

О.В. Ефимова [O.V. Yefimova]¹,
З.С. Тамбиева [Z.S. Tambieva]²

УДК 323.2

DOI: 10.37493/2307-910X.2022.3.19

СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ИССЛЕДОВАНИЮ МАССОВОЙ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

MODERN APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF MASS POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

*Институт международных отношений Пятигорского государственного университета Россия,
г. Пятигорск, E-mail: oyefimova@yahoo.com*

² Северо-Кавказской государственной академии, Россия, г. Ставрополь, E-mail: tambieva@mail.ru

Аннотация

Принципиальным вопросом современных исследований остается изучение ситуации, когда масс-медиа стали продолжением нервной системы человека, влияют на сознание и поведение человека в процессе коммуникации. Цель статьи – определить, что современная коммуникация вобрала в себя не только передачу сообщения, но и конструирование ценностно-смыслового пространства и трансляцию образцов поведения и культуры. Сделан вывод о том, что глобальность информационного фрейма активно осваивается не только социальными акторами, но и различными политическими агентами, для которых неиспользование медиапространства означает упущение потенциальных возможностей воздействия на неограниченную аудиторию. Необходимо признать, что современная массовая политическая коммуникация вобрала в себя не только передачу сообщения, но и конструирование политического пространства, в чем и заключается ее изменившаяся сущность. Преобладающая доля политической коммуникации осуществляется посредством и в интересах субъектов политической коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: политика, политическая коммуникация, государство, масс-медиа, политический агент, политический дискурс.

Abstract

The fundamental issue of modern research remains the study of the situation when mass media have become an extension of the human nervous system, affect human consciousness and behavior in the process of communication. The purpose of the article is to determine that modern communication has absorbed not only the transmission of a message, but also the construction of a value-semantic space and the translation of patterns of behavior and culture. It is concluded that the globality of the information frame is being actively mastered not only by social actors, but also by various political agents, for whom not using the media space means missing potential opportunities to influence an unlimited audience. It must be recognized that modern mass political communication has absorbed not only the transmission of a message, but also the construction of a political space, which is its changed essence. The predominant share of political communication is carried out through and in the interests of the subjects of political communication.

Keywords: politics, political communication, state, mass media, political agent, political discourse.

Introduction. Despite the fact that today political communication is one of the most studied civilizational problems in the system of social sciences and humanities and in special works devoted to the study of certain aspects of political communication, both in modern domestic and foreign practice, nevertheless, we have to state that a coherent theory of mass political communication does not currently exist. It is going through a transitional stage, since it does not fully reflect the categories of mobility, interactivity and convergence of new media, and the following “pre-conditions for the paradigm crisis of the world civilizational order of life” [5, 281]. Science is at the stage of formation of such a subject paradigm, which is designed to move away from the dominant theories that prioritize either information or communication as a specific technical process that provides a dialogue between government and society, and pay attention to improved spatial and communication practices.

General principles and approaches, united within the framework of mass political communication and the phenomenon of mediatization of politics, are little actualized and developed. To

date, there is no generalizing, cumulative knowledge that takes into account the features, characteristics, means of implementation, etc., which require differentiation, analysis, synthesis and systematization. Thus, the state of development and study of a very important problem determines the need for this study.

The degree of development of the problem. Scientific research has paid great attention to the specifics of communication, and as a result, areas for studying the features of communication have been formed, represented by the study of: features of the communicative interaction between the institutions of political power and society [23]; technologies of Internet communications as a tool to influence the functioning of modern institutions of power [10]; as a factor in the formation of public opinion in modern Russia [22]; from the point of view of network political communication of power and society [16]; the effectiveness of communication [3], [15], including the state [19], etc. Nevertheless, one should point out the extreme insufficiency of works devoted to the subject of communication from the perspective of the problems of the relationship between the political and the media.

Research methods. Due to the interdisciplinary and complex nature of mass political communication, the theoretical issues of studying the phenomenon are among the problematic issues, the consideration of which does not fit into the usual framework of general political science paradigms, which to a certain extent claim to be universal metatheories.

Therefore, depending on the object, subject and methodology of research, it is possible to create a certain interdisciplinary level of analysis, which will allow obtaining specific results, more specific and methodologically supported. This goal required the solution of the following tasks: to consider the essence of mass political communication, as well as to determine the relationship between mass political communication and media space; focus on changing the functions of modern mass political communication.

