

Современная наука и инновации.  
2024. № 2 (46). С. 154-162.  
Modern Science and Innovations.  
2024;2(46):154-162.

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ /  
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Научная статья / Original article

УДК 323; 378; 008.  
<https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2024.2.16>

Мадина Мухтаровна Абазалиева  
[Madina M. Abazalieva]<sup>1\*</sup>,  
Мария Геннадьевна Павлова  
[Maria G. Pavlova]<sup>2</sup>

Медиапространство и сфера  
политической коммуникации:  
политологический анализ

Media space and the sphere of political  
communication: a political science  
analysis

<sup>1</sup>Северо-Кавказская государственная академия, г. Черкесск, Россия /  
North Caucasian State Academy, Cherkessk, Russia

<sup>2</sup>Пятигорский государственный университет, г. Пятигорск, Россия /  
Pyatigorsk State University, Pyatigorsk, Russia

\*Автор, ответственный за переписку: Мадина Мухтаровна Абазалиева, [abazalieva@mail.ru](mailto:abazalieva@mail.ru) /  
Corresponding author: Madina M. Abazalieva, [abazalieva@mail.ru](mailto:abazalieva@mail.ru)

**Аннотация.** Массовая политическая коммуникация стала выступать как многогранный феномен взаимодействия субъектов политики путем обмена информацией в процессе борьбы за власть или ее осуществление, включая тактику индоктринации и является производной от медиапространства, т.к. она зависит от того, какие услуги предоставит последняя: будут ли это усовершенствованные цифровые электронные новинки или устаревшие технически и морально устройства прошлого века. Поэтому если в 1960-х или 1970-х годах можно было выделить три области медиапространства (печатное, радио и телесредство), то сейчас речь идет и об интернет-пространстве, которое заняло свою лидирующую нишу, причем с охватом большей части медиапространства: интернет-пространство продолжает расширяться, практически «освоив» печатные СМИ и телевидение и радио.

**Ключевые слова:** масс-медиа, медиатизация политики, СМИ, информационное общество, политический процесс

**Для цитирования:** Абазалиева М. М., Павлова М. Г. Медиапространство и сфера политической коммуникации: политологический анализ // Современная наука и инновации. 2024. № 2 (46). С. 154-162. <https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2024.2.16>

**Abstract.** Mass political communication began to act as a multifaceted phenomenon of interaction between political actors through the exchange of information in the process of power struggle or its implementation, including the tactics of indoctrination, and is derived from the media space, because it depends on what services the latter will provide: whether it will be improved digital electronic novelties or outdated technically and morally devices of the last century. Therefore, if in the 1960s or 1970s it was possible to distinguish three areas of the media space (print, radio and television space), now we are talking about the Internet space, which has occupied its leading niche, and with coverage of most of the media space: The Internet space continues to expand, having practically "mastered" print media and television and radio.

**Keywords:** mass media, mediatization of politics, mass media, information society, political process

**For citation:** Abazalieva MM, Pavlova MG. Media space and the sphere of political communication: a political science analysis. Modern Science and Innovations. 2024;2(46):153-161. <https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2024.2.16>

**Introduction.** It is right to say that media space can be defined as a real or virtual space of communicative practice based on multi-level digital and network technologies. Accordingly,

communicative practice in the sphere of politics (political media space or media space of political meanings) is a political space based on multi-level digital and network technologies; communicative space, including media and mediatized political images of political “locals”, “fields”, “spheres”. And, as V.G. Vodopyan rightly notes, “The media space is an open social system, which is created by the interdependent integrity of relations between producers and consumers of mass information transmitted through the mass media” [2, 185]. At the same time, in general, the media space in a globalizing society is characterized by the process of disseminating any information, including political information, in a symbolic media space that produces both reality and pseudo-reality, developed and based on the use of information and communication technologies and the Internet.

