

Современная наука и инновации.
2024. № 2 (46). С. 202-212.
Modern Science and Innovations.
2024;2(46):202-212.

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ /
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Научная статья / Original article

УДК 323; 327

<https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2024.2.21>

Мария Сергеевна Погосова
[Maria S. Pogosova]

Медиатизация политики и политическое
манипулирование как составляющие
информационного противоборства

Mediatization of politics and political
manipulation as components of information
warfare

Пятигорский государственный университет, г. Пятигорск, Россия, pogosova-mari@mail.ru / Pyatigorsk
State University, Pyatigorsk, Russia, pogosova-mari@mail.ru

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается проникновение медийной составляющей в информационное противоборство, что приводит к значительным трансформациям в логике и функциональном интерфейсе принятия решений на политическом уровне, а также к изменению внутривнутриполитической ситуации, основанной на изменении общественной дискуссии. Делается вывод, что средства массовой коммуникации и политика сражаются не только в поле интересов политической элиты и политического руководства, но и в зоне создания политического курса, политических ориентиров, обеспечивающих политический смысл существования определенного общества. Следующий вывод - в современных условиях медиатизация политики с целью информационного противоборства присуща любому политическому режиму и включает в поле влияния, например, повседневную культуру, культуру выбора делегирования полномочий, культуру реагирования и понимания новостной информации, отношение к депутатскому корпусу и в целом доверие к СМИ. Но при этом процессы информационного противоборства могут протекать в различных вариациях – от концентрации умов, когда политические смыслы транслируются неизменными, что дает возможности для позитивного сотрудничества, либо информационное противоборство приводит к открытой конфронтации, подогреваемой пропагандой.

Ключевые слова: информационное противоборство, информационная среда, медиакommunikation, политический процесс, медиатизация политики, манипулирование сознанием

Для цитирования: Погосова М. С. Медиатизация политики и политическое манипулирование как составляющие информационного противоборства // Современная наука и инновации. 2024. № 2 (46). С. 202-212. <https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2024.2.21>

Abstract. The article examines the penetration of the media component into information warfare, which leads to significant transformations in the logic and functional interface of decision-making at the political level, as well as to changes in the internal political situation based on changes in public discussion. It is concluded that mass media and politics merge not only in the field of interests of the political elite and political leadership, but also in the area of creating a political course, political guidelines that provide the political meaning of the existence of a certain society. The following conclusion is that in modern conditions, the mediatization of politics for the purpose of information confrontation is inherent in any political regime and includes in the field of influence, for example, everyday culture, culture of choice of delegation of authority, culture of reaction and understanding of news information, attitude towards the deputy corps and, in general, trust in the media. But at the same time, the processes of information warfare can occur in various variations – from the concentration of minds, when political meanings are transmitted unchanged, which gives opportunities for positive cooperation, or information warfare leads to open confrontation, fueled by propaganda.

Keywords: information warfare, information environment, media communication, political process, mediatization of politics, manipulation of consciousness

For citation: Pogosova MS. Mediatization of politics and political manipulation as components of information warfare. Modern Science and Innovations. 2024;2(46):202-212. <https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2024.2.21>

Introduction. The rivalry of political systems, the desire of individual subjects who have private media or have administrative resources that allow them to influence the media, create an information confrontation when it is possible to influence the perception of an individual or even society of the world around them. We are talking about the possibility of artificially, through the media, creating a picture of the world that does not correspond to reality that does not reflect objective reality. Even W. Lippman formulated the idea of a “pseudo-environment”, which is formed by the mass media, and “a person is not able to verify the accuracy of the information received through the mass media, and is forced to trust it” [19, 29]. Previously, this process was called mediocratization, and political confrontation based on information confrontation and influence on the media-political space, on the interaction and formation of media-political complexes - mediacracy [3, 85-86]. As an example, let us cite serious structural changes accompanied by information confrontation and symbolic forms that are firmly entrenched in the public consciousness, for example, the “era of glasnost”, “perestroika”, “Cold War”, “stagnation”, “thaw”, “Arab Spring”, etc.

Even the French sociologist P. Champagne turned to the theory of “mediatization of politics,” which considers such aspects of information warfare as the development of political topics on radio and especially on television. The researcher emphasized that the active intervention of politicians in the information sphere led to a change in the very content of what the media call “politics” [34, 154]. It should be noted that in the modern political space, information confrontation entails a new configuration of the strategic communication frame (frame of the rules of the game), where relations between the participants - the largest media, government bodies and political communication bodies - are built on the basis of mutual benefit, be it economic or political dividends, which leads to serious structural changes in the political process, political consciousness and political culture.