Research results and their interpretation. In the conditions of a democratically developing state, the influence of the mass media on politics always increases dramatically. However, for a long time this influence could only be exercised through the press or through an open and direct meeting of politicians with citizens. Only since the 1960s can we talk about the penetration of mass communication into political life, but only since the end of the last century, with the development of the Internet, the implementation of public policy has become impossible without mass public participation. On the other hand, there is a potential opportunity to make any information global, to arouse interest in it among an unlimited audience. As a result, the growth of information and communication technologies has generally corrected ideas about political communication, however, political analysis as well, since “the property of unpredictability is increasingly becoming a property of a politician at all levels and scales of the event field” [4, 142].

Initially, the basic basis of the theory of mass communication was the constructivist approach in sociology, which studies communication as a social phenomenon. Among other sciences and scientific disciplines that study communications and related issues of communication systems, communication processes, and at the present stage of development of communication theory and practice - and communication technologies themselves - one can name anthropology, psychology, linguistics, semiotics, technical sciences and, of course, political science. , whose area of interest in the field of communication is extremely wide and important, as it touches upon the vital issues of the functioning of society and states on various scales, up to global ones.

Also of concern to the scientific community is the fact that mass political communication, one of the key vocations of which is the consolidation of society and the coordination of political interests, in fact, has practically ceased to serve the designated function, transforming into a field of targeted influence on the object by political and political interests interested in a certain benefit. other entities. But this position in science has not been properly reflected, and in the existing basic theories of political communication a generalized understanding of the phenomenon is given.

All definitions of political communication in a significant list of works carry a fairly broad semantic load, as, for example, in the founder of the theory of communication H. Innis , who un-

derstands political communication as “a mechanism by which the existence and development of human relations is ensured, including all mental symbols, means of transmission in space and preservation in time” [9, 167]. P. Smith, C. Barry, A. Pulford dwell on the understanding that “communication is the act of sending information from the brain of one person to the brain of another person” [24]. We are closer to the definition of communication given by the political scientist A.V. Atanesyan : “communication is a connection, a relationship between phenomena that may belong to one or different systems, respectively, communication supports a system or interaction between subsystems, creating a system at a higher, generalizing level” [2, 38]. It should be noted that the stated interpretations are generally characterized by a generalizing approach, which is inevitably accompanied by either an expanded understanding of the problem or a clear contradiction. While agreeing that communication is a connection and relationship between different subjects, we nevertheless emphasize that communication does not always create a system at a higher level. I would also like to draw attention to the fact that any field of studying communication, including political ones, initially assumes an interdisciplinary nature of work, which is not reflected in the proposed interpretations.

So, communication, including political communication, is a complex phenomenon that plays a leading role in the existence of society. As far as political communication is concerned, historical examples of its origin were demonstrated on the squares of ancient Greek city-states, where all the most important state-political issues were discussed. Ancient Greece is a vivid example of how mass character, publicity and openness were at the heart of everything political. With the departure of the Greek city-states from the forefront of political life, a tendency appeared in the state structure and government to deny democracy, and the number of authoritarian-type monarchies began to grow. But with the advent of technical means of disseminating information, the era of mass communication, mass awareness, active political participation, including the so-called “grassroots”, began.

The transmission of messages in any state structure inevitably implies the presence of certain technical means of communication, therefore communication imposes specific requirements on structural elements, which consist of technical channels, areas of control, preservation, accumulation of information, etc. But, even with such structures, not all information is able to generate the process of "establishing meaningful contacts between" political subjects: the recipient of information (recipient) and the sender (communicator) [14, 66].

Deutsch [27], a pioneer in the study of the political system as an information and communication system, gave rise to a twofold theoretical continuation. So, from the point of view of G. Szelsky, “the state should not follow the interests and will of individual citizens and groups”, and in the first place when considering political communication, it is necessary to put the technical aspect of the organization of political power, and not the social one [See: 8, 23]. In contrast to this concept, J. Habermas in his studies focused on learning activities and cultural norms, suggesting that social and political values should dominate political communication and follow the "interests of the general population" [28, 108].

The works of the founders of the theory of political communication, despite the polarity of views, have become an undoubted breakthrough in the scientific consideration of the problem. However, the development of information systems and the latest technologies did not lead to the solution of social problems. Moreover, new media only increased the possibilities for maneuvers for institutions and subjects of power, expanded the field of manipulative influence on the recipient in the course of mass political communication. Nevertheless, it should be noted that under certain political regimes, it became possible to strengthen the autonomy of grassroots government structures in the state, electronic voting and interactive communication systems appeared, the destruction of hierarchical ties in public administration, etc. With the emergence and penetration of new media into the broad masses, changes in the socio-political nature took place, which caused the prerequisites for active involvement in political relations of the broad masses.

