

KONSTANTIN  
PRESLAVSKY  
UNIVERSITY  
SHUMEN



ШУМЕНСКИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ  
“ЕПИСКОП КОНСТАНТИН  
ПРЕСЛАВСКИ”  
*50 ГОДИНИ ЗАЕДНО ПИШЕМ ИСТОРИЯТА*

---

FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

PLAMEN KIROV IVANOV

ABSTRACT  
OF DISSERTATION WORK

„FROM THE THEORY OF COMMUNICATION TO THE  
SOCIAL SCIENCE ”

FOR OBTAINING THE EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC  
DEGREE "DOCTOR OF ECONOMICS"

FIELD OF HIGHER EDUCATION: 3. SOCIAL, ECONOMIC  
AND LEGAL SCIENCES

PROFESSIONAL FIELD: 3.4. SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

SCIENTIFIC SPECIALTY: ORGANIZATION AND  
MANAGEMENT OUTSIDE THE FIELD OF MATERIAL  
PRODUCTION (SOCIAL ACTIVITIES)

SHUMEN  
2021

The dissertation was discussed and directed to the public defense of the extended council of the Department of Social Work at the Faculty of Education of the Konstantin Preslavsky – University of Shumen.

The dissertation contains an introduction, two chapters, a conclusion, conclusions and literature. The bibliography includes 203 literary sources in foreign and Bulgarian languages.

***The public defense of the dissertation will take place on 01.09.2021 from 13.00 in Hall 211 of the Faculty of Education of the Konstantin Preslavsky – University of Shumen.***

The materials on the defense are available to those interested in the Department of Scientific Development of the Academic Staff of the Konstantin Preslavsky – University of Shumen, Rectorate, 1st floor, room 107 and on the website of the University.

In the modern information society, the issue of communication is becoming increasingly important. The complicated pandemic situation confirms the importance of communication through different means and in different environments.

The interest in the consideration of communication from a theoretical-cognitive point of view is connected first of all with the extraordinary ambiguity, as well as with the disciplinary ambiguity of the very concept of communication. It turns out that there is no humanities discipline that does not study communication. History, economics, linguistics, sociology, literature, social psychology and social philosophy, ethics and aesthetics, logic - all these disciplines offer their own reconstructions and formalization of communication between people. The topicality of the topic stems from the need to describe the general framework for conceptual conceptualization of this phenomenon, which is a common philosophical and theoretical-cognitive task. Such a universal concept can be specified by the individual disciplines, which indicate in it their own unique subject or aspect. The realization in the work of an epistemological interpretation of the communicative processes corresponds to the obvious possibilities of both the reductionist and the universalist interpretations. On the one hand, there is a narrow sociological concept of communication, and on the other hand - extremely broad generalizations. The proposed understanding of communication as a special kind of cognitive process allows us to go beyond the classical notions.

The special interest in the study of modern types of communication stems from the special importance that *unsuccessful communication* acquires. This phenomenon can be seen as a global problem of modern society, which is built of communicative boundaries: racial, gender, age, cultural, political, religious, linguistic and many others. Difficulties in overcoming them due to misunderstandings lead to deviations in the proposed ways of communication, but last but not least they are seen as causes of social conflicts, as obstacles to the transmission and diffusion of knowledge, as a fiasco of integration programs. and the socialization of cultural minorities. The explication of the conditions for communicative success and the definition of the concepts for successful communication becomes relevant. This question is not as simple as it seems at first glance. Whether the communication appears as a

demonstration of its success or the communication always has a subordinate or rather instrumental character, which is oriented towards achieving some external goals and tasks in relation to the communication itself and cannot be considered as "own achievement" as something valuable in itself. In this regard, it is important to clarify not only the concept of communicative *success / fiasco*, but also the additional in terms of communicative communication, if it does not contradict and is communicatively necessary, the phenomena of pauses, silence and interruption of communication. The latest paradoxical images, in turn, prove to be an important contribution to communication.

The main key relevance and interest is the development and explication of its own *theoretical and cognitive content* of communication, as well as the reconstruction of the inscription of communicative issues in the history and development of philosophical and social, but above all epistemological ideas and concepts. However, for a very long time it was not obvious that communication was first and foremost an epistemological concept and problem. In classical philosophical teachings, although Aristotle gives the exact "communicative" definition of man as a "talking animal", we are talking about the spheres of being, not including the communicative sphere. It is in this connection that the philosophical concept of communication allows to some extent to "save" philosophy itself. Philosophy in her research on communication returns precisely to *the relevance of classical philosophical problems*:

- to the communicative - space;
- to the communicative - time;
- to the social - casualness;
- to the collective - the subject,

filling each of these problems with content characteristics and testing their own ideas on the experience of the functioning of real society and communication.

The evidence listed so far, requiring epistemological analysis of communication includes a number of new circumstances related to the development of information and social networks, as well as the application of electronic computers and computers, which made possible the "unconventional" outside. human and beyond the social and even beyond the semantic types of translations of communication. It is about the symbolic aspects of live communication, about the

communication between computers and computers taking place in our time, about the mysterious ontological and epistemological status of programs and algorithms that encode and decode the meaning of the reactions of input signals, but obviously do not "experience" "From machines (as an analogue of consciousness) in the form of meaningful experiences.

This kind of "communication" is also obviously not oriented towards distinguishing between *the known and the unknown*, the obvious images, ie. the material, presented sign message and the inaccessible, hidden in the skull, individual meaning of the message - the distinction that has always motivated, provoked and maintained communication between people. In this regard, the question of whether machine communication is possible communication of another kind, where the secrecy of the other consciousness will cease to be a major indicator and trigger of the communicative act, requiring new and new connections and formations of communication systems. In this sense, the relevance of the explication of the epistemological content of the concept of communication turns out to be related to some aspects of human knowledge.