So, “in the modern information society, there are acute issues of finding and using new methods of political communication that influence the political mobilization of citizens” [9, 55]. Therefore, it is necessary to understand that the connection between politics and the mass media has become an integral and at the same time objective characteristic of the development of both mass political communication and society as a whole.

**Materials and research methods.** From our point of view, new theories of the media space, respectively, and of mass political communication, should be based on the categories of mobility, interactivity and convergence, since, indeed, “in the age of simulacra, mass media lose their dependence on society and “spray” both in the social, and political reality, enriching reality with digital images and narratives” [1, 190]. In turn, false, multi-level digital and network technologies that are being developed daily offer more advanced spatial and communicative practices of the political media space and mass political communication as well. Summarizing various approaches, we can assume that the study of political communication in line with the transmission of political values involves the use of a systematic approach, which will allow us to consider the phenomenon as a complex phenomenon, in all respects connected with various aspects of the life of society. In general, the systemic approach allows us to recognize the modern essence of the political media space, which lies in the fact that, firstly, the state occupies a leading position in control over the mass media, accordingly, it owns the market for political information, and secondly, currently political communication is part of a unified system of global information influence and control, elements of which are included in almost all socially and politically significant processes.

**The degree of scientific development of the topic.** Russian researchers A.Yu. paid much attention to the issues under consideration. Belokon [1, 189-197], V.G. Vodopyan [2, 182-189], E.E. Voinova [3, 6-10], B.V. Kagarlitsky [6], N.L. Ledyukova [7, 69-76], A.V. Manoilo [8, 24-28], I.G. Napalkova [9, 55-72], E.G. Nim [10, 31-41], V.S. Svechnikov [13], A.I. Soloviev [14, 5-18], A.A. Soldatov [15, 471-474], A.V. Soldatov [15, 471-474], V.B. Stroganov [16, 99-104], F.I. Sharkov [17, 32-40], E.N. Yudina [18, 151-155] and others. Due to the complexity and scope of the issue under consideration, the format of this study does not allow us to cover in detail the discussions of researchers who have concentrated on considering the phenomenon of the media space. But at the same time, we have to admit that in foreign and domestic science the terms “media space” and “political media space” and their theoretical structures are still at the stage of study.

**The main part of the study.** The media space as an object of research by domestic scientists is more often considered in the system of interrelations of the media themselves. So, E.G. Nim notes that “media space can have both physical and “virtual” geography” [10, 33] and proposes a theoretical construct that reflects the structure of media space and the key areas of its study (Table 1). This theoretical construct quite successfully copes with most of the tasks of displaying the structure of the media space, but, in our opinion, it does not consider how mass communication is characterized by the transmission of complex messages, including those of a political nature. We assume the relevance of studying the political space through the prism of the synthesis of politics and media space, which will allow us to explore media political images of “locals”, “fields”, “spheres”.

**Table 1. Media space as an object of research [10].**

Society as a “space of spaces”	Territories as spaces	Sociality and its spaces	Spaces that exist in the imagination
Space understood as mediated	Media as an image of the territory	Media social images of “locals”, “fields”, “spheres”	Imaginary worlds and their media images
Space understood as mediatized	Mediatized territories	Mediatization of social images of “locals”, “fields”, “spheres”	Imaginary worlds and their mediatization
Media space	Media territory	Sociocultural space as a direct media space	Media space as an imaginary space

Let's consider the definition of media space by E.G. Nim, by which the author understands the material space of information and communication networks and flows. If the media space corresponds to channels of information transmission, i.e. the media themselves and the system of their interrelations, then the mediated space correlates with the content, and the mediatized space correlates with the environment of its distribution and consumption [10, 32]. Most likely, the above interpretation narrows the field of understanding the media space, since it is impossible to separate the modern media space from politics and vice versa. A more accurate interpretation is given by E.G. Yudina, since he draws attention to the ambiguity of the concept of “media space”: “this is a space represented through media – both physical and social” [18, 151]. The researcher identifies three main elements of the media space: mass media; relations between media agents and information symbolic product, as a result of the activities of the media. Therefore, concludes E.G. Yudina, “Media space can be positioned as a special reality, which is part of the social space and organizes social practices and representations of agents included in the system of production and consumption of mass information” [18, 151].