Next, consider the structure of political communication, the formula of which was first

proposed by G. Lasswell. We emphasize right away that the researcher considered political communication as a complex process with a specific focus, internal structure and socio-political functions. He developed a linear model of the communication process based on the behavioral stimulus-response approach. In this case, the audience is the object of the “who reports? - what does it say? - to whom? - on what channel? – with what effect?”, and the information transmitted by the communicator should have a direct impact on the recipient [18, 141].

Lasswell's rather optimistic formula considered political communications as an incentive, imperative process, ending with a certain, expected effect. R. Braddock improved this formula by adding two more points to the well-known scheme: “under what circumstances does it report? - What is the purpose of reporting? [7, 91]. Subsequently, the behaviorist B. Berelson proposed his understanding of the structure and model of political communication, the essence of whose theory is that one of the essential aspects of influencing power is elections and a referendum, in the process of which political communication plays an important role [26].

Characterizing the modern communicative space, the researchers write that it is distinguished by “the interaction of different cultures and the variety of communicative means and practices” [20, 12]. Indeed, the very relationship between political subjects in the course of their desire to use power for their own purposes cannot be carried out without information exchange, without communication. Any political activity is closely associated with its “communication dimension”, which gives rise to M.N. Grachev to define political communication as “a special, special case of communication, which is the informational impact of political actors on each other and the surrounding social environment (society)” [12, 232]. As the author rightly believes, having certain advantages of a methodological, epistemological and ontological order, generally accepted concepts face considerable difficulties when considering communication processes, a phenomenon that has become an integral part of the life of modern society [13, 23]. Researcher I.S. Nikitina draws attention to the institutional nature and specific information content of political discourse [21, 9].

However, all existing theories adhere to either the information or communication paradigm, paying insufficient attention to the role of modern media in the implementation of mass political communication. In our opinion, it is with the advent of new media that one can forget about the previously announced objective essence of communication as a tool for the democratization of public life. On the contrary, the modern essence of mass political communication lies in the formation of the mass media as the main instrument of policy formation, and not in the direction of democratization, but to please a rather narrow circle of people. This process is partly objective, since the reasons for uneven access to sources of information are objective. In addition, the monopoly ownership of the media market by individual companies and government structures also dictates its own characteristics of the process.

We proceed from the position of R.V. Korotkevich that political communication is one of the main links of the political system of society, which provides the relationship between its other components through the translation of political values. But at the same time, political communication also acts as a process that includes the activities of political subjects in combining, producing, and disseminating values that are significant for political subjects through the media. The purpose of distribution is the formation in line with the stabilization of existing ideas or their change, as well as the way of thinking and actions of other social actors [17, 195].

However, despite the fact that the predominant share of political communication is carried out through and in the interests of media magnates (the founders of the mass media, advertisers, power structures using administrative resources, parties in power, oligarchic structures), globalization processes make their own adjustments in this direction. This means that in the environment of mass political communication, informal media based on the interactivity of the media space (for example, the blogosphere) began to take their place, which, in particular, began to be used, for example, by the organizers of color revolutions and adherents of eversion technologies.

Researchers rightly assume that “the acute problem of the formation in the field of public

policy of various values, ideologies, doctrines, symbols, feelings, oppositional opinions and speeches, the formation of official norms that are implemented in the field of communications" [6, 217]. Consequently, the traditional view of politics as a "socio-technological structure, whose institutions are oriented towards the purposeful transfer, exchange and protection of information" [25, 15], needs to be corrected, since from now on the institutions of mass media policy are also oriented towards construction of information for the purpose of not only interaction, but also impact. Therefore, we agree with the definition of M.N. Grachev that political communication is "communication in the sphere of politics, a type of communication that represents the informational impact of political actors on each other and the surrounding social environment" [13, 23]. We only add that mass political communication can also be considered as a projection of the political constructions of an interested political subject using the capabilities of the mass media into the fields of the socio-political media space and other subspaces.

In this regard, we would like to cite a scheme for the participation of the media in modern mass political communications, developed by P. Norris, who devoted her research to the media and political communications. According to the theory of P. Norris, the role of the media is the role of an intermediary between the subjects of socio-political relations and society as a system of views and ideas about the activities of these subjects [29, 14]. The media mediate the processes of political communications, providing a link between political institutions and society, between voters and those elected, between organizations at different levels.