In connection with the above, the need to study the manipulation of human consciousness, which is the essence of information warfare, is becoming urgent.

Materials and research methods. The article uses a structural-functional method, which implies the decomposition of the object being studied into its component parts and the disclosure of the internal connection and relationship between them. The thematic field of research contributed to the use of general scientific methods of theoretical knowledge, such as the scientific description of the object of knowledge, the axiomatization method, the hypothetico-deductive method, the formalization method, etc. Among the specific scientific research methods, the authors turned to the method of theoretical pluralism.

The degree of scientific development of the topic. Fundamental works in the field of media research and information warfare in political communication were proposed by such Western scientists as B. Berelson, H. Godet and P. Lazarsfeld [2, 142], K. Deutsch [39], G. Lasswell [42, 37- 51], M. McCombs and D. Sheve [43, 176-185], J. Clapper [40], W. Weiss [44, 77-195], etc.

The works of famous domestic scientists deserve attention - I.A. Bronnikova [5, 66-88], V.V. Burmatova [6], M.S. Vershinina [8], S.V. Volodenkova [11, 22-31], Yu.Yu. Lektorova [18], N.V. Opanasenko [25], N.P. Pimenova [26], O.N. Podorova-Anikina [28], A.I. Solovyov [30, 5-18] and others, who focus on the difficulties and subtleties of the conceptual analysis of information warfare.

Modern domestic science examines in detail the problems of information warfare by using the capabilities of the media space. These are the works of E.L. Dotsenko [14], M.M. Dunyaeva [15], I.V. Nightingale [31, 1374-1390], A.Ya. Farina [33] and others, who discuss technologies for constructing socio-political reality in political confrontation. G.V. Kashkan [2, 142], O.A. Kuprin [2, 142], N.A. Lukyanova [2, 142], O.Yu. Malinova [2, 142], T.N. Mitrokhina [2, 142] and others explore the mechanisms of formation of semantic content and political discourse in order to influence public opinion.

Much attention is paid to the activities of the media, which often pose a threat to the construction or existence of civil society, the information and psychological security of the

individual, and national security, considered in their works by M.A. Astvatsaturova [2, 142], R.V. Abrahamyan [2, 142], S.V. Anufrienko [2, 142], A.K. Botasheva [2, 142], E.V. Galkina [2, 142], P.L. Karabuschenko [2, 142], B.G. Koibaev [2, 142], S.I. Linets [2, 142], A.V. Peconidi [2, 142] and others.

But a review of the literature shows that, despite a fairly large number of works close to our chosen topic, a comprehensive and large-scale study of the phenomenon of information warfare has not been carried out. It is precisely this circumstance that dictated the choice of the topic of the article.

Research results and their discussion. Back in the late 1940s, Western scientists established that the political message (the shortest meaning, a summary of the political text) and the essence of political texts play a very important role not only in the process of human communication, but also in the process of information warfare, in the opinion of most researchers, based on the manipulation of consciousness. Therefore, we agree with D.P. Gavroy, who comes to the conclusion: “information warfare is a form of struggle of social actors aimed at obtaining information superiority and winning in the sphere of real life, which represents the use by each of them of information and other resources, special means and methods to influence information processes and information environment of the opposing subject and protection of one’s own information processes and information environment” [12, 20].

Modern science examines in detail the problems of information warfare. And here we agree with leading scientists that the core of information warfare is the propaganda and psychological impact on human consciousness. So, A.Ya. Kasyuk suggests that “In the system of methods and methods of information warfare, along with information and propaganda influence in the first decades of the 21st century, information and psychological influence occupies an increasingly important place. Information-psychological impact is an influence on individual or social consciousness that causes a transformation of the psyche, a change in views, opinions, attitudes, value orientations, motives, attitudes, stereotypes of the object” [16, 23].

Considering that the media communication sphere, as a medium for conducting information warfare, is based on the manipulation of the individual’s consciousness, researchers name various technologies and techniques for influencing the human psyche in the process of information warfare and manipulation of political consciousness. In order to obtain an advantage, for example, [27, 8] are used: 1) “choice without choice” (when the field of choice is narrowed and only options that suit only the manipulator remain); 2) “fragmentation” (consists in informing the object of manipulation with fragmentary, brief, meager, insignificant reports about large-scale or significant events); 3) “simplification of the problem” (information is presented in such a way that the object of manipulation involuntarily affirms the idea that the information is beyond the scope of his understanding or knowledge); 4) “extraction from history” (false knowledge is introduced, various myths are used, certain facts are presented and others are hushed up).