As a result, we are increasingly seeing public presentations of political messages and meanings, where there is a communicator, a message, a means of transmission (channel) and an addressee (recipient). Such a scheme is not equal and partner-like, since a chain of unidirectional communication process is built, which a subject-object process is built on the political interest of one of the communication participants - and always the communicator. We are talking about the features of one-way and two-way communication, which is a very important point in understanding the political media space, although “Political communication itself is the central mechanism in the formulation, production, legitimacy and implementation of collective binding political decisions” [22].

J. Volkheimer and A. Jansson rightly focus on the political dimension of the media space. Considering the processes of ideological influence and convergence of the public and private spheres, global and local problems, researchers distinguish between the merger of politics and the media as equal and unequal, as partner and non-partner [23, 89]. With partner mediatization of politics, strategic, equal communication follows. In this case, the goal of the communicator - the subject of politics - is to communicate in the form and through public compromises and discourses. This is the so-called strategic, equal communication. With non-partnership mediatization of politics, everything is subordinated to the manipulative interest of one of the participants in communication, which is characterized by the absence of feedback elements and takes place in conditions of an unequal communication partnership. Let us note that in modern society, non-partnership mediatization of politics and non-partnership relations in the field of political communication predominate, and there are objective reasons for this state of affairs. Firstly, society does not have the opportunity to know and monitor all the processes occurring within the political field, which means it is forced to turn to the media as a source of information and ideas about reality, which creates ample opportunities for the interpretation of events, opinions, comments, etc. -secondly, the manipulation of consciousness is a process invisible to the average person, carried out constantly by the mass media (for example, social, political or commercial

advertising), but society has come to terms with the fact that it is being manipulated. Thirdly, it seems difficult to influence the state of affairs in the media space due to closed access to the activities of information holdings and to information sources mediated by political power.

As N.L. Ledyukova writes about this, “the presence of the media institution already suggests that there is a way to control human behavior, that it is possible to establish in advance certain behavioral patterns, which are just one of many theoretically possible” [7, 74]. As one of such exemplary behavior for an individual, the researcher cites “accustoming him to the process of constantly receiving information about events that occurred in the country and the world (habitualization)” [7, 74]. And, as N.L. Ledyukova suggests, that “it cannot be said that the media plays a dominant role in the process of political informing the audience” [7, 74]. In our opinion, this is an overly optimistic interpretation, since G.D. Lasswell is right, when he notes that “the media is omnipotent” and the audience receives only the news that needs to be conveyed to the audience [21, 179].

The synthesis of politics with the area of the virtual space of the mass media has become a kind of indicator of the political rating of the subject of a political campaign and led to the emergence of a certain media reality, designed in the interests of the leaders of political communication. The images of the reality around us are set or created as a result of the use of discursive practices, various mechanisms of mediatization of political space. For example, a striking example is the leading role of political propaganda, in the implementation of which, as a special way of transmitting political ideas, the activity of persuaders remains specific, when the subject of propaganda “independently interprets the meaning of political values for society” [13, 19]. The main goal of propagandists in the most general form is, first of all, to influence the political consciousness of the masses and each individual in particular. You can also name other tasks that are performed along the way: ensuring the continuity of the ideological guidelines and worldview of the political elite, “developing immunity” to the perception of “alien” or “hostile” values [14, 6].