**First of all**, it is about the adequacy of the understanding of the utterances of the other, whose reconstruction is difficult, and may be completely impossible in the conditions of inaccessibility to the foreign consciousness.

**Secondly**, the communication problem is related to the fundamentally dual purpose of any communication, which is aimed on the one hand at integration and achieving mutual understanding and agreement, and on the other - at the informational description of the subject of the message.

**Third**, communication is based on important epistemological differences of knowledge / ignorance, ie. the popularity of some information about one participant in communication and its obscurity about the other, which actually not only but also provokes the formation of communication systems and the very diversity of forms of sociality.

**Fourth**, communication is divided into cognitive communication and normative communication, but no less generally remains an isomorphic process of cognition, as it always represents a *rational choice*, in this sense - as *cognition* - between subjective and objective interpretations of one or another message, *the rationality of*

*the choice* between interpreting the utterances as aimed at maintaining cohesion - a message of the known, certifying the community - and the interpretation of the utterances as directed to the message of the new and the unknown.

### **ACTUALITY OF THE PROBLEM**

In the dissertation the possibilities for the creation of theories of communication, which are based on an interdisciplinary foundation, are considered. Traditional approaches to the analysis of communication are based mainly on the socio-philosophical, sociological and historical-ethnological foundations. At the center are the possibilities for formulating synthetic and interdisciplinary-fundamental concepts of communication as a single subject of study of a number of disciplines and approaches:

- biology and neurophysiological justifications of communication theory;
- general systems theory;
- the theory of living and social systems;
- logical-mathematical formalization of the communicative processes;
- cybernetics or management theory;
- the general theory of observations, which are formulated within the framework of physical theory and taking into account the effects that observers bring to the observed phenomena.

This research focuses on the use of the results that have been developed within these disciplines.

Considering the history of the concept of communication, two separate stories are indicated:

- the history of the term, changing its own meaning - history of semantics;
- the history of the concept itself, which is not fixed unambiguously in the form of a term, but showing some historical content invariance.

The latter presupposes the existence of a modern meaning of the word in past conceptualizations of the given phenomenon and its reproduction, where the consideration of such an evolution of understandings syntactically fixed in the form of words may fully

presuppose work with different concepts united only by their external kind. Looking at invariant semantics, the reproducible meaning that is verbalized by different words, we will not be able to show evolution. Therefore, we will try to reconcile several perspectives and consider the changing meaning of the word "communication" as reflecting the transformation of the meaning of the process of actual communication.

The concept of *communication* (from the Latin *communicatio*) is deeply rooted in European culture, language and history and originally referred to a very wide range of references - message, certificate, connections, exchange, community. Does this happen as a consequence of the Latin *communicare* (sharing with each other, let's do it together), which in the 15th century was established in the English language, whose roots are much deeper. The Indo-European root *type* expresses the meaning of something common, indicates the community of the meaning of a word or behavior. The Latin *munus* has the meaning of public retribution for merits (indicates merits, contributions, rituals to honor the dead). In Germanic languages, the roots corresponding to the modern forms *meaning* (English), *meinung*, *gemein* (German) are formed from this root.

In Latin, *communicatio* was not originally an indication of a symbolic process for translating symbols or thoughts from one to another, nor did it mean dialogue, but rather served to denote simulations of such dialogue, a rhetorical device, consisting of a reference to hypothetical considerations, in fact absent opponents or an audience, where there was another non-dialogical meaning: *communication* - meant a religious sacrament of communion, but it was not a message, but testified to belonging to a particular religious community, which does not imply a communicative response.

This concept, but not the term itself, entered the philosophical turn in a relatively obvious form thanks to Plato. In the dialogue "Sophist" the theme of the same name is understood as some kind of reasoning or "*art of persuasion*", "*art of direct speech*", "*art of speech*", free of objectivity, but focused on the reasoning itself. The resulting persuasiveness of reasoning is called into question by virtue of precisely this persuasiveness, and skepticism and doubt are inalienable features of any developed reasoning. It is from this dialogue that the so-called "old European tradition" begins, which avoids suspicious "sophisms" that require reference to "things

themselves" and somehow implies some access to the latter in their independence from their communicative discussion. In this way, ontology gets an obvious priority over epistemology, and words and language are always reduced to dubious and unreliable means of reconstructing the characteristics of things. The modern, already everyday meaning of the concept of communication, transfer or physical transmission (light, electricity, heat, signals, etc.), as well as the mutual exchange of messages, emerged only in the 19th century. The term "communication" entered the modern philosophical turn a little later thanks to Leo Leventhal (later used by J. Habermas) in his distinction between the "authentic" and the "instrumental" type of communication, where "authentic communication leads to the formation of unity, socialization of inner experience".

Such a philosophical understanding of communication as a way of some "reconciliation" between the Ego and the Other at first contrasts sharply with the "communicative theory" (mathematical theory of signal and information transmission) emerging in the 1940s, where communication is presented in the form of of functioning connections from deanthropologized units: source of information, transmitter - coding of the message, channel-medium, receiver (decoding of the signal), place of destination (destination). With such a "cybernetic" understanding of communication, the discrepancy between the inherent human communication is obvious, a precise distinction between *sender / recipient* with the fundamental differences (recipient and sender) *according to the type of access* to information that the message carries. Later, as a result of the development of cybernetic concepts, attempts were made to apply it to human communication. In the cybernetic interpretation of communication, the interest from communicating poles (sender-receiver) gradually shifts to the field of media communication, ie. to the channels for dissemination of information.

