

Zh.M. Doskhozina

International Information Technology University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

e-mail: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com

**RESEARCH OF COMMUNICATION:
CULTURAL-PHILOSOPHICAL CONTEXT**

In this article the author reveals the specifics of axiological approach to modern problems of communication with the help of fundamental philosophical theories analysis. In the center of the study are such concepts as socio-philosophical reflection, intersubjectivity, alienation, personalism and ideal communicative community. These concepts have become the starting points of 20th century philosophy in the study of human being's existential nature. The moral priorities of the philosophical theories' founders were aimed against the monological concept of communication, the use of human being and various manipulative techniques directed solely for profit. According to the philosophers, the value basis of communication is in the process of building a true dialogue, where each of its participants acquires an ideal relationship and comes to an understanding of the other. The theories that contribute to the return of man to his true moral purpose are becoming particularly relevant in connection with the cultural world's unification, the globalization process, and the humiliation of an individual as an object of virtue. The construction of an ideal communicative group becomes possible when the participants of communication overcome their own subjective attitudes and create mutual rational motivation. The considered theories call for such universal human values as love, care, respect, honesty, freedom, justice, spirituality, truth, and humanity. According to the philosophers, appeal to these values in the process of communication can lead a person out of the widespread alienation and unlock the destructive existential circle of modern human being, constructed of vices.

Key words: existentialism; values; alienation; interaction; dialogue; ethics; morality; communicative group; axiology; human; society.

Ж.М. Досхожина

Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

e-mail: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com

**Коммуникацияны зерттеу:
мәдени-философиялық контекст**

Бұл мақалада автор іргелі философиялық теорияларды талдау арқылы коммуникацияның заманауи мәселелерін аксиологиялық көзқарас тұрғысынан саралайды. Зерттеудің негізгі мәселесі ретінде әлеуметтік-философиялық рефлексия, субъективтілік, персонализм және идеалды коммуникативті қоғамдастық секілді ұғымдар көрсетілген. Осының нәтижесінде аталмыш тұжырымдамалар адамның экзистенциалды табиғатын зерттеудегі ХХ ғасыр философиясының бастапқы бағыттарына айналды. Философиялық теориялардың негізін қалаушылардың моральдық басымдықтары коммуникацияның монологиялық тұжырымдамасына, адамды пайдалануға және тек пайда табу үшін әртүрлі манипуляциялық әдістерге қарсы бағытталған. Философтардың пікірінше, қарым-қатынастың негізгі құндылығы шынайы диалог құру процесіне бағытталады, мұнда оның әрбір қатысушысы тамаша қарым-қатынасқа ие болады. Сондай-ақ, бұл мақалада мәдени әлемнің бірігуіне, жаһандану процесіне және жеке тұлғаны ізгілік объектісі ретінде қорғауға байланысты мәселелер адамды шынайы моральдық мақсатына қайтаруға ықпал ететін теория ретінде қаралады. Идеал коммуникативті қауымдастықты құру – коммуникацияға қатысушылардың әрқайсысының субъективті көзқарастарын және өзара ұтымды мотивацияны жеңу арқылы мүмкін болады. Қарастырылған теориялар сүйіспеншілік, қамқорлық, құрмет, адалдық, бостандық, әділеттілік, руханият, шындық және адамгершілік сияқты әмбебап жалпыадамзаттық құндылықтарға шақырады. Философтардың пікірінше, қарым-қатынас процесінде осы құндылықтарға жүгіну адамды иеліктен шығарудың кең таралған күйінен алып тастай алады және кемшіліктерден құрылған қазіргі адамның деструктивті экзистенциалды шеңберін айқындайды.

Түйін сөздер: экзистенциализм; құндылықтар; жатсыну; интеракция; диалог; этика; мораль; коммуникативтік топ; аксиология; адам; қоғам.

Ж.М. Досхожина

Международный университет информационных технологий, Казахстан, г. Алматы
e-mail: zhanatdoskhozkhina@gmail.com

Исследование коммуникации: культурно-философский контекст

В данной статье автор раскрывает специфику аксиологического подхода к современным проблемам коммуникации с помощью анализа фундаментальных философских теорий. В центре исследования находятся такие понятия как социально-философская рефлексия, интересубъективность, отчуждение, персонализм и идеальное коммуникативное сообщество. Именно эти концепции стали отправными направлениями философии XX века в исследовании экзистенциальной природы человека. Моральные приоритеты основателей философских теорий были нацелены против монологической концепции коммуникации, использования человека и различных манипулятивных техник, направленных исключительно для получения выгоды. По мнению философов, ценностная основа коммуникации является базисной в процессе построения истинного диалога, где каждый из его участников обретает идеальную взаимосвязь и приходит к пониманию другого. В связи с унификацией культурного мира, процессом глобализации и уничтожения личности как объекта добродетели, особую релевантность приобретают теории, способствующие вернуть человека в его истинное моральное назначение. Конструирование идеального коммуникативного сообщества становится возможным при преодолении субъективных установок каждого из участников коммуникации и взаимной рациональной мотивации. Рассмотренные теории призывают к таким универсальным общечеловеческим ценностям как любовь, забота, уважение, честность, свобода, справедливость, духовность, истина и гуманность. Обращение к этим ценностям в процессе коммуникации, по мнению философов, способно вывести человека из повсеместного состояния отчужденности и разомкнуть деструктивный экзистенциальный круг бытия современного человека, выстроенного из пороков.

Ключевые слова: экзистенциализм; ценности; отчуждение; интеракция; диалог; этика; мораль; коммуникативная группа; аксиология; человек; общество.

Introduction

In the intricate tapestry of human communication, the underlying values that shape our interactions play a pivotal role in shaping the fabric of our societies. This scientific article delves into the axiology of communication, aiming to unravel the profound connection between our values and the way we engage with one another. Axiology, the philosophical study of values, provides a lens through which we can analyze the ethical and moral dimensions inherent in our communicative endeavors.

As we navigate an era marked by unprecedented technological advancements and global interconnectedness, understanding the axiological foundations of communication becomes increasingly crucial. This exploration seeks to go beyond the surface of verbal and non-verbal exchanges, shedding light on the values that influence our choices of expression, interpretation, and ultimately, the construction of meaning in interpersonal, intercultural, and digital communication contexts.