Often, among the significant characteristics of a political system, researchers name responsiveness, that is, the ability to respond to impulses coming from the environment, including from the media [20, 176]. In this regard, we note that most authors, studying propaganda and “public relations,” characterize them as one of “the reactions of the political system to the growing complexity of the environment and its desire to reduce complexity through functional differentiation” [15, 471]. Very diverse interests can act as political ideas. For example, this could be propaganda of patriotism and heroism, a healthy lifestyle and education, ideological unity or, on the contrary, destruction, division along national or racial lines, unification in the face of danger, etc. Propaganda of patriotism and heroism is achieved by praising the Motherland, chanting its exclusivity, through calls for heroic deeds, poems and verses in honor of heroes, erecting monuments, etc. Promotion of a healthy lifestyle is carried out by showing the preferences that an individual receives when turning to sports and exercise; Propaganda of education popularizes information about economic, political achievements, social programs, advertises the political system, etc. Propaganda of destruction sets as an example its own value system as the only correct one, trying to convince society of the depravity of another value system, disseminating information about the atrocities of opponents, their mistakes and/or crimes, trying to expose, humiliate, and emphasize negative features [19, 298]. The propaganda of division is based on the formula “those who are not with us are against us” and are aimed at combating dissent in any area. This propaganda slogan works well in the religious-political (between believers of different faiths) and religious-psychological spheres (between fanatical believers and other members of society), in the sphere of ethno-national confrontation, affecting the worldview and spiritual guidelines of the individual.

The propaganda of division is also used to produce disagreement between opposition countries during information confrontation, during information wars, etc. The latter type includes, for example, the attitude of Western media, political strategists and the US political elite towards the Russian global television network RT (Russia Today), created in 2005 and designed to broadcast news stories in many languages of the world, such as Russian, French, Arabic, English, German

and Spanish, and which the West characterized as a “propaganda machine”: in the spring of 2014, John Kerry spoke unflatteringly about the Russian Global Television Network, calling it a “propaganda mouthpiece” of V. Putin [4]. In 2022, the EU banned the broadcasting of Russia Today and the work of the Sputnik agency [5].

As another example, let us cite the activities of major global media channels on the eve of the Syrian conflict, when in 2012 the central topic of media propaganda was the topic of the civil war in Syria. The conflict, taking into account the interests of Western countries, and in particular the United States, began with propaganda comments from the “international community”: “Assad is killing his citizens”, “This is another stone in the wall of the Arab Spring”, “The rebels need to be supported”, “Assad is in resignation”, etc. [24]. This propaganda campaign lasted for several months. However, in the modern global media space, the propaganda actions of one side are often debunked in the media by the other side, which has alternative sources of information at its disposal. Thus, in continuation of the Syrian theme, the German newspaper “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” reported that the “massacre in Houla”, widely circulated in the media, was organized not by the forces of B. Assad, as Western propagandists insisted, but by opposition terrorists supported by NATO [12]. After this information appeared, anti-Syrian propaganda gradually began to decline.

To resume political manipulation, it is necessary to constantly create new information occasions. This topic is still little studied, although there is direct evidence of the use of this technology in the conduct of information wars. But we can agree with the researchers that “in the events in Ukraine one can discern the signs that previously appeared in all the “color revolutions” [8, 24]. Indeed, comparing the events in Ukraine with events, for example, in Egypt, where the same popular unrest led to a change in the political regime, the widespread inclusion of all types of mass media in the ideological indoctrination of the population and the well-organized supply of the rebels with everything they needed - speaks about the actions of political strategists, the task of which – organization x artificially created political instability.

In this regard, Russian researcher V.B. Stroganov notes that “the interpenetration of the Internet and politics directly affects the transformation of the political process, the digitalization of political governance, changes in patterns and models of interaction between political institutions and citizens. As a result, we are faced with the problem of changing such an ambiguous form of control as political manipulation, which takes on the character of a rhizome: vector communications are disrupted, the hierarchy of subject and object is eliminated, and manipulation becomes viral in nature” [16, 99]. This circumstance is caused primarily by the fact that Western media are almost completely commercialized and are at the mercy of capital, and, as a result, are not independent. A situation is emerging in which the Western audience is in a state of illusion of objectivity and truthfulness in mass cases of constructing political meanings and images, but at the same time there is practically no political mass communication with the participation of actors from society. In our opinion, such a situation entails a number of factors: 1) the inaccessibility of the field of politics as a field of decision-making to society; 2) the bias of mass political communication circulating in the media space; 3) the control of the mass media by the political component of society and strict financial subordination, after which “even in the absence of censorship established from above, a political “agenda” is being built on the principles of self-censorship” [3, 7].; 4) and, finally, the leveling of politics, the lack of genuine dialogue, accompanied by the artificial construction of a shortage of alternatives.