In the field of television, when conducting information warfare, political manipulators more often use such manipulative technologies as “neurolinguistic programming” (NLP) and “repetition”. The first technique, using the technique of intonation highlighting individual words in the spoken text, carries a “hidden command” and a “hidden message”. The second technique consists of daily, constant and continuous information over a long period of time on the same topic, which affects the person’s subconscious, forcing other, more significant events to be relegated to the background or to “accept” as true the imposed information with which the recipient was previously exposed. I don't agree. Political manipulation and the construction of a different political reality is realized with the help of lexical and grammatical means of expressing epistemic modality, thanks to which the necessary behavior is achieved in the objects of manipulation.

The Internet is no less significant in terms of political manipulation. These are all kinds of blogs and websites, as well as news programs that use the technique of “information noise and rumors.” Their manipulative capabilities during information warfare are revealed by a large-scale accumulation of a large volume of various secondary information, after which the object of manipulation is unable to concentrate on searching for or understanding messages or problems that

are important to him.

Note that the nature of information warfare includes a double impact. The first is an open message, the second is a parallel “coded” signal intended to evoke those actions, behavior, opinions or feelings that the manipulator needs. The maximum success of political or other manipulation is facilitated by the ignorance of the individual or groups in a certain area, which does not allow the subjects at whom the power of information influence is directed to defend their interests.

Political manipulation in information warfare with the aim of shaping a certain media reality has become a widespread practice. In this case, the objective reflection of facts is relegated to the background, and the tasks of managing mass perception with the help of fictitious events, facts, and processes come to the fore. As a demonstration of this phenomenon, D. Rushkoff gives the following example, when the murder of a football fan can be presented in the media in a biased way, in the light of a nationalist interpretation, which will be a hidden radical message and will entail a chain reaction of discussion on social networks, actively supported in blogosphere. The growth of comments and the sending of information to the mobile phones of an endless circle of people, ultimately, can cause a strong emotional response in a large number of audiences, which will turn them into an angry crowd that can be indirectly controlled via the Internet and brought out into the city streets in a matter of hours [29].

This mechanism was used by specialists during color revolutions, often practiced by anti-globalists during actions, and is increasingly being used by various extremist groups. Such a reaction to information that has entered the sphere of mass media, interpreted in a certain way, aimed at changing worldviews, usually accompanied by video recording and hidden information inserts, can be called a “network virus.” Thus, any event interpreted and presented to the public can carry such a network virus, and with the development of digital technologies and mobile devices, the spread of the virus occurs instantly, which facilitates the process of manipulation. The global nature of the network and the anonymity of the distributor make network viruses especially dangerous, which is important from the point of view of the information security of nation states.

In this regard, the statement that the power of the ruler in a totalitarian society does not need to manipulate the consciousness of the masses at all [9, 30] has now lost its relevance. In our opinion, totalitarian governments in the age of the Internet and globalization are no less committed to the total invasion of the media into the control of a person’s feelings and consciousness, his passions, tastes, preferences, including political ones.

So, the political life of society is increasingly becoming the sphere of show business and public relations, which gave rise to the famous Canadian media researcher M. McLuhan to call the modern world a “global village” and the era of the “new tribal man,” since the mass media “returns man into a primitive state, in which the auditory-visual multidimensional perception of collectivity and the world as a whole comes first” [22]. In the “global village,” myth reigns, and with the help of mass media, according to M. McLuhan’s prophecy, “it will be possible to keep the emotional climate of entire cultures under control” [7, 10].

The constructivist approach when considering the problem of mediatization of politics interfering in the information space during information confrontation was demonstrated by the leading German sociologist N. Luhmann, the creator of the concept of social systems, who gave an original interpretation of the mass media as a separate social system operating on the basis of the binary code “information/ non-information.” According to N. Luhmann’s hypothesis, the reality of the mass media is a second-order reality. It is intended to replace those landmarks of knowledge that in another historical period of time were formed through priests, aristocrats, sages, religion, etc. [21].

Information warfare is ideological in its essence, since information is specially generated, sold and bought, contract “murders” can be carried out with the help of a pen, and the interpretation of current political information continues to carry an ideological load.

When conducting information warfare, any information can act as a means for constructing the desired reality, for example, news from the world of economics, which, it would seem, should have objectivity. However, even economic events are presented selectively, depending on the degree to which they attract media attention. In this regard, D. Croteau notes that economic information in the media often concerns only the life of the business community [38].