Acknowledging the significance of communication as a cornerstone of human interaction, this article embarks on a multidisciplinary journey, drawing

insights from philosophy, linguistics, psychology, and sociology. By scrutinizing the intricate interplay between values and communication, we aspire to enrich our comprehension of the ethical considerations, cultural nuances, and societal implications inherent in the ways we convey and receive information.

Through a comprehensive review of existing literature and empirical studies, this article aims to contribute to the growing body of knowledge surrounding the axiology of communication. By fostering a deeper understanding of the values that underlie our communicative acts, we aspire to pave the way for more conscious, ethical, and culturally sensitive interactions in an increasingly interconnected global landscape.

Materials and methods

This research analyzes different philosophical communicative theories including E. Husserl's concept of intersubjectivity, ethics by I. Kant, dialogical personalism of M. Buber, transcendental pragmatism of K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas and personality concept by M. Scheler. During the communication research, the author used a dialogical approach, the

methodology of ethical-axiological analysis of spiritual culture, the methods of analysis and synthesis. Also, the phenomenological and analytical methods were applied.

Literature review

Philosophical approach of this research is based on classical communication theories represented in such book as «Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals», «The transformation of philosophy», «I and Thou» and «Ideas of a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy» (Kant, 2023; Apel, 2001; Buber, 1993; Husserl, 1999). Cultural context is reflected in the following studies: «The world of communication», «The sociology of communication», «General theory of social communication», «Moral consciousness and communicative action» (Kagan, 1988; Koneckaja, 1997; Sokolov, 2002; Habermas, 2006).

The main research scientific positions are conducted by the ideas of one of the greatest representatives of the Frankfurt school E. Fromm, the known philosopher-existentialist G. Marcel and the founder of philosophical anthropology M. Scheler.

The author also corresponds to the modern foreign scholars, researching communication nature from the point of artificial intellect revolution and digital progress, such as D. Gunkel, K. Appiah, B. Friedman, L. Siedentop, I. Van de Poel and L. Royakkers.

Results and Discussion

As stated by Friedman a value «refers to what a person or a group of people consider important in life» (Friedman, Hendry, 2019: 149). While it holds true that most values revolve around what individuals deem significant in life, it is not immediately apparent that everything people prioritize in life qualifies as a value. Some contend that values should be distinguished from simple preferences or individual interests. Thereby, Van de Poel and Royakkers characterize value as «lasting convictions or matters that people feel should be strived for in general and not just for themselves to be able to lead a good life or realize a good society» (Van de Poel, Royakkers, 2011: 72).

The diversity in values is evident when observing the various cultures and societies worldwide, each emphasizing and prioritizing distinct sets of values

(Flanagan, 2017). The evolution of axiological principles remains a consistent aspect of human history. Reflecting on the moral values held by our predecessors reveals a notable contrast with our current perspectives. Past generations embraced moral convictions that, by contemporary standards, might be considered prejudiced and bigoted, just as our own beliefs might be perceived as abhorrent by them. Delving deeper into history accentuates the extent of these transformations (Appiah, 2010; Pleasants, 2018; Pinker, 2012).

In this aspect, it is interesting to consider the theory of value change attributed by British researcher Ian Morris (Morris, 2015). According to this theory, changes in energy capture technology influence societal value systems. In foraging communities, energy capture technology is fundamentally simplistic, relying on human muscle and cognitive abilities to extract energy from an environment largely beyond their control. These communities are composed of small, nomadic bands that move from place to place. Therefore, it is more plausible that humans have inherently been social beings, with the emphasis on celebrating individual intelligence emerging later in human development (Schneewind, 1997; Siedentop, 2017).

Modern research conducts a lot of attention to the connection of artificial intelligent and human values, which is presented in anthropocentric way, presupposing that humans will continue to be the central moral subjects and beneficiaries of the artificially intelligent social order. However, one could question this perspective and argue that a truly artificially intelligent order would prioritize machines as the primary moral subjects (Gunkel, 2018).

From what we can observe that the axiological research takes an important place in the modern humanitarian science, although the correlation of human values and communication in philosophical way have not been investigated completely. The conducted research paper distinguished from the rest by the appealing to classical communicative philosophical theories in relation to contemporary social values of humanity.

The modern world is characterized by cultural, professional, and personal multilingualism. To restore normal communication, individuals must achieve a higher level of understanding by moving from languages of expression to the language of meanings. This involves perceiving the meaning, being loyal to its expression, learning another's

language, speaking it, and translating between different languages of cultural and historical meanings and symbols. At this historical moment, it is essential to develop the highest human abilities, as the future of civilization largely depends on cultivating the skills of collaborative thinking combined with developed individuality.

The interpretation of communication as an intersubjective social relationship and action had led to a trend towards a more multidimensional view of human relations, a deeper understanding of human beings' identity in the light of widely understood social ties. Western social philosophy and cultural science portrayed democratic society as a living, continuous communication of people who resolved scientific, political, social problems through discussion, debate, confrontation and positions. For the modern man it has become axiomatic belief that the most important issues in a democratic society can be solved only through free discussion, and open clash of opinions. Whereas initially, during the period of the existentialism and personalism philosophy's development, the problem of communication was mainly considered in the personal aspect, today it is put in terms of global, human being is explored as a world-historical task, affecting the common destiny of all mankind.

The study of communicative processes got a scientific popularity since a strengthening of globalization and unification processes, when a societal integration of people was getting weaker, and society was not able to maintain close contacts among themselves. In this aspect, different forms and practices of communication were developed and explored mostly by the Frankfurt School's representatives and other European philosophers.

The first dialogical concepts in the twentieth century were based on the radical research of consciousness, carried out within the framework of phenomenology by the German philosopher E. Husserl and his disciples and associates. E. Husserl has built the foundations for the concepts of dialogue, which have evolved in different currents as within phenomenology, existentialism, philosophical anthropology, pragmatism and personalism. E. Husserl's concept of intersubjectivity is considered as a key for all the above-mentioned philosophical schools. Intersubjectivity is the subject's structure that responds to the individual multiplicity of subjects and serves as the basis of their community and communication. E. Husserl's concept of phenomenology considers intersubjectivity through

the disclosure of its implicit and explicit intensities, in which the transcendental Self ascertains the existence and experience of the Other (Husserl, 1999).