Developing the ideas of P. Norris, S.D. Glukharev suggests that it is the symbolic space created by the mass media that forms the basis of the media space. At the same time, mass political communication is a projection of the selected information and its interpretation as a reflection of the actions, ideas and thoughts, first of all, of the ruling elite in the media space, since the media currently "is an economic enterprise whose financial well-being and existence depends on the state or representatives of the political elite" [11, 110].

Conclusions. Thus, the essence of mass political communication today has changed dramatically, which is largely due to the change in the functions of new media. The functions of the media that were previously inherent in them (integrative, educational, educational, etc.), and the functions of the media, or rather the dysfunctions that modern media perform (dysfunctions of drug addiction, disintegration, expectations and disappointments, etc.), differ significantly. In the era of the use of many digital technologies, the impact of the media extends to all spheres of an individual's life. The new era "invented" a new cycle in the classical three-stage information and communication structure: "message (message) – translation (communication) – perception (interpretation) – communion". It was the initiation that became the main task assigned by the function of modern media, which was reflected in the essence of mass political communication.

However, to date, researchers do not sufficiently take into account the important essential characteristic of mass political communication, which consists not only in the circulation, circulation and movement of information. In our opinion, it is necessary to take into account the goals and objectives of political communication, which consist not only in the transfer of information, but also in changing opinions, judgments, attitudes, attitudes, and behavior of the mass audience.

It should be emphasized that we are not considering individual cases of political communication, implying political management, but the general spatial and informational interaction of political subjects and their influence on the "agenda". In our opinion, it is important to take into account the "procedural" and "functional" components of mass political communication, which allows us to focus on the totality of the phenomena of information impact and the interaction of subjects in the sphere of politics regarding the power exercised in the media space.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Андреев А.В. Политические резонансы и их влияние на политические процессы: глобальный, национальный и локальный уровни: дис...канд. полит. наук. Кемерово, 2015. 243 с.

2. Атанесян А.В. Актуальные проблемы современных политических и конфликтных коммуникаций. Ереван: Изд-во Ереванского гос. ун-та, 2008. 154 с.
3. Батагова А.Д., Кувыркова Е.А. Проблемы эффективности коммуникации российских экспертов-международников с обществом и властью // Политическая социология. 2022. Том 10. № 2. С. 41-55.
4. Боташева А.К. Теория хаоса и политический анализ: взгляд сквозь призму непредсказуемости политических событий // Современная наука и инновации. 2018. № 2 (22). С. 142-145.
5. Боташева А.К., Адамова М.А. Политико-экономические аспекты межстрановых отношений и экономико-политические факторы неравномерности развития мирового сообщества // Вестник Пятигорского государственного университета. 2018. № 3. С. 281-284.
6. Боташева А.К., Ануфриенко С.В. Медиаполитический процесс как фактор влияния на событийную сторону политической жизни (на примере событий на Украине 2014-2015 гг.) // Вестник Пятигорского государственного университета. 2019. № 1. С. 217-223.
7. Брэддок Р. Формула Лассуэла // Вестник связи. 1958. № 8. С. 88-93.
8. Вилков А.А., Казаков А.А. Политические технологии формирования имиджей России и США в процессе информационно-коммуникационного взаимодействия (на материалах «Российской газеты» и «Вашингтон Пост». 2007-2008 гг.). Саратов: Издательский центр «Наука», 2010. 170 с.
9. Володенков С.В. Теория коммуникации Х.А. Инниса и современные информационно-коммуникационные технологии: политологический анализ // Социально-политические науки. 2011. № 1. С. 166-169.
10. Володенков С.В., Ромашкина А.Б. Технологии интернет-коммуникаций как инструмента влияния на функционирование современных институтов власти: актуальные вызовы // Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. 2020. № 1. С. 33-40.
11. Глухарев С.Д. Медиапространство как элемент информационной безопасности // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Сер.: Социально-гуманитарные науки. 2011. № 9. С. 109-111.
12. Грачев М.Н. Политическая коммуникация: теоретические концепции, модели, векторы развития. М.: Прометей, 2004. 327 с.
13. Грачев М.Н. Политическая коммуникация: теоретико-методологический анализ: автореф. ... дисс. д. полит. наук. М., 2005. 28 с.
14. Казаков М.А., Зубкевич А.А. Манулятивные технологии и имиджевые коммуникации на этапе смены идеологии развития политических лидеров и элит современной России // Астраханский вестник экологического образования. 2012. № 4. С. 65-72.
15. Катышева Л.В. «Простой и понятный язык» как новый тренд коммуникации государства и общества // Политическая социология. 2022. Том 10. № 2. С. 85-94.
16. Ковшов М.А. Законодательная и представительная ветви власти с точки зрения сетевой политической коммуникации власти и общества // Общество: политика, экономика, право. 2022. № 2. С. 29-36.
17. Короткевич Р.В. Средства массовой информации – элемент политической системы общества // Лесной вестник (1997-2002). 2002. № 3. С. 191-196.
18. Лассуэлл Г.Д. Психопатология и политика. М.: Издательство РАГС, 2005. 352 с.
19. Минаева Л.В. Управление государственной коммуникацией в период пандемии: зарубежный опыт // Политическая социология. 2022. Том 10. № 2. С. 23-40.
20. Никитинская А.А. Социально-философский анализ общественного диалога в социальных сетях: дис. ... канд. филос. наук. Архангельск, 2022. 167 с.
21. Никитина И.С. Вербализация коммуникативно-прагматической категории «толерантность» в современном немецком политическом дискурсе: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Санкт-Петербург, 2022. 19 с.