Despite the fact that most media declare their ideological impartiality (which is explained by the desire to maintain neutrality in any situation, given that radicalism is not welcomed and “centrism” is traditionally held in high esteem), an invisible ideological commitment is certainly present, at least even in that a certain standard of democracy with a “centrist” position is being promoted. We can say that schemes for interpreting events are generated and circulated in the spirit of the dominant interpretations of Western “common sense” [32], reproducing or trying to reproduce the existing social order and the values on which it is based.

Consequently, we can agree with the researchers that information confrontation is based on the mediatization of politics, which is nothing more than “a set of mass phenomena of information impact and interaction in the process of penetration of the political field into the media, as a result of which there is a movement of political meanings from the real area to the area virtual, media” [10, 4].

At the same time, the information confrontation itself leads to the devaluation of traditional methods of legitimizing power, but the desire to influence the enemy forces political subjects to move even further into the sphere of virtual political space and to exploit the capabilities of the media even more actively. Of particular concern is the “intransitivity” of mass media serving mediatized politics, i.e. lack of technical ability for the recipient to give an adequate response to those who turn the world into a virtual, iconic reality. In other words, this is the absence of exchange between the subject (producer of information) and the object of exchange (consumer of information), where the communicator is not interested in the active position of recipients, their feedback, mental activity, or analytical approach to the perceived information.

Moreover, the manifestation of information and psychological influence from the media on public opinion and the consciousness of the population with a deliberately constructed goal (if not to misinform the population, then, at a minimum, to construct distorted/false ideas about international events and political events in the world) has become a new type of weapon, which is used in all countries of the world.

Virtual reality is the main result of the possibilities of information warfare, where the media are an active participant in this process. Formal or informal political subjects participate in the process of political interaction, either when interests coincide with the sphere of mass media (usually this occurs through public presentations of political meanings) or within the political sphere (for example, with the help of management technologies), or on the Internet, where they can remain shadow players in the political field.

In connection with the listed aspects of information warfare, it is possible to predict further qualitative changes, both in the structure of the media and in the strategy of states that seek to expand the degree of their influence on public opinion. Thus, information warfare, which is accompanied by political manipulation and/or purposeful construction of the “necessary” political reality, threatens the construction or existence of civil society, the information and psychological security of the individual, sometimes threatening national security, which makes the problem under consideration especially relevant.

The ensuing nature of the changes associated with the development of new media has brought forward the emergence of new theories of the model of mass political communication, among which the dialogue model of the Dutch researchers J. Bordwik and B. van Kaam is of particular interest. They focused on the emergence of alternative types of information flow, suggesting that the dialogue model of broadcasting is more typical for the flow of information in a real communication network, since agents have the opportunity to independently choose the time, topic and place of the message [37, 17-18]. In this case, it is possible to ignore the center and intermediaries.

In contrast to this model, we should highlight the widespread broadcasting model, in which information is broadcast from one center to a mass audience, which gives such a model a monological character and, accordingly, the leading character of the sender of information in mass political communication.

Having analyzed the essential side of political communication, which is carried out in the sphere of media space and more often serves to ensure issues not only of power and power interests, but also of information confrontation, we note that two components are mandatory in the process of modern mass communication: “source” and “consumer” / “involuntary consumer”. Note that this is the first time the problem has been considered from the “consumer”/ “involuntary consumer” perspective. This means that the phenomenon of mass political communication acts as the semantic content of the interaction of political subjects through the circulation of information in the process of struggle for power or its retention and in the process of information struggle, when attitudes are dictated that are internally rejected by the individual, but he is in the field of media influence.

It should be noted here that the concept of “media space” is the most important element of the conceptual apparatus of our research, since it is important for us to identify the relationship of social and political processes that underlie the concept of information confrontation in the “media space”, which will make it possible to determine the functional meaning of the media space in connection with political communication aimed at information impact.

The very concept of “media space,” which is actively used in the field of mass communication, is relatively new for political science and has not been fully conceptually developed. Moreover, this term is not associated with definitions in related disciplines that use the terms QMS or media. Traditionally, sociologists were the first to study the phenomenon of media space and more often designate it as “a special reality that is part of the social space and organizes social practices and representations of agents” [36, 36]. Domestic sociologist S.I. Shelonaev, relying on the teachings of P. Bourdieu on the functioning of the media space, understands by this term a set of force fields, the “nodes” of which are “media agents (mass audience, owners and representatives of the media), relations between which are built on the basis of influence or power” [35, 85].