The experience of the Other mechanism is determined by the temporary nature of being-consciousness: the Other receives significance through my own memories of myself. The French philosopher Gabriel Marcel wrote the following about the Husserl's concept of intersubjectivity: «... The philosophy of intersubjectivity is the category «Between». I would say that the philosophy of intersubjectivity can save us both from the pressures of individualism, which leave us alone with ourselves, and from collectivism, which suppresses human individuality. The mental reality of human existence is man with man. Only when the individual is aware of the Other as his own otherness and tries to penetrate the Other based on it – only then he can break the cycle of loneliness... We are not yet clearly aware of all this, because we are not dealing with some consistency, as in the case of the human soul and the world around it; reality «between» each time arises anew in the process of I and Thou contact» (Marcel, 2004: 99-100).

Another key idea in modern, ethically oriented concepts of communication is alienation. The alienation phenomenon was felt and described by many modern philosophies. In the broadest sense, alienation can be defined as the relationship between the subject and its function, stemming from the breakdown of their original unity. This attitude leads to the impoverishment, change, perversion, and transformation of the subject.

Here is what the German philosopher and psychoanalyst Erich Fromm wrote about the alienation phenomenon of the modern world: «The specific relationship of one individual with another has lost its clear human meaning, has acquired the character of manipulation, where man is used as a means... Not only economic but also personal relations between people have acquired the character of alienation, instead of human relations they have become like relations of things... The person feels and becomes alienated from himself. Human being doesn't feel himself like the center of own world or the creator of his own actions. Nowadays means seem to have turned into a goal, and not only «God is dead» as Nietzsche claimed in the XIX century, but also man died, and only organizations and machines are alive» (Fromm, 2017: 106-107). In the twentieth-century philosophy, concepts of dialogue

were created precisely in relation to the problem of alienation. True communication and dialogue were understood as alternatives to an alienated world.

The concept of alienation emerges as a significant theme in contemporary, ethically oriented notions of communication, echoing sentiments articulated by various modern philosophies. Broadly understood, alienation is described as the discord between the subject and its function, stemming from the dissolution of their initial unity. This profound disconnect manifests in a spectrum of consequences, including impoverishment, alteration, perversion, and transformation of the subject. The exploration of alienation within the realm of communication underscores its pervasive influence on the dynamics between individuals and their communicative roles, prompting a deeper reflection on the ethical dimensions and implications of such disjunctions in modern discourse. The recognition and examination of alienation contribute to a nuanced understanding of communication ethics, inviting scholars and practitioners to navigate the complexities of contemporary interactions with a heightened awareness of the potential ramifications of disunity and transformation within the communicative subject.

In this context, the axiological communication model is getting more relevant. The basic principles of it had been shaped by two controversial influential ethical orientations at the beginning of the twentieth century. According to the definition by I. Kant, these two directions in ethics are heteronomous and autonomous, depending on what they consider as the basis of morality. The first one tried to justify ethical principles from non-moral spheres of public life. The second sought to justify absolute ethics based on the idea of moral principles' independence and free from any external requirements.

Heteronomous ethics finds its main representation in the teachings of utilitarianism by J. Bentham, J. St. Mill, and sociocentrism by O. Conte, K. Marx, and E. Durkheim. Utilitarians adhered to the principle of eudemonism in ethics, where the purpose of human life was seen as attaining happiness, and the method to achieve this goal was to establish a way of life where the total sum of pleasures outweighed the total of sufferings.

According to Mill, virtue is not an end in itself, but rather a means to achieving happiness. He did not recognize any modern, eternal ideas, including moral principles, as he believed they evolved from experience and changed throughout history. The

only constants, he argued, were humanity's desires and the pleasure derived from satisfying them. In Mill's view, the task of ethics, as understood by utilitarianism, is to identify the conditions that maximize happiness for the greatest number of people. This is achieved through the principle of utility, which transcends purely selfish notions of happiness by promoting actions that contribute to the general welfare. Thus, utility serves as an objective criterion of morality for utilitarians.

Sociocentric direction in ethics is based on the laws of historical development, which are necessary, like natural processes. Society is regarded as a subject of history. The differences within that area stemmed from the way in which philosophers viewed society. O. Conte saw the beginning of social life in the development of knowledge, E. Durkheim in religion, K. Marx posited that economic relations constitute the ultimate driving forces behind all human activities. According to Marx, economics serves as the primary foundation of society, with law, religion, philosophy, and ethics forming the ideological superstructure that mirrors the class interests of different segments of society.

In this context, K. Marx viewed morality as primarily serving to protect class interests, leading him to adopt a critical stance towards it. He argued that morality functions as an internalized enforcer within individuals. According to K. Marx, all morality amounts to hypocrisy and bigotry, preaching concepts like «spirit» and «spirituality» to soothe the souls of the impoverished classes and to camouflage the economic needs and interests of the dominant class.

The second direction in moral philosophy was autonomous ethics, which places a premium on individual agency, acknowledging that each person possesses the intellectual autonomy to critically evaluate ethical dilemmas and make moral choices based on their own principles. This perspective encourages a sense of moral responsibility and a commitment to one's values, fostering a more self-directed and reflective approach to ethical decision-making. In the realm of autonomous ethics, individuals are seen as moral agents capable of engaging in conscientious reasoning, contributing to a richer and more diverse ethical discourse within the broader context of society.

Philosophers who espouse autonomous ethics aim to establish an absolute ethic whose principles cannot be derived from external sources or reduced to another reality. In this framework, moral

principles are seen as inherently valuable, as ends in themselves, and humans are viewed as moral beings by nature. Unlike utilitarianism, absolute ethics does not prioritize the pursuit of happiness but instead focuses on the moral development and perfection of individuals. Autonomous ethics is distinguished by its critique of all forms of moral reductionism.