These two main approaches - the integration-communicative and the instrumental or media-communicative, do not cancel each other out, but rather describe two states of the same process. The shift in the field of media instrumentalization of communication, the interest in the search for algorithms for automatic achievement of communicative and activity success can be considered as a negative but current characteristic, including human, and not exclusively machine communication. A critique of this kind of instrumental

reason, involving the use of money and administrative power as communicative media for success, was first made by J. Habermas.

Of course, we are more interested in the concept of *communication* in its epistemological sense. It is a communication aimed at:

- Distinguishing *knowledge/ignorance* - the knowledge of an Ego that is unknown to the Other, which motivates him to communicate it.

- Distinguishing *message/information* - open and accessible communicative message and closed and inaccessible to the Ego consciousness of Another, in which the meaning, motives are localized or information is "embedded" for a message. It is this distinction that provokes all new and new attempts to validate the inaccessible meaning and significance offered in the course of communication messages whose relationship is based on understanding and misunderstanding to make, although not necessarily a congruent understanding, a choice for their accentuations and deviations. Such communication needs to be distinguished from communication in the ordinary sense, which is oriented towards reaching agreement and mutual understanding, integrating communities and socializing individuals.

The epistemological understanding of communication has only recently begun to develop. Her research partly establishes the reaction to a number of theoretical and technical responses as special responses to the 19th-century notions of "solapsism" (only I exist) and "telepathy," which set the ultimate theoretical points of communication, but may have played a major role. the changed structure and nature of communication between people in the 19th century, when media-mediated or instrumental communication (print, telegraph, telephone) began to "narrow" interactive face-to-face communication in some sense. These changes in the practice of communication do not go unnoticed in literary reflection. Given the above epistemic distinctions, William James speaks of the "great schism" as a necessary prerequisite for the communication process.

The dominance of "old European traditions", in which the *objective* dimension of communication clearly dominates over the *social* dimension, has been preserved until the linguistic change in philosophy. It was not until the twentieth century that language gained the leading role as a major cognitive tool, making communication one

of the leading philosophical and epistemological problems. Thus, in Ludwig Wittgenstein's philosophy, the objective dimension of communication is "limited" by language and can no longer go beyond what is communicated within human communication. What cannot be communicated, interpreted by others and understood as the meaning of what is said in a certain sense, cannot be given objective status (to be discussed).

At the same time and within the *linguistic* interpretation of communication, a solution to key communicative problems is found: impossibility and at the same time necessity to "dissolve" the other's consciousness in order to ensure the adequate verbal reaction of the hidden and therefore always hypothetical meaning of sent messages. Linguists Charles Ogden and Iver Richards, developing the ideas of H. Frage, B. Russell and L. Wittgenstein, try to solve this problem in fact, and not by compiling manifestos in the style of logical positivism, by attaching to the words an extremely unambiguous meaning and clearly separate the symbolic and emotional meaning of the words.

The latter would allow them, from their point of view, to give unambiguous meaning to the communication and to ensure the authenticity of the interpretation of the messages sent. Thanks to this method of communication, they did not have to choose between the subject of the message ("it's raining") and some attitude (intention, hope, fear, amazement at the fact that "it's raining", etc.) to motivate this. utterance and must therefore be presented as its "extra-objective" meaning. Due to this purification of communication, a universal basic English dictionary containing 850 words is offered. As a means of achieving objective unambiguity, universal consent is established in a universally divisible sense, which unambiguously proclaims the priority of the social dimension over the objective. All other used semantic meanings are considered as untrue (non-authentic) communication.

Heidegger considers this danger of "unauthetical" communication, but in a different aspect. In it, the communicative message, according to the thinker, in principle cannot claim to overcome the differences between the Self and the Others, insofar as the "events in speech" represent an already existing, but not yet "assigned" connection with the Others. Here the understanding of the "message" acquires special importance, insofar as the "message" reveals the world at the level of syntax, ie. before each interpretation

and analysis, ie. "Appropriation" as an initial manifestation of consent. Semantics as an exchange of semantic messages and pragmatics as coordination of actions does not matter much for the understanding of communication.

Like Heidegger and John Dewey, he focuses on the possibilities of modern communication to transcend the interactive boundaries of face-to-face communication. Compensating for the divisions that arise in this way and compulsory education, which is called to be universalized and to make common "experience" and later "culture" and thus to restore the "immediate community of experience" lost in the course of communicative instrumentalization of the Ego and the Other, but as with Heidegger, this solitude with others, according to Dewey, is not on a semantic level of meaning localized in the psyche and thinking of individuals, but in the objectively given language itself, the meaning of words to be understood. not as "private property", but as a "method of action" and "a way of using things".

Close to the ideas of pragmatism J. H. Mead tries to solve the problems with the "closedness" of the consciousness of the Other as a major obstacle to translating the meaning of the messages. In his conception, this role of mediator is taken over by the "objects". Objects are presented in this way as living partners of people and only for this reason they can be contacted as people. The conditions for communication and contact with objects are interpreted as deeper and presupposed contacts and communication between people before they have been created, abilities to differentiate the external world of living and non-living matter, socially and mentally. The "self-direction" of the roles of objects represents in Mead the condition for the differentiation of man as an object and living being, different from all other living beings and objects, because it is precisely objects that are presented as the most common carriers of many roles - sustainable and predictable. different types of behavior. Thanks to objects, man has learned to define himself through others and only later, and thanks to him, the possibility of contact with some other individuals for "communication with the Other", with the community or the team.