We can talk about the birth of “mediatized political communication,” since today its implementation requires a small space where there is any electronic device and the Internet. Unlike previous years, the emphasis of political mobilization has moved from newspapers, radio, and to some extent television, to the Internet (blogosphere, social networks and other platforms). From now on, the preference of information consumers is given to personal media viewing, and mass political communication has come to be reduced to influencing the consciousness of the individual and the public consciousness in general through the use of the capabilities of “new media” and the formation of a certain media reality. We are talking about the mediatization of politics and the manipulation of an individual’s political beliefs, views and preferences.

In the context of the global media space, media in politics have become the main, if not the only important, channel for the dissemination of both influencing and counteracting information. The main characteristic feature of modern mass political communication has become the ability to experiment with “spaces”, audiences and the very potential of new media. As a result, politics began to be understood not only as relationships that develop in the struggle for power, but also as a systemic communicative device, where alternative actors in the political space are created through the Internet. Now it is the mass media that can determine the essence, content orientation and nature of the socio-political processes taking place in society.

During propaganda, the mechanism of influence on human consciousness occurs due to logical substitutions and emotional experiences occurring in the human mind. As a result, the formation of new attitudes is produced that influence the social or political behavior of the individual. It turns out that the mechanisms of influence on a person for propaganda purposes are based on the psychological impact on consciousness and affect the entire psychological and emotional sphere of the individual.

Of course, political culture and the political consciousness of citizens play an important role in the promotion of political values. It cannot be denied that the dominant political culture directs information flows in a certain direction, “sets” political and communication processes at a certain level of value orientations, patterns of political behavior, etc. Let us take as an example the elite American publication New York Times, whose views, as is known, have always been pro-government. It has become traditional for New York Times journalists to express the official point of view, reflecting the idea that American diplomacy is right.

Conclusion. Information warfare, as a process of communication technology, is carried out through a synthesis of everyday and theoretical knowledge, presented to the audience with the help of specially fabricated audiovisual information, which is, in essence, either political propaganda or a frankly psychological impact on the addressee. It turns out that the process of information warfare cannot proceed without the use of political propaganda, which is one of the leading tools in the implementation of intended political goals, which include, for example, the formation of public opinion on pressing government issues, changing the emphasis in the news “agenda”, distraction attention from covering topics and problems that are undesirable for authorities. Also, the process of information confrontation cannot proceed without the mediatization of politics, which has led to the fact that political subjects, in their desire to manipulate the political beliefs, views and preferences of an individual, often carry out an artificial construction of political reality in order to influence public consciousness. In this regard, it seems appropriate to study in more detail the effect of an equally effective tool for mediatizing politics - the mechanism of setting the “agenda”. Here we can state that the construction of political reality has brought virtual models into the socio-political reality of the population of most countries of the world, which contain an endless variety of brands, simulacra and political stereotypes that fill the communication space.

It should be emphasized that the simulation of objectivity and reality is inherent not only in professional journalists, but also in politicians when interacting with the media. They demonstrate a good knowledge of the subject of discussion, history, philosophy, economic factors and political events, skillfully misleading through a logically constructed chain of argumentation.

Thus, modern mass communications systems have become a convenient tool of information warfare for disseminating messages designed to influence the socio-political consciousness and behavior of citizens, to evoke certain political attitudes, views, and orientations. In the case of political communication in the media space, we are dealing with the media space as part of the political space, which projects political structures formed in the process of interaction of political actors into other subspaces or fields of socio-political space.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Аствацатурова М. А., Абрамян Р. В. Этносоциальный и этнополитический контент СМИ Ставропольского края в условиях современных рисков Северо-Кавказского Федерального округа // Журналист. Социальные коммуникации. 2013. №1. С. 71-80.
2. Ануфриенко С. В., Линец С. И. Российская пресса как инструмент противодействия терроризму: мониторинг, анализ, интерпретация // Вестник ПГЛУ. 2014. № 12. С. 112-116.
3. Бодрунова С. С. Медиакратия: СМИ и власть в современных демократических обществах: дис. ...докт. полит. наук. СПб., 2015. 286 с.
4. Боташева А. К., Миллер И. С. Специфика политических дебатов в рамках политической коммуникации в предвыборный период // Каспийский регион: политика, экономика, культура. 2019. № 2 (59). С. 62-68.
5. Бронников И. А. Политическая коммуникация и современность // Юридические исследования. 2013. № 4. С. 66-88.
6. Бурматов В. В. Политическая коммуникация в России: запрос на новый институциональный порядок // Государственное управление. Электронный вестник. 2012. № 33. С. 6-21.