In turn, an analysis of materials presented on the Internet suggests that for the Russian Federation, Western specialists and political strategists have long developed a scenario for preparing a revolution, for which “freedom of speech” in the Western sense is extremely necessary. In the scenario worked out in Ukraine, Georgia, Yugoslavia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, etc., mediatization mechanisms were used, where the main emphasis was on influencing young people through the media [6]. For this purpose, the ideas of the well-being of American-style democracy and the ideas of the illegitimacy of other political regimes and authorities are, as a rule, introduced into the mass consciousness of people.

As Russian Foreign Minister S. Lavrov stated, “The West is trying to create a “belt of instability” around Russia, developing the territories around it economically and militarily... They are trying to form a belt of instability around us, forcing our closest neighbors and brotherly peoples to make a choice - either you and The West, or you are from the Russian Federation. They want to develop in a variety of ways - both military and economic - the territories around our country and surround us with a cordon sanitaire, and even derive some benefit from the fact that the West will have a decisive influence on the development of our neighboring countries” [11]. Let us remember that on Bolotnaya Square in 2011-2013 there were already attempts to create a precedent of political disobedience. At the moment, the ground for social discontent on the part of the population is being purposefully prepared through economic sanctions and information leaks of a provocative nature, which suggests that it is necessary, first of all, to develop a strategy for information counteraction to the processes of ideological division of society into different opposing camps. It is necessary to have in your arsenal a wide range of counter-propaganda, tools for protection against eversion technologies, which are also based on the work of political strategists using the capabilities of the mass media.

In the Russian Federation at present, both at the level of the scientific community and at the state level, awareness is beginning to come of the degree of security threat posed by the mediatization of political reality. In connection with the events in Ukraine, the comprehensive role of the world media in creating a targeted anti-Russian discourse has become obvious, since a significant number of challenges to Russia’s security lie precisely in the information dimension, and “currently Russia is exposed to massive aggressive information influence, which becomes possible as a result of the global mediatization of political reality” [1, 192]. We must pay attention to the popularity of social networks, which are focused, among other things, on political communication and accelerate information exchange in the public space.

In a fair opinion, F.I. Sharkova, “Mobile social networks generate a new type of information used in a virtual social environment and, accordingly, new information and communication technologies” [17, 32]. In turn, social networks, creating complex and multidimensional connections between users in the electronic network space, demonstrate self-organization, which, according to F.I. Sharkova, “is consistent with N. Luhmann’s theory of autopoietic systems... since public opinion, which is articulated in the political public sphere, means something different from the point of view of the life world than from the point of view of the state apparatus system. We conclude that network dynamics are increasingly driven by aspects of the public sphere that are oriented either towards strategic communication goals or towards achieving mutual understanding” [17, 38]. It should be noted that the implementation of political communications in the network space of social networks activates users of different political views on various political platforms, establishing a form of communication between different political views.

**Research results and their discussion.** Thus, the function of mass political communication at the present stage is not only in the circulation, circulation and movement of information, but also in changing the opinions, judgments, and attitudes of the audience. Mass political communication is becoming a key tool for shaping the political media space, not in the direction of democratization, but in the direction of satisfying the political interests of a fairly narrow circle of people. In turn, the synthesis of politics with the field of virtual space of the mass media led to the emergence of an artificially created media reality. The images of reality in it are set by the authorities and are created as a result of the use of discursive practices and various mediatization mechanisms. In this regard, we can talk about the emergence of a phenomenon – mediatized political communication.