In accordance with these branches of interpretation, communication should be considered as the so-called "philosophy of dialogue", which is traditionally associated with the name of M. Buber, defending the "ontology of dialogue" on a theological

foundation. E. Levinas considers the dialogue with the Others as a kind of "transcendental form", certifying the mental identity of the Self. Philosophical dialogism takes a developed form in the ideas of polyphony of M. Bakhtin, which specifically appear in such properties of dialogue as symphony, multiple polarity, ambiguity of words and in this form of synthesis the Self and the Other form an event that is embedded by them. at the heart of the structure of being Particularly interesting in this connection are the possibilities offered by Bakhtin for a historical-empirical interpretation of his general scheme, which is applied to historical cultural types, where the Self and the Others are presented in different light. F. Rosenzweig, F. Ebner, O. Rosenstock-Hussey, and W. B. Bibler developed their versions of the philosophy of dialogue.

In sociological conceptions of communication, the problem of closed consciousness and the impossibility of reconstructing the meaning of the messages sent becomes a constructive element of social theory itself. Thus, in Georg Simmel's "philosophy of life", communication is presented as a circular interaction, as a transition from actions (Tun) to experiences (Leiden), as casual influences on one or another social form, for example, forms of marriage, of the respective experiences - in this case the feeling of love and affection. The problem of closed consciousness and extremely individual access to the meaning of what is said is revealed through the stable and reproducible correlations of feelings and communication:

- experiences of the beautiful - a social form of art;
- experiences of the sacred - a social form of religion.

From the standpoint of *phenomenological sociology*, the problem of communication is presented much more broadly, going beyond the problems of asymmetry of access to meaning between communicators. The problem of communication is considered in the first place, in the asymmetry of *time perspectives*, trying to understand the communicators with each other. The speaker proceeds from some, localized in some future goals of his speech (in-order-to-communication), and the interpreter of the communicative act proceeds from some "located in the past" knowledge of the Other using symbols (because-of-communication). At the same time, the times of desynchronization in the understanding of a message unambiguous in its form are supplemented by indications of the principled impossibility to certify in subjective, individual and even

ideologically extreme or even on the contrary objective, universal, generally accepted use of signs. The understanding Ego, however, always takes into account the following circumstance: that which in the statements of the Other is presented as a definite past, collective, objective (upbringing, education, social affiliation) from the point of view of the Other itself, which is determined by his free individual conception. In addition, a communicative problem arises in the process of understanding and still from what meaning lies behind certain signs, but also what intentions, desires or emotions motivate it. Moreover, communicative understanding is possible without introducing empathy. The problem is provided in spatial - temporal and personal-collective, ie. taking into account the subjective and objective possibilities in the interpretation of the signs, *regionalization of the sphere* of the living world and it is relatively *uniformly* differentiated in all participants in the communication.

In the reflection of *sociological functionalism*, the key problem in communication discussed above loses its significance - the *asymmetry* of access to the meaning of utterances in the Ego and the Other. Communication, by the way, as well as the communicating person-actor himself, is now considered as a condition for some deanthropologized event - action. However, such imposition of communicative restrictions on the goals and means of action and their rational use turns out to be impossible from the point of view of functionalism only on the basis of communication, ie. some mutually beneficial treaty (Hobbes and other forms of utilitarianism). Ultimately, compliance with the contract requires some conditions. The conclusion of the contract for the observance of the agreements will obviously not help, which means - the existence of non-contractual rules, ie. non-communication conditions for communication. Such non-contractual rules must be some structural prerequisites for communication, above all values or moral foundations of communication, standards, norms and ideals. In this case, the function of the communicating person as one of the conditions for action is reduced to the functions - perceptions and satisfaction, ie. to the ability to fix the completeness of actions and to feel satisfaction with the realization of goals. The rationality of communication and action has long been determined not by human reason, but functionally, ie. to what extent the action meets the basic

conditions or prerequisites - adaptation, reproduction of the basics of culture, integration, satisfaction with the achievement of goals.

Not without complicity and at the same time opposing the functional approach J. Habermas turns the concept of communication into a universal characteristic of social reality, which is presented in the concepts of *communicative rationality*, *communicative action*, *communicative system (society)* and *concepts of the living world*. Communicative action is aimed at achieving understanding, as opposed to instrumental or rational action, which is teleologically oriented.

At the same time, the linguistic understanding of a given approach also requires rationalization even more than the relationship between goals and means. Rationally communicating individuals are not obliged to use perlocutionary effective expressions, i.e. requirements to obey the will of the speaker, which does not mean a refusal of justification and criticism.

The concept of *rational communication* brings communication closer to the standard understanding of knowledge, which is a sum of true and well-founded beliefs, only adding the sign of *intelligibility*. Ultimately, communicative rationality is based on four concepts: intelligibility, objective truth, normative correctness, and subjective truth or conviction. J. Habermas's ideal rational communication reproduces the ideal situation of scientific discussion - with equal chances for participation and right of initiative in discussions, recognition of interpretations and arguments, freedom from administrative arbitrariness and refusal of simulations in speech intentions. It is right for such a rational "communicative mind" to define "rational communicative" action, thus freeing itself from the influences of the media, "from the rulers" - external to this mind, instrumentally oriented systems of "households" and "administrations".

The *constructivist* appeal to communication has deep roots and branches to the ideas of the Stoics with their difference *echne-arete / sofia*. The latter presupposes a distinction between propositional, informative or reflexive knowledge (*knowledge - what*) and non-reflexive activity expressed knowledge - skills (*knowledge - how*), which makes it possible to preserve rationality within knowledge - skills, as a kind of belief in conditions of doubt, paradoxes and contradictions that are characteristic of the knowledge of the reflexive.