7. Верник А. Г. Теория социальных медиа в работах Маршала Маклюэна // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. 2014. № 23. С. 10.
8. Вершинин М. С. Политическая коммуникация в информационном обществе. М.: Изд-во РГБ, 2009. 252 с.
9. Владимирова М. Б. Скрытое воздействие на массовое сознание (манипулирование) как современная проблема // Социальные коммуникации. 2011. № 4. С. 30-45.
10. Воинова Е. А. Медиатизация политики как феномен новой информационной культуры: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 2006. 24 с.
11. Володенков С. В. Политическая коммуникация и современное политическое управление // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 12: Политические науки. 2011. № 6. С. 22-31.
12. Гавра Д. П. Информационное противоборство: современное понимание, характеристики, подходы к междисциплинарному познанию // Российская школа связей с общественностью. 2023. № 29. С. 10-26.
13. Галкина Е. В., Койбаев Б. Г., Пекониди А. В. Внутриполитический имидж России в медийном пространстве США (2008-2011 гг.). Владикавказ: ИПЦ СОИГСИ ВНЦ РАН и РСО-А, 2013. 216 с.
14. Доценко Е. Л. Психология манипуляции: феномены, механизмы и защита. М.: Речь, 2003. 304 с.
15. Дуняева М. М. Современные средства массовой коммуникации как технологии «информационной войны» // Перспективы науки. 2014. № 10 (61). С. 121-124.
16. Касюк А. Я. Информационно-психологическое воздействие в информационном противоборстве // Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета. Общественные науки. 2021. № 1 (842). С. 22-34.
17. Куприна О. А. Массовая коммуникация как элемент политических манипуляций // Наука и Мир. 2023. № 3 (3). С. 245-246.
18. Лекторова Ю. Ю. Политическая коммуникация в информационном пространстве: опыт теоретико-методологического осмысления // Вестник Пермского университета. Серия: Политология. 2011. № 1. С. 71-80.
19. Липпман У. Общественное мнение. М.: Институт фонда «Общественное мнение», 2004. 384 с.
20. Лукьянова Н. А., Кашкан Г. В. Коммуникативно-семиотические технологии конструирования социально-политической среды // Вестник Российского государственного гуманитарного университета. 2011. № 1. С. 50-58.
21. Луман Н. Реальность массмедиа. М.: Праксис, 2005. С. 133-134.
22. Маклюэн М. Понимание медиа: Внешние расширения человека. М.; Жуковский: «КАНОН-пресс-Ц», «Кучково поле», 2004. 418 с.
23. Малинова О. Ю. Конструирование смыслов: исследование символической политики в современной России. М.: Институт научной информации по общественным наукам РАН, 2013. 421 с.
24. Митрохина Т. Н. Проектирование современной политики: дискурс-анализ СМИ // Вестник Саратовского государственного социально-экономического университета. 2014. № 5 (54). С. 157-164.
25. Опанасенко Н. В. Политические коммуникации: новые возможности и технологии // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Политология. 2013. № 1. С. 150-155.
26. Пименов Н. П. Концепты новых форм политической коммуникации в современной России // Известия Иркутского государственного университета. Серия: Политология. Религиоведение. 2015. Т. 11. С. 105-111.
27. Пирущий О. Н. Телевидение и Интернет как средства политической манипуляции: дис. ... канд. полит. наук. Ставрополь, 2009. 180 с.

28. Подорова-Аникина О. Н. Политические коммуникации в условиях трансформации современного российского общества: дис.канд. полит. наук. СПб., 2013. 251 с.
29. Рашкофф Д. Медиавирус! Как поп-культура тайно воздействует на ваше сознание. М.: Ультра. Культура, 2003. С. 115-116.
30. Соловьев А. И. Политическая: к проблеме теоретической идентификации // Полис. Политические исследования. 2014. № 3. С. 5-18.
31. Соловей И. В. Трансформация политического бытия в пространстве медиа-реальности // В мире научных открытий. 2014. № 11.3 (59). С.1374-1390.
32. Тузиков А. Р. Масс-медиа: идеология видимая и невидимая // Полис. Политические исследования. 2002. № 5. С. 123-133.
33. Фарица А. Я. Анализ современных форм, методов и приемов информационно-психологического воздействия по каналам СМИ // Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета. 2010. № 581. С. 247-266.
34. Шампань П. Делать мнение: новая политическая игра. М.: Socio-Logos, 1997. 354 с.
35. Шелонаев С. И. Медиапространство: структура и распределение социально капитала медиа-агентов // Общество. Среда. Развитие (Terra Humana). 2011. № 4. С. 85-98.
36. Юдина Е. Н. Медиапространство как культурная и социальная система. М.: Прометей, 2005. 236 с.
37. Bordewijk J. L., Kaam B. Towards a classification of new teleinformation services // Intermedia. 1986. Vol. 14. No. 1. P. 17-18.
38. Croteau D., Hoynes W. Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences, London: Sage publications, 2003. P. 123-134.
39. Deutsch K. W. The Nerves of Government. Models of Political Communication and Control. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1963. 316 p.
40. Klapper J. The effects of mass communication. N.Y.: Free Press, 1960. 302 p.
41. Lazarsfeld P., Berelson B., Gaudet H. The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up his Mind in a Presidential Campaign. N.Y. Columbia University Press, 1968. 478 p.
42. Lasswell H. D. The Structure and Function of Communication in Society. // The Communication of Ideas / Ed.: L. Bryson. New York, 1948. P. 37-51.
43. McCombs M., Shaw D. The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass-Media // Public Opinion Quarterly. 1972. No. 36. P. 176-185.
44. Weiss W. Effects of the Mass Media of Communication / The Handbook of Social Psychology / Eds. G. Lindzey, E. Aronson. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 1970. P. 77-195.