**Conclusion.** The mediatization of politics is carried out through the synthesis of everyday and scientific knowledge, presented to the audience with the help of specially fabricated audiovisual information, which creates a picture of virtual reality, often radically different from real political reality. The most common mechanisms for the mediatization of politics at present

are: the formation of public opinion, setting the “agenda”, media construction of reality and propaganda. The phenomenon of mediatization of politics makes it possible in a short time to adjust, change, and shape public opinion on current government issues, place the necessary emphasis on the global, regional, and national news “agenda,” and divert attention from coverage of undesirable topics and problems.

## ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Абазалиева М. М., Белоконов А. Ю. Социально-политические аспекты медиатизации политики в России // Современная наука и инновации. 2022. № 4 (40). С. 189–197.
2. Водопьян В. Г. Медиапространство в сфере массовой коммуникации: социокультурная реальность // Вестник Адыгейского государственного университета. Серия 1: Регионоведение: философия, история, социология, юриспруденция, политология, культурология. 2017. № 1 (194). С. 182–189.
3. Воинова Е. Медиатизированная политическая коммуникация: Способ медийного искажения политики или способ организации дискурса? // Вестник Московского ун-та. Сер. 10. Журналистика. 2006. № 6. С. 6–10.
4. Госсекретарь США Джон Керри назвал телеканал RT «рупором пропаганды» // RT. 2014. 25 апр. URL: <http://russian.rt.com/article/29283> (дата обращения: 12.03.2024).
5. ЕС запретил вещание Russia Today и работу агентства Sputnik. URL: <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/13931753?ysclid=lwdqf9rsw5133423875> (дата обращения: 12.03.2024).
6. Кагарлицкий Б. В. «Оранжевые мираж» или начало политики? // Взгляд. 2007. 19 ноября. <http://vz.ru/columns/2007/11/19/125686.html> (дата обращения 12.03.2024)
7. Ледюкова Н. Л. Функциональное измерение СМИ // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. 2011. № 1. С. 69–76.
8. Манойло А. В. Украинский кризис и «управляемый хаос»: след «цветных революций» арабской весны // Власть. 2014. № 4. С. 24–28.
9. Напалкова И. Г., Семенов А. С. Интернет-мем как метод политической коммуникации // Гуманитарные и политико-правовые исследования. 2022. № 2. С. 55–72.
10. Ним Е. Г. Медиапространство: основные направления исследований // Бизнес. Общество. Власть. 2013. № 14. С. 31–41.
11. Политтехнологи на Западе хотят расшатать ситуацию в России перед выборами – Лавров. URL: <https://www.belta.by/world/view/politтехнологи-na-zapade-hotjat-rasshatat-situatsiju-v-rossii-pered-vyborami-lavrov-451816-2021> (дата обращения: 22.03.2024).
12. Развал антисирийской пропаганды в западных СМИ. URL: <https://yvision.kz/post/razval-antisiriyskoy-propagandy-v-zapadnyh-smi-280193> (дата обращения: 12.03.2024).
13. Свечников В. С. Манипулятивные практики в социальном конструировании реальностей: автореф. дис. ... канд. социол. наук. Саратов, 2004. 37 с.
14. Соловьев А. И. Политическая коммуникация: к проблеме теоретической идентификации // Полис. 2002. № 3. С. 5–18.
15. Солдатов А. В., Солдатов А. А. Сущность и особенности коммуникативных процессов в политической сфере современной России // Четвертая промышленная революция: реалии и современные вызовы. X юбилейные Санкт-петербургские социологические чтения: сб. материалов Международной научной конференции, Санкт-Петербург, 13-14 апреля 2018 года. Санкт-Петербург: Федеральное государственное автономное образовательное учреждение высшего образования "Санкт-Петербургский политехнический университет Петра Великого", 2018. С. 471–474.
16. Строганов В. Б. Ризоморфная политическая манипуляция в интернете: специфика и технологии // Вопросы управления. 2021. № 6. С. 99–104.
17. Шарков Ф. И. Социальные сети как основа формирования пространства публичных коммуникаций // Коммуникология. 2019. Т. 7. № 4. С. 32–40.