Also, in general, the constructivist understanding of communication is characterized by a reorientation of interest in how communication is carried out and how it is generated (constructed) with the question of what its topic or subject is.

Оттук произтича „онтогенетичното” - интерпретацията за формиране на когнитивните и комуникативни способности. От гледна точка на Ж. Пиаже точно в самата комуникация се осъществява конструктивния „фундаментален процес на познанието” по пътя на „децентрирането на субективните илюзии”, благодарение, на което „субектът получава възможност да заема позиции спрямо другите хора или самите обекти”.

Piagetian and linguist Ernst von Glasersfeld and physicist, psychologist and mathematician at the University of Illinois Heinz von Foerster, biologists Francisco Varela and Umberto Maturana expanded the concept of *communication* by taking it beyond the close relationship between language and consciousness. As a result, they formulate the broad, so. a constructivist understanding of knowledge that actually boils down to the process of *observation*. Наистина, наблюдението са разбира много по-широко, отколкото е обичайно. It can take place not only within the framework of communication and cognitive processes (individual human perceptions and thinking), but also manifests itself in the behavior of various species:

- biological systems (cells, organisms and their organs);
- the brain;
- consciousness;
- culture;
- society;
- machines.

In other words, where the difference between objects and one or another operation and the agents of operations themselves takes place, there is also the place, albeit too primitive and rudimentary of knowledge and primitive loneliness ("minimal self" - D. Denet). Loneliness turns out to be a consequence of (self) observation as a process of marking due to one or another difference. It is obvious that in this sense, communication is always an observation, as long as one topic is chosen as the leading one, and all the others deviate. The communication itself is presented in the form of an observer, and this

shows the difference between the subject of the discussion and the discussion itself.

A brief historical overview of the development of the concept of *communication* allows us to say that communication has an extremely complex multidisciplinary nature, which is the result of a continuous process of evolution and presenting it as a complex set of ongoing types of activity, as the main we can we point out the *speech* primarily for:

- Expression (religious, etc.) involvement.
- Rhetorical meaning of communication.
- Search and fixation of mutually inaccessible meanings and meaning.
- Phenomenological experience for mutual understanding by certifying a common spatio-temporal regionalization of the living space of the participants in the communication.
- Cybernetics, instrumental and media-mediated streams and information channels.
- Psychological search for the reasons for communicative role behavior.
- Functional sociological understanding of communication as a repeater of culture and traditions.
- Communication as a polyphonic dialogue between people and cultures.

Communication as a special type of observation (type of observer), which is not related to the mental observation capabilities of the individual consciousness.

All of the above gives grounds for formulating the following

**HYPOTHESIS: KNOWLEDGE OF THE THEORY OF COMMUNICATION IS A GUARANTEE FOR EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE SOCIAL SPHERE.**

IN OTHER WORDS, THE SOCIALITY OF KNOWLEDGE APPEARS WHERE IT IS NECESSARY TO DECIDE ON WHAT SHOULD BE APPLIED THE QUALITY OF INCORRECT FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE.

## **OBJECT OF THE RESEARCH**

The *object of the research* is the theory of communication, but not in its entire wide format, but in a socio-epistemological aspect. Particular attention is paid to the cognitive conditions for communication - the symbolic media. These include both the universal means of *disseminating communication* (language, writing, print and telecommunications) and the symbolic means of achieving communicative success in specific *areas of communication* (truth, knowledge, power, faith, money, etc.). Moreover, communication as an object of scientific research differs significantly from the "standard" subjects for scientific theorizing - such as moving bodies in physics, organisms in biology, the transformation of atomic-molecular bonds in chemistry, in terms of its "dimension of procedures". in space and time. To limit the object framework of the study in addition to social space and social time, we introduce a special collective - personal dimension of communication, which allows to take into account its specific meaning, which we call "social causes", within this dimension actions, statements, communications and socially significant events to which different types of "authorship" are attributed as their specific causes.

## **SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH**

The *subject of the research* is the social-communicative content of the important epistemic processes and the respective concepts: truth, knowledge, symbolic means, which allow to differentiate a special type of communications, which are oriented to these symbols. It is primarily about scientific communication, which is considered to be doubly determined. On the one hand, it is determined by its own subjects of scientific interest, above all current scientific problems - subject dimension, and on the other hand, is motivated by the structural properties of communication itself, the requirements for scientific communications, the processes for extracting information from such messages, for their understanding and explanation.

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH**

- Explication of the social - communicative content of the classical concepts from the theory of knowledge.

- Demonstration of the laws that connect the structure of scientific communication, scientific knowledge with the functionally differentiated structure of society and communications.
- Considering and defining communications as a fundamental cognitive process.

### **RESEARCH TASKS**

1. Development of methodological bases of the theory of communication in its epistemological interpretation.
2. Reconstruction of the directions for development and evolution of the communicative structure.
3. Explication of the basic typology of the types and means of communication.
4. To carry out a comparative study of the structure of communications and the structure of cognitive activity.
5. To develop a conceptual apparatus of the communicative context or the dimensions of communication, in which for each communicative act its meaning or significance can be determined.
6. To make an analysis of the scientific knowledge about the subject and the presence in it of such properties that characterize it as "natural, generic" properties of human communication as an understanding and explanation of communicative messages.
7. To analyze the scientific and general communicative properties for understanding and explanation.
8. To consider the problem of the relationship between the levels of social - communicative knowledge and its specific features by comparing it with the solution of similar problems in the development of different theories.

### **METHODS AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE RESEARCH**

The following methods and theoretical approaches were used in the study:

- Methods and approaches from the general theory of communication systems, social systems and mental systems.