I. Kant indeed provided a significant contribution to human morality, and his influence on contemporary ethical thought is substantial, although his teachings have faced criticism over time. I. Kant asserted: «Nowhere in the world, nor anywhere else, is it possible to think of anything else that could be considered good without limitation, except only good will... Good will is not good because it acts or does; It is good not because of its suitability to reach any goal, but only because of will, i.e., by itself» (Kant, 2023: 228-229). Even if good will could not achieve its goal due to external standing, «yet it would flash like a precious stone in itself as something that has in itself its full value» (Kant, 2023: 230). Morality is absolute. At the basis of absolute ethics I. Kant grounded his teachings on the fundamental division into two realms: the natural (experiential) world and the supernatural (intelligible) world. Man is the tenant of two worlds: he belongs to the first as a sensual being; to the second, intelligible world he belongs as a hypersensitive being. According to I. Kant, there is the independence of man from the determining causes of the perceived world, i.e., from nature with its laws.

Manifestations of obligation by I. Kant served as a foundational element for the development of modern axiology, the theory of values. This development occurred within the ethical teachings of the neo-Kantians such as V. Windelband, G. Rickert, and others, as well as within the phenomenological philosophy of E. Husserl and M. Scheler. The German philosopher R. Lotze was the first to introduce the term «values» into philosophy. R. Lotze criticized naturalistic ethics and referred to psychic acts as phenomena bound by time and experience on one hand, and to the timeless, super-empirical content of these acts, which he termed «values» or «meanings», on the other. Theoretical, practical (ethical), and logical values hold unconditional significance for individuals, according to R. Lotze. He viewed humans as microcosms striving for improvement and engaging with others in the process of realizing values. Thus, R. Lotze's concept speaks to the creation of an ideal world of culture and morality.

R. Lotze's theory of values found further development among the neo-Kantians. These thinkers posited that philosophy could only exist due to shared values. They viewed values as norms that constituted the essence of all cultural functions, particularly human morality. By merging I. Kant's ethics with R. Lotze's teachings, the neo-Kantians translated the discourse of values into the language of cultural philosophy. They identified truth, goodness, and beauty as values, with science, morality, law, art, and religion as «value-benefits» crucial for humanity's existence.

Norms-values governed not only moral actions but also theoretical and aesthetic pursuits. Each value was considered an end, pursued for its intrinsic worth rather than for material gain or sensual pleasure. Values were perceived not as realities but as ideals, with a transcendental subject – referred to as «consciousness in the end» – as their bearer, serving as the source and foundation of all human normative activities. This transcendent subject, as the bearer of values, contrasted with the individual and possessed a temporal character. The neo-Kantians distinguished between value and duty as transcendent and immanent realities, respectively, and highlighted metaphysical distinctions between values and norms.

Axiology as a teaching about values, their origin, essence, functions, types and forms. Nowadays, it is an independent section of philosophy. In contemporary social and cultural philosophy, the issue of values has a special place, first, in connection with the widespread interpretation of culture as a set of all values created by mankind, as well as in the context of culture interpretation as a regulatory and normative area of human activity. Values, along with norms, models, and ideals, constitute essential components of the regulatory system within society. Consequently, analyzing the existential foundations of various social practices has become a fundamental aspect of socio-philosophical and cultural-philosophical studies. The axiological problem within the investigation of communicative culture is illuminated within the context of ideal development. This includes generalized concepts of perfection across different spheres of social life, as well as the normative models and aspirations inherent within each cultural system.

The author attempted to delineate the problematic field of modern ethically oriented concepts of social communication through such soft-mental concepts as intersubjectivity, alienation, morality,

and values in a brief way. The basic principles of ethical-axiological model of communication are most vividly represented in such seemingly different philosophical teachings as phenomenological personalism of M. Scheler, dialogical personalism of M. Buber, transcendental pragmatism of K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas. For all those speakers, the problem of communication and dialogue was viewed as a basis for morality and intersubjective understanding.

Modern personalism, phenomenology, axiology, and philosophical anthropology are intricately linked to the exploration of the dialogue problem, particularly regarding the dialogical nature of human existence. This concept aligns with phenomenological personalism, as articulated by Max Scheler, who emphasized the notion of embeddedness and the structuring of society within the individual personality. According to Scheler, the Other Self is given prior to empirical experience, existing transcendentally, and self-perception is shaped by the mechanism of regarding oneself as another (i.e., substantiating the transcendental status of dialogue).

M. Scheler considered the essence of personality, which is the highest value, as a base for dialogue. Personality is the spiritual center of value divine kingdom; its task is to understand and embody values. According to M. Scheler, the measure of humanity within personality is divine, as personality lacks its own essence beyond that of the deity. Therefore, encounters with the Other are mediated by values, with knowledge of the other being intertwined with an understanding of their value. This encounter occurs within the hierarchy of personalities. M. Scheler posits that the meeting of personalities and dialogue isn't merely about transmitting values that cannot be simply conveyed, but rather about capturing these values through the interaction of personality and archetype. Values are not comprehended solely within the subject but are actualized in the act of co-participation with them. Understanding values and the Other, as the bearer of values, can only be achieved through active identification or co-ownership.

It's important to highlight that the theory of values within the phenomenological school, particularly as articulated by M. Scheler, is grounded differently than in the Kantian tradition. While the neo-Kantians conceptualize the notion of value as stemming from intelligent will, phenomenologists view value as emanating from emotional acts of preference-love, with negative values arising from acts of disgust and

hate. Phenomenologists consider these emotional acts to be more fundamental phenomena than acts of choice. «All our spiritual life, and not only the subject knowledge and thinking in the sense of being knowledge has «pure» intentions in essence. The spirit's emotional component, i.e., feelings, preferences, love, hate and will, have the original content, which they do not need to borrow from «thinking» and which ethics should open regardless of logic» – writes M. Scheler (Scheler, 2022: 82).

M. Scheler concurs with I. Kant in asserting that human will cannot be subordinated to the benefits and purposes of others, as the use of these benefits would alter the meaning of good and evil. A good will possesses good goals, leading to variations in the values sought by the will. M. Scheler argues that the values expressed through acts of kindness do not belong solely to the empirical world. Just as colors can be separated from colored objects and contemplated in isolation, so too can values such as beauty, nobility, majesty, and sacredness be contemplated as pure phenomena, distinct from the individuals to whom they may belong.