18. Юдина Е. Н. Медиапространство как социологическая категория // Преподаватель XXI век. 2008. № 2. С. 151–155.
19. Cook T. Governing with the news: the news media as a political institution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. 398 p.
20. Deutsch K. W. The Nerves of Government. Models of Political Communication and Control. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1963. 250 p.
21. Lasswell H. D. The Structure and Function of Communication in Society / Berelson B., Janowitz M. Reader in Public Opinion and Communication. New York: The Free Press, 1966. P. 178–189.
22. Jarren O. Politische Kommunikation in der Mediengesellschaft: Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / GWV Fachverlage GmbH, Wiesbaden, 2006. 276 p.
23. Jansson A. Textural Analysis. Materialising Media Space // Geographies of Communication: The Spatial Turn in Media. Göteborg: Nordicom, 2006. P. 87–106.
24. Mohammadi S. Flipping the Script: The Western Media's Syria Propaganda Is Falling Apart // Activist Post. 2012. 30 July. URL: <http://www.activistpost.com/2012/07/flipping-script-western-medias-syria.html> (дата обращения: 12.03.2024).

## REFERENCES

1. Abazalieva MM, Belokon AYu. Socio-political aspects of the mediatization of politics in Russia. Modern Science and Innovations. 2022;4(40):189-197. (In Russ.).
2. Vodopyan VG. Media space in the sphere of mass communication: sociocultural reality. Vestnik Adygejskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 1: Regionovedenie: filosofiya, istoriya, sociologiya, yurisprudenciya, politologiya, kulturologiya = Bulletin of Adyghe State University. Series 1: Regional studies: philosophy, history, sociology, jurisprudence, political science, cultural studies. 2017;1(194):182-189. (In Russ.).
3. Voinova E. Mediatization of political communication: the way of media distortion of politics or the way of discourse organizing. Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 10. Zhurnalistsika = Moscow University Bulletin. Series 10. Journalism. 2006;6:6-10. (In Russ.).
4. US Secretary of State John Kerry called RT a "mouthpiece of propaganda". RT. 2014. 25 apr. Available from: <http://russian.rt.com/article/29283> [Accessed 12 March 2024]. (In Russ.).
5. The EU has banned the broadcasting of Russia Today and the work of the Sputnik agency. Available from: <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/13931753?ysclid=1wdqf9rsw5133423875> [Accessed 12 March 2024]. (In Russ.).
6. Kagarlickij BV. "Orange mirage" or the beginning of politics? Vzglyad. 2007. 19 November. <http://vz.ru/columns/2007/11/19/125686.html> [Accessed 12 March 2024]. (In Russ.).
7. Ledyukova NL. Functional dimension of mass media. World Economy and International Relations. 2011;1:69-76. (In Russ.).
8. Manojlo AV. Ukrainian crisis and the "controlled chaos": a trace of color revolutions of the arab spring. Vlast' = Power. 2014;4:24-28. (In Russ.).
9. Napalkova IG, Semenov AS. Internet-meme as a method of political communication. Humanitarian, political and legal studies. 2022;2:55-72. (In Russ.).
10. Nim EG. Media space: main directions of research. Biznes. Obshestvo. Vlast = Business. Society. Power. 2013;14:31-41. (In Russ.).
11. Political strategists in the West want to destabilize the situation in Russia before the elections – Lavrov. Available from: <https://www.belta.by/world/view/polittechnologi-na-zapade-hotjat-rasshatat-situatsiju-v-rossii-pered-vyborami-lavrov-451816-2021> [Accessed 22 March 2024].
12. The collapse of anti-Syrian propaganda in Western media. Available from: <https://yvision.kz/post/razval-antisiriyskoy-propagandy-v-zapadnyh-smi-280193> [Accessed 12 March 2024]. (In Russ.).
13. Svechnikov VS. Manipulative practices in social construction of realities: author's abstract. diss. ... candidate of sociological sciences. Saratov; 2004. 7 p. (In Russ.).
14. Solovev AI. Political Communication: To the Problem of Theoretical Identification. Polis. Political Studies. 2002;3:5-18. (In Russ.).