- Methods for comparative description of social phenomena - communication systems and communication media.
- Methods and approaches from the general theory of social systems, which are used in the analysis of interaction systems, organizational systems and functional systems.
- Logical-deductive methods for formalizing the processes of observation and communication.
- Second-order cybernetics methodology and approaches used to analyze communicative understanding processes.
- Methods and approaches of constructivist psychology and linguistics.
- Methods and approaches of neo-Darwinist theory of evolution - the synthetic theory of evolution, which are used to analyze society.

## **CHAPTER ONE. SYMBOLIC MEDIA COMMUNICATIVE KNOWLEDGE**

Chapter one deals with:

- Concept of forms and ways of communication as a basis of the theory of communication systems.
- Communicative dissemination of knowledge - language and writing.
- The axis of knowledge / ignorance as an axis for communicative differentiation.
- Telecommunication features of modern society.

## **CHAPTER TWO: TRUTH AND KNOWLEDGE AS A COMMUNICATIVE SUCCESS**

Chapter two focuses on:

- Truth as a medium for communicative observation and its genesis on value attitudes.
- Social truth.
- The sociality of knowledge and the possibilities for its determination.
- Scientific knowledge in individual and in system-communicative perspective.
- Understanding the differences in the points of view of scientific observations.

- Theoretical forms of social knowledge.

## **CONCLUSION**

We began our discussion by turning to the theory of communicative media, which allowed us to analyze the cognitive-theoretical properties of communication.

We have considered the approaches of the theory of communicative and social systems, first of all, the concepts of communicative media as methodological bases of the social philosophy of science. Of particular importance in this regard were the so-called media for the dissemination of communication: linguistic, written, printed and electronic and social means of communication on the network. Their consideration made it possible to formulate epistemological consequences of the theory of communication and to conclude that the distinction between knowledge and ignorance forms the axis of communicative differentiation in both traditional and modern societies. Using a system-communicative methodology, we went further to the genesis of communicative media truth, the specifics of the scientific communication system, the role of communicative understanding and explanation within this type of communication and social causality in the structure of scientific knowledge. At the same time, we paid special attention to the study of the theoretical form of social knowledge, which we characterized using the concept of emergentism, distinguishing it from the reductionism of the natural sciences.

Using a communicative approach to the analysis of the structure of scientific knowledge, we also focused on the specific question of whether it is possible to consider research as ordinary communication of ordinary people, which, of course, remains with scientists. In fact, any new scientific achievement with some knowledge, but also with a request for contact, a proposal for communication, an invitation for discussion, requires verification by other researchers and, therefore, further communication and the formation of a communication system.

All this in a complex and synthetic consideration of the epistemological content of the concept of communication gave us the opportunity to formulate a socio-epistemological thesis about the special connection of communicative strategies, both in everyday communication and in scientific discussions. These strategies can only

be successful if they provide understanding and, as a result, the acceptance of communication requests.

Concluding our study, we allow ourselves to formulate a number of conclusions that are substantiated in our work on the case communication-knowledge-social science.

We came to the conclusion that the concepts of communicative media and forms should be considered as methodological tools for analysis of knowledge and communication and serve as a basis for systems-communicative theory in general. In an extended form they also allow us to formulate the principles of the theory of mental systems (first paragraph of the first chapter), and in a narrower form they are used to analyze scientific communication, as both phenomena described by these concepts in their evolution form dialectical transitions: new formations within pre-established media solve some integration problems, but at the same time create new conflicts and challenges that require new formations.

The analysis of the formation of communicative media is used as a theoretical resource of social theory, as it allows us to classify societies according to media - communicative characteristics: as pre-traditional, or societies with general ignorance, traditional or based on spoken language and interactive certification of general knowledge, modern societies or on the basis of the informational nature of communication (telecommunication written languages, printed and electronic media), in which the functions of knowledge are special isolated for this function of the communication system.

The methodology used allowed us to:

- To reconstruct the main path of communication development: in the direction from integrated communication to information communication.

- To clarify the conditions for understanding communication and as a consequence of this understanding to determine the evolving conditions for accepting or rejecting communication.

This evolution consists in a special way of objectifying communication: if in traditional societies the acceptance of communication depends on the contextual meanings that a particular contact request acquires in the spatio-temporal and collective-personal dimensions, i.e. depends on an uncontrollable but obvious context, on who, where and when performs the message, then in modern society the specified context is essentially reduced to the objective dimension

of communication, ie. to what is actually communicated in this communication, as the latest forms and media of communication (social networks) also destroy the essential unity of communication.

In our work we came to the conclusion that communication is a form of knowledge, as it is an observational, selective, discriminatory, cognitive activity. Each discussion appears in the form of optional acts, ie. knowledge of the topic, time, place, participants in communication. However, this structural isomorphism of communication and knowledge is undergoing a transformation. Initially, communication is a form of knowledge, as it is an observation in its broadest sense, namely at the same time a process of designation / differentiation, ie. discussing one topic and rejecting all other topics of discussion. Later, communication becomes isomorphic to knowledge in a narrower sense: it takes forms that coincide in their basic stages with the standard definition of knowledge: the elements of communication (communication, information, understanding) reproduce the structural elements of knowledge (assumption, justification, truth). In the latter case, the communication is reoriented for its main reasons: the reference point of conduct "solidarity / non-solidarity" is changed to the reference point "known to me / unknown to another".

The communication in the present paper was considered in a measuring context, ie. it is defined in the spatial - temporal, subjective, collective-personal dimensions that form the hyperspace of communication. These dimensions or horizons of communication change their relative importance in the evolution of communication.