M. Scheler posits that the concept of a priori does not solely align with the «formal» aspect as I. Kant argued. Instead, M. Scheler suggests that emotional life also possesses its own a priori content, which he terms the «substantial a priori». Love and hate, according to M. Scheler, serve as the original foundations of the human spirit. Therefore, values are understood as the intentional content of emotional acts, independent of the nature or empirical course of those acts. A priori structure of values independent of the subject's purposeful activity or will. By M. Scheler, the essence of any values is concluded in the intuitive appearance of which they are established: the more durable values are the higher, as the satisfaction they bring. The least durable values are those associated with mere pleasure, often tied to the gratification of sensual tendencies or material wealth, which provide transient satisfaction. Above these are cognitive or aesthetic values, which are indivisible.

Hence, all who engage in the contemplation of beauty or the pursuit of truth share a common joy. Beyond these lies the value of the saint or the divine value, which, in love, unites all who partake in it and provides profound, enduring satisfaction. According to M. Scheler, all values ultimately stem from one foundational value: the value of the divine personality – the infinite, personal spirit characterized by love.

The philosophical reflections of personalism's prominent representative M. Buber are inextricably linked to his religious experiences. Thus, he unequivocally links the emergence of Christianity with the aspiration to bridge the gap between the human will and God's grace. He perceives the nationalization of Christianity as a departure from this aspiration. With the church and state interposing themselves between humanity and God, they elevated their parasitic nature and exploited humanity's yearning for mystical union with God, thereby disrupting the mutual dialogue between the divine and the human. This distortion has led to the estrangement of truth, idea, and morality from reality, fact, and politics. As a result, we are now experiencing the consequences of this division in the universe. The monological principle of communication is prevailed. M. Buber was convinced by harmfulness of communication's monological type and actively searched for alternative.

M. Buber suggests that the focus of anthropology should not be solely on the individual human being, but rather on spiritual dialogue. He emphasizes that dialogue between people is most effective when conducted through God and guided by his commandments of morality and love. In contrast to the dominant monological and alienating relationships prevalent in society, characterized by «I-It» interactions, M. Buber advocates for complex mutual relationships based on love and reciprocity, encapsulated in the dynamic of «I and Thou». M. Buber contends that every genuine encounter in real life constitutes a meeting. True communication, he argues, begins when the other person ceases to be viewed merely to an end. The meeting zone, according to M. Buber, lies between «I» and «Thou», transcending subjective and objective distinctions. It is in this narrow space where the subjective and objective meet that authentic human connection occurs. M. Buber frequently emphasizes that one of humanity's main errors is the belief that the spirit resides solely within individuals. Instead, he posits that the spirit exists in the space between individuals, in the dialogue between «I» and «Thou». «The Spirit is not I, but between I and Thou. The Spirit is not like the blood circulating within me, but rather the air that I and Thou breathe» (Lifintseva, 2013: 32). This space between individuals serves as the core of countless communication relationships, where mutual intentions, verbal, non-verbal, and spiritual dialogues intersect. «Between» serves as the origin point from which one can embark on two crucial

journeys: firstly, towards a renewed comprehension of personality, and secondly, towards a renewed comprehension of community. In dialogical personalism, the primary focus shifts from the individual or the collective to the person engaged in communication with another person. The unique essence of humanity, according to this perspective, is revealed only within living relationships (Lifintseva, 2013).

M. Buber proposes that genuine spiritual dialogue transcends mere verbal exchange. It involves a dynamic and transformative encounter between individuals, where each participant acknowledges the inherent sacredness of the other. In the «I and Thou» relationship, individuals engage in a mutual and reciprocal connection that goes beyond the transactional nature of everyday interactions. The spiritual dialogue, according to M. Buber, is characterized by openness, presence, and a deep recognition of the divine spark within each person. Through this dialogue, individuals strive to reach a shared understanding and unity, fostering a sense of interconnectedness and spiritual elevation. M. Buber's emphasis on authentic encounters and transcendent connections in spiritual dialogue has left an enduring impact on existentialist philosophy and discussions surrounding human relationships.

Indeed, M. Buber presents not only an alternative to individualism and collectivism, which are initially rooted in a false monological commonality, but advocates for a different worldview and a distinct point of reference – the opposite perspective. According to M. Buber, the center of the universe is not found within «I» but rather in «Between». This space is considered the desired value, the primary category of human reality. M. Buber asserts that the dilemma of “individualism versus collectivism” must be transcended within the realm of «Between», which is authentic and real. M. Buber identifies this «Between» in out-of-state self-organizing associations, such as village communities, communal settlements, or kibbutzim. It is not merely a theoretical concept but a tangible space where collective efforts are directed towards achieving universal well-being. This space is where genuine human connection and collaboration thrive, grounded in principles of mutual respect, responsibility, and cooperation (Buber, 1993). Indeed, the «Between» zone is not merely a utopian concept but a concrete space where concerted efforts are made to realize universal material prosperity. However, its primary focus is on spiritual communion with

God. Within this space, communication is grounded in principles of mutual love, responsibility, and self-sacrifice, as well as mutual assistance. Those who inhabit the «Between» zone are remarkable individuals, embodying selflessness and dedication to the collective good. M. Buber refers to them as builders, as they work tirelessly to create and sustain communities founded on these principles.

These individuals are living, active, and crystallizing centers, imbued with a powerful charismatic and passionate energy that both solidifies and inspires their followers. What sets the builder apart from a leader is their consistent adherence to dialogical principles. They refrain from encroaching upon the freedom of others and do not act in the name of themselves or the collective, but rather in the pursuit of personal freedom, love, and justice. In communities led by builders, practice takes precedence over theory. The emphasis is on continuous dialogue rather than adherence to theoretical postulates. Communication within these communities is intensely concentrated, existing within the constraints of ordinary space and time – «here and now». The «I-Thou» dialogue is ongoing and infinite, transcending the limits of a knowledgeable object, a solved task, or an achieved goal. It represents an endless journey towards God, an eternal process of becoming.

The central issue of communication is extensively explored in the works of modern German philosophers K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas. According to their perspective, all participants in communication are guided by generalized, intersubjective norms of communication. These norms, along with communicative competence and rational motives, enable the communication process itself. Communicative action is considered a megatype for all types of social action. Unlike instrumental action, communicative action is not solely oriented towards success; instead, its primary aim is to achieve mutual understanding among all participants. As we saw at the beginning of our research, the starting point of theoretical reflection in ethical-axiological concepts of communication is the problem of cognition's intersubjectivity introduced by E. Husserl.

