problems and introduces the rules of a modern discursive space and dialogue with the Other.

So, modern communication should be understood as a metadiscourse that has to exist, creating syntheses that unite people, transforming the communicative space into the interaction of life worlds.

REFERENCES

- Boichenko, M. I. (2018). Komunikatyvna paradyhma doslidzhennya kultury. *Ukrayinski kulturolohichni studiyi*, 1 (2), 5–9. http://www.library.univ.kiev.ua/ukr/-host/viking/db/ftp/univ/uks/uks_2018_02.pdf (In Ukrainian)
- Hnatyuk, Olya (2005). *Proshchannya z imperiyeyu: Ukrayinski dyskusiyi pro identychnist*. Kyiv, Krytyka. (In Ukrainian)
- Domnich, S. P. (2015). Sotsiokulturna komunikatsiya: filofska-antropolohichnyy analiz movlennyevykh praktyk u mizhkulurniy vzayemodiyi [avtoref. kand. filos. nauk. V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University]. *KhNU repository* http://www-center.univer.kharkov.ua/ru/refer/avtoferat_-_domnich.pdf. (In Ukrainian)
- Yermolenko, A. M. (1999). *Komunikatyvna praktychna filosofiya*. Kyiv, Libra, 1999. (In Ukrainian)
- Yermolenko, A. (2022). Etyka dyskursu Karla-Otto Apelya yak «persha filosofiya» tretoyi paradyhmy: 100-richchya vid dnya narodzhennya Karla-Otto Apelya. *Filofska dumka*, 2, 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.02.023>. (In Ukrainian)
- Kolinko, M. V. (2019a). Dyskurs-analiz u doslidzhenni mizhkulturnoyi komunikatsiyi. *Hileya: Naukovyy*

- Visnyk*, 141 2), ch. 2. *Filosofski nauky*, 69–72. <http://gileya.org/index.php?ng=library&cont=long&id=178> (In Ukrainian)
- Kolinko, M. (2019b). *Mizhkulturna komunikatsiya: vid rozrznennya do vklyuchennya. Mizhkulturna komunikatsiya*. Vol 6 (1), 189–212. (In Ukrainian)
- Kolinko, M. V. (2019c). *Mizhkulturna komunikatsiya: topolohichnyy vymir*. Vinnytsya, TVORY. (In Ukrainian)
- Kolinko, M.V. (2018). *Topos yak ponyattya sotsialnoyi topolohiyi. Multyversum. Filosofskyy almanakh*, 3–4 (165–166), 32–44. (In Ukrainian)
- Palahuta, V. Y. (2010). *Samoidentyfikatsiya sotsialnogo subjekta v diskursivnykh prostranstvakh*. Dnepropetrovsk, Innovatsiya. (In Russian)
- Blommaert, J. (2011). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Communication. Cambridge dictionary. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/communication>.
- Communication. Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. URL: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/american_english/communication.
- Foucault, M. (2002) *Archeology of knowledge*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Kolinko, M., Petryshyn, H. (2022). *Simulacra and fakes in the information warfare. Skhid*, 3 (3), 9–14. [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2022.3\(3\).266049](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2022.3(3).266049)
- Yereskova T., Mazuryk O., Aleksandrova O., Tymofieieva H., Zavadskyi V. (2020) *Uncertainty as a regular feature of modern ukrainian society. Teorija in Praksa*. 3, 928-946.

Комунікація: типологія метадискурсу соціальних взаємодій

Марина Колінько (ORCID 0000-0002-1043-2742)

Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

Галина Петришин (ORCID 0000-0003-3428-8789)

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка (Україна)

Галина Чумак (ORCID 0000-0001-5974-9022)

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка (Україна)

У статті основна увага приділяється визначенню та аналізу комунікації як методу дискурсу соціальних взаємодій з точки зору топологічної методології. Соціокультурні трансформації, що формують модель глобального світу та змінюють український ландшафт, інтенсифікацію міжкультурних контактів, міжнародних відносин, взаємовідносин соціальних спільностей на різних рівнях актуалізують проблему комунікативної взаємодії. Процеси глобалізації, що залучають представників різних культур до загального розвитку цивілізації, виклики військових конфліктів, зокрема війни українського народу проти російського вторгнення, вимагають адекватно побудованого дискурсу. У таких контекстах поняття комунікації як метадискурсу, тобто дискурсу про дискурси соціальних взаємодій, набуває нового змісту.

Ключові слова: комунікація, дискурс, топологія, інтеркомунікація, діалог, соціальна взаємодія.

Received (Надійшла до редакції): 10.01.2022,

Accepted (Прийнята до друку): 20.02.2023

Available online (Опубліковано онлайн) 01.04.2023