We have shown that the adequate analysis of scientific knowledge, scientific explanations, the specifics of scientific laws, as opposed to random generalizations, as in the question of criteria and evaluations of the best or preferred theories and best concepts is done by comparing it with "natural" "Communication, through the explication of beings of natural understanding and its preconditions. We are forced to abandon the naive attitude, according to which only the subject of scientific interest should guarantee the truth of the statements about it and impose a correct understanding. It is argued that the objective dimension of scientific, like any other communication, must also be complemented by social and temporal dimensions. For this, a universal concept of understanding is being developed, which is characteristic of both science and other forms of

sociality. Such an understanding is defined by us as a process of comparing the factual and the latent in terms of their correspondence, ie the understanding is realized when it comes to fixing the difference:

- between the explicit and obvious words of the message and the motives of the communicator hidden behind them;
- the distinction between data and evidence for syntactic forms and the diversity of their semantics, the distinction between signifier and signified, in short, the difference between self-direction (this in communication refers to the discussion itself) and foreign reference in communication specifications does not refer to the topic of discussion, ie to the outside world of communication).

It is justified that the understanding in scientific communication, as well as the understanding in all other forms and communication systems is determined twice. On the one hand, understanding and mutual understanding is ensured by appealing to the properties of objects, which seem to require mutual consent for them, ie. objective measurement of scientific communication. On the other hand, science remains a communicative system and any scientific proposal or publication can be interpreted as a proposal for discussion, as an expression of the intentions of researchers, as the realization of their ambitious ideas and the pursuit of scientific success, ie. self-referential, i.e. there is communication, not just the outside world. It follows that the choice of theories and their interpretations largely depends on the difference in the orientational observational perspectives of the participants in scientific communication. Scientists cannot understand each other simply because they are in different dimensions and recognize as "natural" different orders of things, the meta-arrangements of life. The main source of their misunderstanding, however, is this common difficulty caused by adherence to the different poles of the basic communicative distinctions.

Examining the case *communication-knowledge-social science*, we came to the conclusion that the system-communicative approach allows to establish connections and differences between the levels of empirical observation and theoretical variables in social theory. This difference in levels shows significant differences from the organization of scientific knowledge in developed physical disciplines, which requires a reduction of the laws at the phenomenal level, to the hidden micro-theoretical dependencies between variables.

In social theory, the reduction to an inconspicuous theoretical and hypothetical reality seems to be complemented by a reconstruction of the emerging effects of macro-level communication.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. The concepts of communicative *forms and media* should be considered as methodological tools for analyzing knowledge and communication and serve as a system-communicative theory. In an expanded form, they allow to formulate the beginning of mental systems (first paragraph, first chapter) and in a narrower form - are used to analyze scientific communication. The two phenomena described by these concepts in their evolution form dialectical transitions (second and fourth paragraphs of the first chapter) - the new formations within the previously established media solve some integration problems, but at the same time generate new conflicts and problems that require new forms.

2. The analysis of the formations of the communicative media is used as a theoretical resource in social theories, insofar as it allows to classify the media society - communicative feature - as pre-traditional or society of universal ignorance, traditional or based on oral speech and interactive authentication of new knowledge. or based on the informational nature of communication (telecommunication media - writing, print and electronic means), in which the cognitive function is responsible for specially designated functions of the communicative system of sciences.

3. The above methodology allows:

- ✓ to reconstruct the highway for the development of communication in the direction from integration-oriented communication to information communication;
- ✓ to explain the conditions for understanding the communication and as a consequence of this understanding - to determine the evolving conditions for adaptation or deviations in the communication.

4. This evolution consists in the special way of objectification of communication: if in traditional societies the acceptance of communication depends on the contextual meanings, which a question in contacts is obtained in spatial-temporal and collective-personal dimensions, ie. depend on an unspoken obvious context, on where and when the message takes place, in modern society this context is

significantly reduced to the objective dimension of communication - to what exactly is reported in a communication, but always keep in mind that new forms and media - communications (social networks) destroy the objective unity of communication.

5. Communication is a form of knowledge insofar as it is an observational, selective, discriminatory, cognitive activity. Each discussion is presented in the form of electoral acts (knowledge) topics, time, place, participants in communication, in which this structural isomorphism of communication and knowledge undergoes transformations. Initially, communication is presented in the form of knowledge, insofar as it is a kind of observation in its broadest sense, namely, simultaneous processes of *labeling/distinguishing* (discussing one topic and ignoring all others). Later, communication acquires isomorphism of knowledge in a narrower sense: it takes the forms that coincide in its main stages with the standard definitions of knowledge, knowledge: the elements of communication (message, information, understanding) and reproduces the structural elements of knowledge (laying, justification, truth). In the latter case, the communication is oriented in its key motives: the orientation towards *solidarity/non-solidarity* behavior changes to what is known to *me/unknown to others*.

6. Our communicative understanding of the dimensional (measurable) context is determined in spatial - temporal, objective, collective personal dimensions, which form the hyperspace of communication. These dimensions or horizons of communication change their relative importance in the process of the evolution of communication.

7. Adequate analysis of scientific knowledge, scientific explanations, the specificity of scientific laws in their difference from accidental generalizations, as well as the question of criteria and evaluations of good or preferred theories and good concepts, is carried out by comparing them with "natural" communication, by explicating the essence of natural understanding and its preconditions. We are forced to abandon the naïve attitudes that only the subject of scientific interest must guarantee the truth of statements and show correct understanding.

8. It is argued that the subject dimension, as well as the scientific as well as any other communication, must be complemented by social and temporal dimensions. For this reason, *universal concepts*

of understanding have been developed, which is characteristic of both science and other forms of sociality. Such an understanding is defined by us as a process of comparing the *factual* and the *latent*, the subject of their correspondence or inconsistency.