The concept of an ideal communicative society, a central point in K.-O. Apel's philosophy, hinges on the attainment of truth through complete agreement among all participants within a communicative group regarding the interpretation of all matters. He noted: «An intersubjective opinion that can no

longer be challenged by anyone on the basis of existing criteria, must be identical to the concept of truth» (Apel, 2001: 73).

K.-O. Apel highlighted the «dual structure of everyday communication» and emphasized the necessity to distinguish between communicative action and discourse. He identified two components in the process of mutual understanding: communication and expression. K.-O. Apel stressed that discourse should not be conflated with communication that involves action. His primary focus was on the philosophical possibilities offered by the analysis of argumentative discourse.

The need for discourse arises when a single communicative action is insufficient, and there are «breaks» in communication. K.-O. Apel argued that all interests and conflicting claims among people can be rationally addressed only through reasoned discourse. Argumentation, in this context, is seen as a form of communicative action governed by rules that are «liberated from activity». Participants in argumentation are bound by these rules in their communication with an unlimited audience or community.

Thus, the situation of argumentation differs significantly from that of communicative action, which does not necessitate transcending beyond the circle of participants involved in the communication.

Based on the preceding points, K.-O. Apel outlines the practical rules that underlie argumentative discourse:

- the autonomy rule: participants must refrain from using non-argumentative intentions in the reasoning process.

- the requirement to present arguments that would be accepted by the community, as well as the obligation to contribute to establishing structures and rules for an ideal argumentative community. This involves procedures of testing in imagination or practice.

- the requirement to regard others as equal participants in argumentation if they adhere to the rules of reasoning.

- the obligation to exert necessary efforts to expand the understanding of arguments, thereby promoting the realization of public grounds within a genuine communicative group.

These rules are applicable to all practical discourses, including democratic collective will-building processes.

The ideal communicative group asserts itself as a regulative idea precisely because it possesses the

capacity to critically recognize all the shortcomings and difficulties encountered in real human communication. This idea serves to highlight the features of real communication that are absent in actual communication environments. Therefore, real communicative groups are invariably characterized by incomplete information among their members, asymmetry in their statuses, inequality of competencies, and distortions in communication that arise within social institutions.

By identifying these distortions, it becomes possible to integrate discursive ethics into the mechanism for correcting communication deformations. This enables discursive ethics to evolve into a planetary ethics of response, rather than merely evaluation and diagnosis. In doing so, it facilitates a proactive approach to addressing and remedying communication challenges on a global scale. K.-O. Apel writes: «When a person engages in argumentation, they implicitly acknowledge all the demands of all members of the communicative group that can be justified by reasonable argumentation. Otherwise, the requirement of argumentation would be self-limiting. Simultaneously, in the process of argumentation, the person agrees to defend all their own claims against others. Additionally, membership in the communicative group is inherent to the individual. Moreover, the person who argues presupposes two essential things: firstly, a real communicative group of which they are a member by socialization; and secondly, an ideal communicative group that must be able to adequately understand the meaning of their arguments and conclusively judge their truthfulness. The most remarkable and dialectical aspect of this situation is that the individual presupposes an ideal community within the real possibility of society, even though they are aware that this real community, including themselves, is far from the ideal communicative group. However, due to the transcendental structure of reasoning, there is no alternative but to look ahead into this desperate yet hopeful situation» (Apel, 2001: 329).

The concept of the real communicative group holds significant theoretical value for social philosophy because it represents the setting in which public communication becomes possible and tangible. Unlike ideal abstractions, the real communicative group in which we are socialized and exist acquires existential meaning. Furthermore, studying the real communicative group is guided by a distinct methodological principle compared to the examination of idealized concepts.

The problem of utopia and realism can be addressed on a dialectical basis, as proposed by K.-O. Apel. Both ethics and utopia stem from the ideal, making reason inherently utopian. However, while ethics regards the ideal as a regulative, never-achievable idea distinct from reality, utopianism projects it into history. When the distinction between the ideal and history is erased, utopianism loses the capacity for historical criticism and risks becoming blind. Without acknowledging the dialectical interplay and conflating ethical and strategic rationality, utopianism removes its “internal” boundaries and may devolve into anarchic dreaming or brutal terror in its pursuit of goal rationality. This tendency is evident in technocratic utopianism, exemplified by “real socialism” or scientism.

In contrast, ethics, by affirming the ideal in its regulative sense, which is correlated with history but transcends it, gains the authority to critique history and utopianism. In the works of K.-O. Apel, the notion of responsibility ethics emerges as a potent tool for criticizing utopianism as a primary danger within scientific and technical civilization.

Through Apel’s framework, the point is drawn that by maintaining a delicate balance between the regulative ideal and historical reality, ethics can wield its evaluative power to navigate the intricate terrain of utopian aspirations, thereby mitigating the risks associated with unchecked utopianism in our societal pursuits.

The German social philosopher J. Habermas, who belonged to the Frankfurt school, based the most influenced communication theory. In his research, he concentrated on the problem of interhuman connection (*liaison*) – «interaction», focusing on the issue of difference between «true» communication from «false» and the conditions providing the first. We shall briefly detail the main features of his concept.

Based on K.-O. Apel’s concept of the ideal communicative group, J. Habermas developed the notion of normative requirements for speech acts. According to this concept, there are three communication approaches: cognitive, interactive, and expressive, which correspond to three aspects of speech: the propositional content, the interpersonal attitude, and the speaker’s intention, respectively. These approaches are embedded in the following aspects of speech:

- cognitive approach: focuses on the propositional content and corresponds to the demand for truth;

- interactive approach: concerns the interpersonal attitude and aligns with the demand for normative correctness;

- expressive approach: centers on the speaker's intention and relates to the demand for truthfulness.

Ideally, each expression asserts that its propositional content is true, that it conforms to the relationships and expectations established between the communicators, and that the speaker's intentions are sincere. Additionally, there is a fourth requirement for clarity, ensuring consistency with the grammatical rules of language.

The foundational principles served as the cornerstone of philosophical pragmatism, which forged a connection between communication participants and the realm of facts and social norms. J. Habermas suggests that under specific conditions and from a particular perspective, these rules of speech communication can attain ethical significance and serve as the foundation for moral assessment. He wrote: «Mutual understanding and agreement can only arise if speakers uphold these concepts during the course of real communication» (Habermas, 2006: 187). A free communication society is out of all defects and obstacles to communication both internally and externally.