22. Пименов Н.П. Политические коммуникации как фактор формирования общественного мнения в современной России (на примере внесистемной оппозиции): дис. ... канд. полит. наук. СПб., 2016. 181 с.
23. Ромашкина А.Б. Особенности коммуникационного взаимодействия институтов политической власти и общества в условиях цифровых технологических трансформаций: автореф. дис. ... канд. полит. наук. Москва, 2022. 32 с.
24. Смит П., Бэрри К., Пулфорд А. Коммуникации стратегического маркетинга. М.: Юнити-Дана, 2001. 415 с.
25. Суханова К.В. Политические коммуникации власти в современном российском обществе: дис. ... канд. полит. наук. Уфа, 2009. 18 с.
26. Berelson B. The Great Debate on Population Policy: An Instructive Entertainment. New York: The Population Council, 1975. 32 p.
27. Deutsch K.W. The Nerves of Government. Models of Political Communication and Control. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1963. 316 p.
28. Habermas J. The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge, 1989. 508 p.
29. Norris P. A Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Postindustrial Societies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 314 p.

REFERENCES

1. Andreev A.V. Politicheskie rezonansy i ih vliyanie na politicheskie processy: global'nyj, nacional'nyj i lokal'nyj urovni: dis...kand. polit. nauk. Kemerovo, 2015. 243 s.
2. Atanesyan A.V. Aktual'nye problemy sovremennyh politicheskikh i konfliktnyh kommunikacij. Erevan: Izd-vo Erevanskogo gos. un-ta, 2008. 154 s.
3. Batagova A.D., Kuvyrkova E.A. Problemy effektivnosti kommunikacii rossijskikh ekspertov-mezhdunarodnikov s obshchestvom i vlast'yu // Politicheskaya sociologiya. 2022. Tom 10. № 2. S. 41-55.
4. Botasheva A.K. Teoriya haosa i politicheskij analiz: vzglyad skvoz' prizmu nepredskazuemosti politicheskikh sobytij // Sovremennaya nauka i innovacii. 2018. № 2 (22). S. 142-145.
5. Botasheva A.K., Adamova M.A. Politiko-ekonomicheskie aspekty mezhstranovyh otnoshenij i ekonomiko-politicheskie faktory neravnomernosti razvitiya mirovogo soobshchestva // Vestnik Pyatigorskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 2018. № 3. S. 281-284.
6. Botasheva A.K., Anufrienko S.V. Mediapoliticheskij process kak faktor vliyaniya na sobytijnuyu storonu politicheskoy zhizni (na primere sobytij na Ukraine 2014-2015 gg.) // Vestnik Pyatigorskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 2019. № 1. S. 217-223.
7. Breddok R. Formula Lassuela // Vestnik svyazi. 1958. № 8. S. 88-93.
8. Vilkov A.A., Kazakov A.A. Politicheskie tekhnologii formirovaniya imidzhej Rossii i SSHA v processe informacionno-kommunikacionnogo vzaimodejstviya (na materialah «Rossijskoj gazety» i «Vashington Post». 2007-2008 gg.). Saratov: Izdatel'skij centr «Nauka», 2010. 170 s.
9. Volodenkov S.V. Teoriya kommunikacii H.A. Innisa i sovremennye informacionno-kommunikacionnye tekhnologii: politologicheskij analiz // Social'no-politicheskie nauki. 2011. № 1. S. 166-169.
10. Volodenkov S.V., Romashkina A.B. Tekhnologii internet-kommunikacij kak instrumenta vliyaniya na funkcionirovanie sovremennyh institutov vlasti: aktual'nye vyzovy // Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. 2020. № 1. S. 33-40.
11. Gluharev S.D. Mediaprostranstvo kak element informacionnoj bezopasnosti // Vestnik YUzhno-Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Social'no-gumanitarnye nauki. 2011. № 9. S. 109-111.