9. Understanding has a place in those cases where it is a matter of fixing the differences:

- ✓ explicit and obvious messages and hidden for us motives of the informant;
- ✓ to distinguish data with obvious syntactic forms and diversity of their semantics;
- ✓ distinguishing between the signifier and the signified, in a word - about the differences between self-references (what in communication refers to the discussion itself) and foreign references (what in communications refers to the topic of discussion, to the external world of communication).

10. Understanding in scientific communication, as well as understanding all other forms and systems of communication, are doubly determined. On the one hand, understanding and mutual understanding are ensured by appealing to the properties of objects, which precisely forces them to mutual consent - a substantive dimension of scientific communication). On the other hand, science remains a communication system and any scientific proposal (publication) can be interpreted as a proposal for discussion, as an expression of the intention of researchers, as a realization of their ambitious ideas and aspirations for scientific success, ie. self-referentially (meaning the subject of one's own communication, not its external world), from which it follows that the choice of theories and their interpretations depend very much on the differences in the orientational observational perspectives of the participants in scientific communication. Scientists cannot move to mutual understanding only because they are in different dimensions, they recognize the natural different orders in the course of things, the meta-arrangement of life. The fundamental source of their misunderstanding - this is a common difficulty, which is caused by their attachment to different poles of basic communicative distinctions (differences I / other, people / objects, etc.).

11. The system - communicative approach makes it possible to establish connections and differences between the levels of empirical observation and theoretical changes in social theories. This transition

between the different levels shows the significant differences from the organization of scientific knowledge and the development (physical) of the disciplines, which requires a reduction in the regularity at a phenomenal level to a hidden micro level (theoretically) for the dependencies between the variables. In social theories, the reduction to the unobserved, ie. theoretical - hypothetical realities is represented and supplemented by the reconstruction of cases with the manifestation of communicative effects at the micro level.

## **SCIENTIFIC AND THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION**

Scientific and theoretical contributions are related to:

1. Overcoming the methodological and disciplinary features of communication theory.

2. Modern theoretical concepts of communicative theories are usually based on internal - disciplinary developments of the achievements of social - humanitarian disciplines - sociology, economics, social psychology, linguistics, historical - ethnological research and increasingly they do not take into account the principle of unity of scientific knowledge. and the universality of the criteria of scientific knowledge. The realization of this principle requires a radical expansion of the understanding of communications and bringing this concept beyond the spheres of language and speech acts. In this regard, the study formulates a broad - epistemological and constructivist understanding of communication, which allows the interpretation of the latter as a form of knowledge.

3. The display of the theoretical-cognitive content of communication is associated with the following aspects of knowledge, which make possible the new and expanded concept of communication with the following theoretical-cognitive characteristics:

- ***First of all***, we are talking about the key problems for the adequate understanding of the utterances of the Other, whose understanding is difficult in the conditions of inaccessibility of the foreign consciousness.

- ***Secondly***, the problem of communication is associated with the fundamentally dual purpose of any communication, which is oriented on the one hand to integration and mutual understanding, and

on the other - to the informational description of the subject of the speech.

• **Thirdly**, communication is considered in the dissertation as the basis of important epistemological differences knowledge / ignorance, ie. knowledge of some information of one participant in the communication and its unknownness to the other, which provokes the formation of communication systems and various forms of sociality.

• **Fourth**, communication is interpreted as bifurcating cognitive communication and normative communication as a constructive-isomorphic process of knowledge, as it is always a rational choice (and in this sense is knowledge) between the subjective and objective interpretation of one or another message, t .e. a rational choice between the interpretations of the utterances, aimed at maintaining the cohesion (communication of the known) and the interpretation of the utterances as the orientation of the message to the new and the unknown.

4. Last but not least, the theoretical contribution of the research is related to the substantiation of the thesis that cognitive processes and observation processes can take place not only within the classical communication between people and cognitive processes - individual perceptions and thinking of each individual, but and through the ability to find expression in the "behavior" of various species: biological systems (cells, organisms and their organs), brain, consciousness, culture, society, machines, etc., ie. wherever distinctions are made between objects, between one or another operation and the components of the operations themselves, where the most primitive and rudimentary knowledge and primitive self-identification take place.

## **PUBLICATIONS ON THE TOPIC OF THE DISSERTATION**

1. **Ivanov, P.** The knowledge/ignorance - axes of communicative differentiation // *Annual of Konstantin Preslavsky – University of Shumen*, vol. XXIIID, 35 years Faculty of Education, Veliko Tarnovo, Publishing house “Faber”, 2019, pp. 805-811, ISSN 1314-6769
2. **Ivanov, P.** History Stages In Evolution Of Theory Knowledge In Sphere Of Social Work. // *SocioBrains*, Issue 77, January 2021, [www.sociobrains.com](http://www.sociobrains.com), Publ.: Smart Ideas - Wise

Decisions Ltd., Bulgaria, 2021, pp. 141-143, ISSN 2367-5721 (online).

3. **Ivanov, P.** Sociality Of Knowledge. // *SocioBrains*, Issue 79, March 2021, [www.sociobrain.com](http://www.sociobrain.com), Publ.: Smart Ideas - Wise Decisions Ltd., Bulgaria, 2021, pp. 22-24, ISSN 2367-5721 (online).
4. **Ivanov, P.** Objective Preconditions For Advance Of Social Work As A Science. // *SocioBrains*, Issue 81, May 2021, [www.sociobrain.com](http://www.sociobrain.com), Publ.: Smart Ideas - Wise Decisions Ltd., Bulgaria, 2021, pp. 16-17, ISSN 2367-5721 (online).