Thereby, semiotics is getting into ethics since the pragmatic requirements for communication and for the speech act as a structural unit of communication become ethically relevant. So, being interactive, morality has its real basis in language and in communication. Pragmatic language rules could be seen as rules of ethics.

At the core of J. Habermas's social and political philosophy lies the concept of «communicative action», which, according to him, extends beyond mere communication. Communicative action encompasses all forms of interaction conducted collectively and in cooperation with others.

Individuals communicate within the context of a symbolically interpreted life world, which serves as a reservoir of cultural meanings. This life world, inaccessible to external objective settings, fosters mutual understanding through the «I-Thou» dialogue relationship. It's important to note that J. Habermas diverged from E. Husserl's phenomenological interpretation of the life world, which was confined within the philosophical consciousness paradigm. Instead, J. Habermas expanded upon this interpretation by incorporating dimensions of community and personality. Communication serves multiple functions, as

Habermas emphasized, including facilitating agreement and fostering both individual self-identification and identification with social groups. «Communicative action, when viewed from a functional perspective, encompasses various aspects: it involves the transmission and updating of cultural knowledge, facilitating understanding; it coordinates action, promoting social integration and solidarity; and it contributes to socialization by shaping personal identity» (Furs, 2000: 113).

The scope of communicative action does not encompass the entirety of social life diversity. While it addresses social processes, it does not account for systemic integration stemming from strategic and instrumental actions. The perspective of systemic integration emerged from the viewpoint of an external observer, capable of describing society as a self-regulating system. In this framework, systemic relationships are perceived as natural phenomena, akin to a "second nature". The increasing institutionalization and autonomy resulting from modern systematic differentiation are stimulated by rationalization, manifested in culture's ability to critique its unexamined content. Although the symbolic structures of the life world are foundational for cultural generation within social systems, the uncontrolled development and differentiation of the social system lead to the marginalization of language communication by «silent» systems of quasi-communication, destabilizing the life world. Consequently, communication becomes tainted by numerous structural distortions, ultimately undermining social integration.

The institutionalization of society involves the emergence of new communication channels, but the structure of these channels can also introduce new barriers to communication. Therefore, J. Habermas advocates for harmonizing life and developing social structures by pluralizing institutions and integrating them into the communicative exchange within civil society. This approach emphasizes the institutional correlation of the communicative group.

J. Habermas's communicative theory stands as a cornerstone in the realm of critical social theory, offering a comprehensive framework for comprehending the essence and objectives of communication within society. At its core, communicative action emphasizes the importance of open and rational discourse as a means of achieving mutual understanding and consensus among individuals. J. Habermas contends that genuine communication should be free from coercion and

manipulation, allowing participants to engage in open dialogue where they express their perspectives and collectively strive for shared meaning. The theory emphasizes the role of language as a tool for reaching intersubjective understanding and consensus-building, promoting communicative rationality as the foundation for a just and democratic society. J. Habermas’s communicative theory stands as a call for participatory, inclusive, and emancipatory communication, highlighting its potential to foster democratic deliberation and social cohesion by transcending power imbalances and promoting shared values through reasoned discourse.

K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas endeavored to unveil a distinctive normative domain during their analysis of the lifeworld. This domain, termed the basic section, holds universal significance and encompasses forms of rationality such as communication, language, and values. Traditionally, Western philosophy has treated these elements as separate entities, but K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas sought to integrate them into a unified framework, recognizing their interconnectedness and importance in shaping human experience and interaction.

The author prepared an intuitive demonstration of the main philosophical communication theories, which have been considered above (Table 1).

Table 1 – The systematization of communication theories

The philosophers	The main investigated problems	The theories’ key ideas	The main purposes of the theories
E. Husserl	Alienation, non-argumentized dialogue, distraction of communication, utilization of man by man, non-ethical interaction, lack of morality	Intersubjectivity	Harmonizing of life, transcendental dialogue, general happiness, elevation of immaterial values (freedom, love, justice, truth), humanism
I. Kant		Human morality	
M. Scheler		Phenomenological personalism	
M. Buber		Religious experience	
K.-O. Apel		Ideal communicative group	
J. Habermas		Speech interaction	

Conclusion

The exploration of the axiology of communication reveals a rich tapestry of values that intricately weave through the fabric of our interpersonal, intercultural, and digital exchanges. As we navigate the complexities of communication in the 21st century, it becomes evident that values are not passive spectators but active participants, shaping the very essence of our interactions.

The comprehensive analysis undertaken in this scientific article underscores the necessity of acknowledging and understanding the ethical and moral dimensions inherent in communication. Axiological considerations guide not only our linguistic choices but also influence the interpretation of messages, the formation of social bonds, and the construction of shared meanings within diverse cultural and societal contexts.

Summarizing the results of the conducted research, the author came to the next outcomes:

1. Structure of communication arises from the existential thought;
2. Understanding has the primary and constitutive role in communication;
3. Human reality should be interpreted mainly as «understanding of existence».

These outcomes contain an immediate opportunity to move on to a new ethical discourse, putting into the basis of morality the direct understanding in the process of communication.

The communicative justification of ethics is based on the assertion that moral consciousness is an interiorization of the communicative interaction structure, which is also rational and has spontaneous, universal, consensual force of argumentative speech, in which the various participants of communication overcome their subjective attitudes and, thanks to reciprocity of rational motivation, ensure themselves both the objective world unity and the intersubjectivity of their life world.

The author tried to discover the specifics of the axiological model of communication,

focusing primarily on the intersubjectivity concept by E. Husserl, the dialogical personalism by M. Scheler and M. Buber, as well as the transcendental pragmatism of K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas.

As our world becomes increasingly interconnected, and communication transcends geographical and cultural boundaries, the importance of fostering a conscious and values-driven approach to interaction cannot be overstated. This exploration

serves as a foundation for future research endeavors, encouraging scholars and practitioners alike to delve deeper into the nuanced interplay between values and communication. All the philosophical concepts discussed above assert that any ideas or representations about the good, evil, justice, due, etc. are only a semantic expression of the tension that takes place in the structure of communication and are not at all characteristics of the existence itself.