15. Soldatov AV, Soldatov AA. The nature and features of communication processes in the political sphere of modern Russia. In The Fourth Industrial Revolution: Realities and Modern Challenges. X Anniversary St. Petersburg Sociological Readings: collection of materials from the International Scientific Conference, St. Petersburg, April 13-14, 2018. St. Petersburg: Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education "Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University"; 2018;471-474. (In Russ.).
16. Stroganov VB. Rhizomorphic political manipulation on the internet: specifics and technologies. Management Issues. 2021;6:99-104. (In Russ.).
17. Sharkov FI. Social Networks as the Basis for the Formation of Public Communication Space. Communicology. 2019;7(4):32-40. (In Russ.).
18. Yudina EN. Media space as a new sociological category. Prepodavatel XXI vek = Teacher XXI century. 2008;2:151-155. (In Russ.).
19. Cook T. Governing with the news: the news media as a political institution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2005. 398 p.
20. Deutsch KW. The Nerves of Government. Models of Political Communication and Control. N.Y.: The Free Press; 1963. 250 p.
21. Lasswell HD. The Structure and Function of Communication in Society / Berelson B, Janowitz M. Reader in Public Opinion and Communication. New York: The Free Press; 1966. P. 178-189.
22. Jarren O. Politische Kommunikation in der Mediengesellschaft: Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / GWV Fachver-lage GmbH, Wiesbaden; 2006. 276 p.
23. Jansson A. Textural Analysis. Materialising Media Space. Geographies of Communication: The Spatial Turn in Media. Göteborg: Nordicom; 2006. P. 87-106.
24. Mohammadi S. Flipping the Script: The Western Media's Syria Propaganda Is Falling Apart. Activist Post. 2012. 30 July. Available from: <http://www.activistpost.com/2012/07/flipping-script-western-medias-syria.html> [Accessed 12 March 2024].

#### ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ

**Мадина М. Абазалиева** – кандидат политических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры философии и гуманитарных дисциплин, Северо-Кавказская государственная академия, +789283921456, [abazalieva@mail.ru](mailto:abazalieva@mail.ru)

**Мария Г. Павлова** – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры европейских языков, Институт международных отношений, Пятигорский государственный университет, +79614731370, [egoistria@bk.ru](mailto:egoistria@bk.ru)

#### INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Madina M. Abazalieva** – Cand. Sci. (Polit.), Associate Professor, Professor of Philosophy and Humanitarian Disciplines, North Caucasian State Academy, +79614833806, [abazalieva@mail.ru](mailto:abazalieva@mail.ru)

**Maria G. Pavlova** – Cand. Sci. (Philol.), Associate Professor of European languages, Institute of international relations, Pyatigorsk State University, +79614731370, [egoistria@bk.ru](mailto:egoistria@bk.ru)

**Вклад авторов:** все авторы внесли равный вклад в подготовку публикации.

**Конфликт интересов:** авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

**Contribution of the authors:** the authors contributed equally to this article.

**Conflict of interest:** the authors declare no conflicts of interests.

*Статья поступила в редакцию: 16.03.2024;  
одобрена после рецензирования: 17.04.2024;  
принята к публикации: 10.06.2024.*

*The article was submitted: 16.03.2024;  
approved after reviewing: 17.04.2024;  
accepted for publication: 10.06.2024.*