12. Grachev M.N. Politicheskaya kommunikaciya: teoreticheskie koncepcii, modeli, vektory razvitiya. M.: Prometej, 2004. 327 s.
13. Grachev M.N. Politicheskaya kommunikaciya: teoretiko-metodologicheskij analiz: avtoref. ... diss. d. polit. nauk. M., 2005. 28 s.
14. Kazakov M.A., Zubkevich A.A. Manipulyativnye tekhnologii i imidzhevye kommunikacii na etape smeny ideologii razvitiya politicheskikh liderov i elit sovremennoj Rossii // Astrahanskij vestnik ekologicheskogo obrazovaniya. 2012. № 4. S. 65-72.
15. Katysheva L.V. «Prostoy i ponyatnyj yazyk» kak novyj trend kommunikacii gosudarstva i obshchestva // Politicheskaya sociologiya. 2022. Tom 10. № 2. S. 85-94.
16. Kovshov M.A. Zakonodatel'naya i predstavitel'naya vetvi vlasti s tochki zreniya setevoy politicheskoy kommunikacii vlasti i obshchestva // Obshchestvo: politika, ekonomika, pravo. 2022. № 2. S. 29-36.
17. Korotkevich R.V. Sredstva massovoj informacii – element politicheskoy sistemy obshchestva // Lesnoj vestnik (1997-2002). 2002. № 3. S. 191-196.
18. Lassuell G.D. Psihopatologiya i politika. M.: Izdatel'stvo RAGS, 2005. 352 s.
19. Minaeva L.V. Upravlenie gosudarstvennoj kommunikaciej v period pandemii: zarubezhnyj opyt // Politicheskaya sociologiya. 2022. Tom 10. № 2. S. 23-40.
20. Nikitinskaya A.A. Social'no-filosofskij analiz obshchestvennogo dialoga v social'nyh setyah: dis. ... kand. filos. nauk. Arhangel'sk, 2022. 167 s.
21. Nikitina I.S. Verbalizaciya kommunikativno-pragmaticheskoy kategorii «tolerantnost'» v sovremenном nemeckom politicheskom diskurse: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. Sankt-Peterburg, 2022. 19 s.
22. Pimenov N.P. Politicheskie kommunikacii kak faktor formirovaniya obshchestvennogo mneniya v sovremennoj Rossii (na primere vnesistemnoj oppozicii): dis. ... kand. polit. nauk. SPb., 2016. 181 s.
23. Romashkina A.B. Osobennosti kommunikacionnogo vzaimodejstviya institutov politicheskoy vlasti i obshchestva v usloviyah cifrovyyh tekhnologicheskikh transformacij: avtoref. dis. ... kand. polit. nauk. Moskva, 2022. 32 s.
24. Smit P., Berri K., Pulford A. Kommunikacii strategicheskogo marketinga. M.: YUniti-Dana, 2001. 415 s.
25. Suhanova K.V. Politicheskie kommunikacii vlasti v sovremenном rossijskom obshchestve: dis....kand. polit. nauk. Ufa, 2009. 18 s.

ОБ АВТОРАХ / ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ефимова Ольга Васильевна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры европейских языков Института международных отношений Пятигорского государственного университета; тел.: 89197495568; E-mail: oyefimova@yahoo.com

Yefimova Olga Vasilevna, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of European languages At the Institute of International Relations of Pyatigorsk State University; tel.: 89197495568; E-mail: oyefimova@yahoo.com

Тамбиева Зурида Сафарбиевна, кандидат политических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры философии и гуманитарных дисциплин Северо-Кавказской государственной академии; тел.: 89289240712; E-mail: tambieva@mail.ru

Tambieva Zurida Safarbievna, Candidate of Political Sciences, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Humanities of the North Caucasus State Academy; tel.: 89289240712; E-mail: tambieva@mail.ru

Дата поступления в редакцию: 12.03.2022

После рецензирования: 23.07.2022

Дата принятия к публикации: 13.08.2022