References

- Апель К.-О. Трансформация философии. – М.: Логос, 2001. – 339 с.
 Бубер М. Я и Ты. – М.: Изд. группа «Прогресс», 1993. – 404 с.
 Гуссерль Э. Идеи к чистой феноменологии и феноменологической философии. – М.: ДИК, 1999. – 336 с.
 Каган М.С. Мир общения. – М.: Политиздат, 1988. – 319 с.
 Кант И. Основы метафизики нравственности. – М.: Мысль, 2023. – 384 с.
 Конечкая В.П. Социология коммуникации. – М.: Международный ин-т бизнеса и управления, 1997. – 302 с.
 Культурология. XX век: Энциклопедия. – СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. – 447 с.
 Лифинцева Т.П. Философия диалога Мартина Бубера. – М.: ИФРАН, 2013. – 134 с.
 Марсель Г. Опыт конкретной философии. – М.: Республика, 2004. – 224 с.
 Соколов В.А. Общая теория социальной коммуникации: Учебное пособие. – СПб.: Изд. Михайлова В.А., 2002. – 464 с.
 Фромм Э. Бегство от свободы. – М.: Прогресс, 2017. – 288 с.
 Фурс В.Н. Философия незавершенного модерна Юргена Хабермаса. – Минск: ЗАО «Экономпресс», 2000. – 224 с.
 Хабермас Ю. Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие. – СПб.: Наука, 2006. – 379 с.
 Шелер М. К идее человека. – М.: Центр гуманитарных инициатив, 2022. – 140 с.
 Appiah K. (2010) *The honor code: How moral revolutions happen*. WW Norton & Co, New York. – 288 p.
 Flanagan O. (2017) *The geography of morality*. OUP, Oxford. – 362 p.
 Friedman B., D. Hendry (2019) *Value Sensitive Design: Shaping Technology with Moral Imagination*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. – 256 p.
 Gunkel D. (2018) *Robot rights*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. – 371 p.
 Morris I. (2015) *Foragers, farmers and fossil fuels*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ. – 382 p.
 Pleasants N. (2018) *The structure of moral revolutions*. *Social Theory and Practice*, 44 (4). – p. 567-592.
 Pinker S. (2012) *The better angels of our nature: why violence has declined*. Penguin Publishing Group, London. – 832 p.
 Schneewind J. (1997) *The invention of autonomy: a history of modern moral philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. – 650 p.
 Siedentop L. (2017) *Inventing the individual*. Belknap Press: An Imprint of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. – 448 p.
 Van de Poel I., Royakkers L. (2011) *Ethics, technology, and engineering: an Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, NJ. – 384 p.

References

- Apel K.-O. (2001) *Transformacija filosofii* [The transformation of philosophy]. M: Logos, 339 p. (in Russian)
 Buber M. (1993) *Ya i Ty* [I and Thou]. M: Publishing group «Progress», 404 p. (In Russian)
 Husserl E. (1999) *Ideji k chistoj fenomenologii i fenomenologicheskoj filosofii* [Ideas of a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy]. M: DIK, 336 p. (In Russian)
 Kagan M.S. (1988) *Mir obshhenija* [The world of communication]. M: Politizdat, 319 p. (In Russian)
 Kant I. (2023) *Osnovy metafiziki нравственности* [Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals]. M: Idea, 384 p. (In Russian)
 Koneckaja V.P. (1997) *Sociologija kommunikacii* [The sociology of communication]. M: International Institute of Business and Management, 302 p. (In Russian)
 Kul'turologija. (1998) *XX vek: Jenciklopedija* [Cultural Studies. XX Century: Encyclopedia]. St. Petersburg: The University Book, 447 p. (In Russian)
 Lifintseva T.P. (2013) *Filosofija dialoga Martina Bubera* [Martin Buber's philosophy of Dialogue]. M: IPhRAS, 134 p. (In Russian)
 Marcel G. (2004) *Opyt konkretnoj filosofii* [The experience of concrete philosophy]. M: Republic, 224 p. (In Russian)
 Sokolov V.A. (2002) *Obshchaya teoriya social'noj kommunikacii: Uchebnoe posobie* [General theory of social communication: Training manual]. St. Petersburg: V.A. Mikhailov's Press, 464 p. (In Russian)
 Fromm E. (2017) *Begstvo ot svobody* [Escape from freedom]. M: Progress, 288 p. (In Russian)

- Furs V.N. (2000) *Filosofija nezavershennogo moderna Jurgena Habermasa* [Jürgen Habermas's unfinished modern philosophy]. Minsk: JSC «Econompres», 224 p. (In Russian)
- Habermas J. (2006) *Moral'noe soznanie i kommunikativnoe dejstvie* [Moral consciousness and communicative action]. St. Petersburg: Science, 379 p. (In Russian)
- Scheler M. (2022) *K idee cheloveka* [To the idea of human being]. M: Centre of Humanitarian Initiatives, 140 p. (In Russian)
- Appiah K. (2010) *The honor code: How moral revolutions happen*. WW Norton & Co, New York. – 288 p.
- Flanagan O. (2017) *The geography of morality*. OUP, Oxford. – 362 p.
- Friedman B., D. Hendry (2019) *Value Sensitive Design: Shaping Technology with Moral Imagination*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. – 256 p.
- Gunkel D. (2018) *Robot rights*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. – 371 p.
- Morris I. (2015) *Foragers, farmers and fossil fuels*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ. – 382 p.
- Pleasant N. (2018) *The structure of moral revolutions*. *Social Theory and Practice*, 44 (4). – p. 567-592.
- Pinker S. (2012) *The better angels of our nature: why violence has declined*. Penguin Publishing Group, London. – 832 p.
- Schneewind J. (1997) *The invention of autonomy: a history of modern moral philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. – 650 p.
- Siedentop L. (2017) *Inventing the individual*. Belknap Press: An Imprint of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. – 448 p.
- Van de Poel I., Royakkers L. (2011) *Ethics, technology, and engineering: an Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, NJ. – 384 p.

Information about author:

Doskhozina Zhanat Melsovna – PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Mediacommunication and History of Kazakhstan, International Information Technology University (Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com).

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Досхожина Жанат Мэлсовна – PhD, Қауымдастырылған профессор, Медиакоммуникация және Қазақстан тарихы кафедрасы, Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com).

*Received: February 14, 2024
Pirinyata: May 20, 2024*