REFERENCES

1. Astvacaturova MA, Abramyan RV. Ethnosocial and ethnopolitical content of the media of Stavropol Krai in the context of modern risks of the North Caucasian Federal District // Zhurnal. Socialnye kommunikacii = Journalist. Social communications. 2013;(1):71-80. (In Russ.).
2. Anufrienko SV, Linec SI. Russian press as a tool for countering terrorism: monitoring, analysis, interpretation. Vestnik PGLU = Pyatigorsk state linguistic university bulletin. 2014;12:112-116. (In Russ.).
3. Bodrunova S. S. Mediocracy: mass media and power in modern democratic societies: diss. ... doctor of political sciences. St. Petersburg; 2015. 286 p. (In Russ.).
4. Botasheva AK, Miller IS. The specificity of the political debates within political communication during the election period. the Caspian region: politics, economics, culture. 2019;2(59):62-68. (In Russ.).
5. Bronnikov IA. Political communication and modernity. Legal Studies. 2013;(4):66-88. (In Russ.).
6. Burmatov VV. Political communication in Russia: demand for a new institutional order. Public Administration. E-journal (Russia). 2012;(33):6-21. (In Russ.).

7. Vernik AG. Social media theory in the works of Marshall McLuhan. Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University. 2014;(23):10. (In Russ.).
8. Vershinin M. S. Political communication in the information society. Moscow: Publishing house of the Russian State Library, 2009. 252 p. (In Russ.).
9. Vladimirova MB. Hidden influence on mass consciousness (manipulation) as a modern problem. Zhurnal. Socialnye kommunikacii = Journalist. Social communications. 2011;(4):30-45. (In Russ.).
10. Voinova EA. Mediatization of politics as a phenomenon of a new information culture: author's abstract. dis. ... candidate of philological sciences. Moscow; 2006. 24 p. (In Russ.).
11. Volodenkov SV. Political communication and contemporary political management. Moscow University Bulletin. Series 12. Political Science. 2011;(6):22-31. (In Russ.).
12. Gavra DP. Information confrontation: modern understanding, characteristics, approaches to interdisciplinary knowledge. Rossijskaya shkola svyazej s obshchestvennostyu = Russian School of Public Relations. 2023;(29):10-26. (In Russ.).
13. Galkina EV, Koibaev BG, Pekonidi A. V. Domestic political image of Russia in the media space of the USA (2008-2011). Vladikavkaz: IPC SOIGSI VSC RAS and RNO-A; 2013. 216 p. (In Russ.).
14. Dotsenko EL. Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection. Moscow: Rech; 2003. 304 p. (In Russ.).
15. Dunyaeva MM. Modern mass media as information warfare technologies. Perspektivy nauki = Prospects of Science. 2014;(10)(61):121-124. (In Russ.).
16. Kasyuk AY. Information-psychological actions in information warfare. Vestnik of Moscow State Linguistic University. Social Sciences. 2021;(1)(842):22-34. (In Russ.).
17. Kuprina OA. Mass communication as the element of political manipulations. Science and world. 2023;(3)(3):245-246. (In Russ.).
18. Lektorova YuYu. Political communication in the information space: an experience of theoretical and methodological understanding. Bulletin of Perm University. Political Science. 2011;(1):71-80. (In Russ.).
19. Lippman U. Public Opinion. Moscow: Institute of the Public Opinion Foundation; 2004. 384 p. (In Russ.).
20. Lukyanova NA, Kashkan GV. Communicative-semiotic technologies of constructing social-political environment. Vestnik Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta = Bulletin of the Russian State University for the Humanities. 2011;(1):50-58. (In Russ.).
21. Luhmann N. The Reality of Mass Media. Moscow: Praxis; 2005. P. 133-134. (In Russ.).
22. McLuhan M. Understanding Media: External Extensions of Man. M.; Zhukovsky: "CANON-press-C", "Kuchkovo Pole"; 2004. 418 p. (In Russ.).
23. Malinova O. Yu. Construction of meanings: a study of symbolic politics in modern Russia. Moscow: Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences; 2013. 421 p. (In Russ.).
24. Mitrohina TN. Planning contemporary politics media discourse analysis. Bulletin of Saratov State Social and Economic University. 2014;(5)(54):157-164. (In Russ.).
25. Opanasenko NV. Political communications: new opportunities and technologies. RUDN Journal of Political Science. 2013;(1):150-155. (In Russ.).
26. Pimenov NP. Concepts of New Forms of Political Communication in Modern Russia. The Bulletin of Irkutsk State University. Series "Political Science and Religion Studies". 2015;11:105-111. (In Russ.).
27. Pirushchy ON. Television and the Internet as means of political manipulation: diss. ... candidate of political sciences. Stavropol; 2009. 180 p. (In Russ.).
28. Podorova-Anikina O. N. Political communications in the context of transformation of modern Russian society: dis.cand. political sciences. St. Petersburg, 2013. 251 p. (In Russ.).

29. Rushkoff D. Mediavirus! How pop culture secretly influences your consciousness. Moscow: Ultra. Culture, 2003. P. 115-116.
30. Political Communication: To the Problem of Theoretical Identification. Polis. Political Studies. 2014;(3):5-18. (In Russ.).
31. Solovej IV. Transformation of political existence in media reality. In the World of Scientific Discoveries. 2014;(11.3)(59):1374-1390. (In Russ.).
32. Tuzikov AR. Mass-Media: Visible and Invisible Ideology. Polis. Political Studies. 2002;(5):121-134. (In Russ.).
33. Farina AY. Analysis of modern forms, methods and techniques of informational and psychological influence via media channels. Vestnik of Moscow State Linguistic University. 2010;(581):247-266. (In Russ.).
34. Champagne P. Making an opinion: a new political game. Moscow: Socio-Logos, 1997. 354 p. (In Russ.).
35. Shelonaev SI. Media space: structure and distribution of social capital of media agents. Obshestvo. Sreda. Razvitie (Terra Humana). 2011;(4):85-98. (In Russ.).
36. Yudina EN. Media space as a cultural and social system. Moscow: Prometej; 2005. 236 p. (In Russ.).
37. Bordewijk JL, Kaam B. Towards a classification of new teleinformation services. Intermedia. 1986;14(1):17-18.
38. Croteau D, Hoynes W. Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences, London: Sage publications; 2003. P. 123-134.
39. Deutsch KW. The Nerves of Government. Models of Political Communication and Control. N.Y.: The Free Press; 1963. 316 p.
40. Klapper J. The effects of mass communication. N.Y.: Free Press; 1960. 302 p.
41. Lazarsfeld P, Berelson B, Gaudet H. The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up his Mind in a Presidential Campaign. N.Y. Columbia University Press; 1968. 478 p.
42. Lasswell HD. The Structure and Function of Communication in Society. The Communication of Ideas. Ed.: L. Bryson. New York; 1948. P. 37-51.
43. McCombs M., Shaw D. The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass-Media // Public Opinion Quarterly. 1972;(36):176-185.
44. Weiss W. Effects of the Mass Media of Communication. The Handbook of Social Psychology. Eds. G. Lindzey, E. Aronson. Boston: Addison-Wesley; 1970. P. 77-195.

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Мария Сергеевна Погосова – магистрант кафедры международных отношений, политологии и мировой экономики, Институт международных отношений, Пятигорский государственный университет, +79197508947, pogosova-mari@mail.ru

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Maria S. Pogosova – Undergraduate student of the Department of International Relations, Political Science and World Economy, Institute of International Relations, Pyatigorsk State University, +79197508947, pogosova-mari@mail.ru

Конфликт интересов: автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Conflict of interest: the author declares no conflicts of interests.

*Статья поступила в редакцию: 13.03.2024;
одобрена после рецензирования: 19.04.2024;
принята к публикации: 10.06.2024.*

*The article was submitted: 13.03.2024;
approved after reviewing: 19.04.2024;
accepted for publication: 10.06.2024.*