



Social Psychology of Communication: Communication as the Realisation of Social and Interpersonal Relationships

Komiljon Buribaevich Murotmusae¹; Regina Tangrikulova²

¹ Candidate of Medical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology and Humanities, Jizzax Branch of National University of Uzbekistan named after M. Ulugbek, Uzbekistan

² Student, Department of Psychology and Humanities, Jizzax Branch of National University of Uzbekistan named after M. Ulugbek, Uzbekistan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i5.2634>

Abstract

The article discusses the subject area of social psychology of communication: how social and interpersonal relationships are realised. Two important issues on which social psychology focuses are raised. The importance of the interactive side of communication is noted. The necessity of the communicative side of communication in the course of joint activities is noted. Some questions are raised about the place of communication in the whole complex system of human connection with the outside world. The essence of the ontological and epistemological model of communication is also revealed.

Keywords: *Symbolic Interactionism; Destructive Conflict; Communicative; Processes; Communication; Communication; Destabilization; Emotive Processes; Relationship; Contact; Interdiction; Fascination*

Introduction

The Importance of the Interactive Side of Communication

The importance of the interactive side of communication has led to the fact that in the history of social psychology there is a special direction, which considers interaction as the starting point of all socio-psychological analysis. This direction is associated with the name of G. Mead. It is associated with G. Mead, who gave the direction a name - "symbolic interactionism. Finding out the social nature of the human "I", Mead, following W. James, came to the conclusion that interaction plays a decisive role in the formation of this "I". Mead also used C. Cooley's idea of the so-called "mirror self", where personality is understood as the sum of a person's mental reactions to the opinions of others. In Mead, however, the issue is much more complex.

The formation of the self does take place in situations of interaction, but not because people are simply reactions to the opinions of but because in these situations a personality is formed and becomes aware of itself, not by simply looking at others, but by acting in concert with them. The model of such

situations is play, which Mead has in two forms: play and game. In play, a person chooses a so-called significant other and is guided by how he or she is perceived by this 'significant other'. In accordance with this, a person forms an idea of himself or herself, his or her "I". Following W. James, Mead divides this "I" into two beginnings (here, for want of adequate Russian terms, we retain their English names), "I" and "those". "I" is the impulsive creative side of "I", the immediate response to the demand of the situation; "those" is the reflection of "I", a kind of norm controlling the actions of "I" on behalf of others, it is the assimilation by the individual of the attitudes that develop in the situation of interaction and that require conformity to them. Constant "I" reflection with "you" is essential for a mature person, for it is what contributes to the adequate perception of the person of himself and his own actions.

Thus, the central idea of the interactionist concept is that personality is formed in interaction with other personalities, and the mechanism for this process is to establish control of the person's actions by the perceptions that others have of him or her. Despite the importance of positing such a problem, Mead's theory contains significant flaws. Chief among these are two. First, it places a disproportionate emphasis on the role of symbols. The whole framework of interaction outlined above is determined by a system of symbols, i.e. human behaviour in situations of interaction is ultimately conditioned by the symbolic interpretation of these situations. The human being is presented as a creature inhabiting the world of symbols, included in iconic situations. And although, to a certain extent, it is possible to agree with this statement since to a certain extent society does regulate individuals' actions by means of symbols, Mead's categorical approach leads to the fact that the totality of social relations and culture is reduced to symbols only. Hence, the second important miscalculation of the concept of symbolic interactionism follows - the interactive aspect of communication is here again detached from the content of activity, with the result that the richness of an individual's macrosocial relations is essentially ignored.

The only "representative" of social relations remains relations of direct interaction. Since the symbol remains the "last" social determinant of interaction, only a description of this field of interactions is sufficient for analysis, without involving the broad social ties within which this act of interaction takes place. There is a certain "locking" of interaction into a given group. Of course, such Nevertheless, symbolic interactionism, sharper than many other theoretical orientations in social psychology, raised the question of the social determinants of interaction and its role in personality formation. The weakness of the concept is that it essentially fails to distinguish the two sides of communication, such as the exchange of information and the organisation of joint activities. It is no coincidence that many adherents of this school use "communication" and "interaction" as synonyms (see: Shibusani, 1961).

Two Important Issues on Which Social Psychology Focuses

Social psychology focuses on two issues: on the one hand, to analyse the secondary socio-psychological aspects in each conflict (e.g. the awareness of the conflict by its participants); on the other hand, to identify a particular class of conflicts generated by specific socio-psychological factors. Both of these tasks can only be successfully accomplished if an adequate conceptual research framework is in place. It should cover at least four main characteristics of the conflict: structure, dynamics, function and typology of the conflict (Petrovskaya, 1977. P. 128). The structure of the conflict is described differently by different authors, but the basic elements are almost universally accepted. These are the conflict situation, the positions of the participants (opponents), the object, the "incident"(trigger), the development and resolution of the conflict. These elements behave differently depending on the type of conflict. The common notion that all conflict is necessarily negative has been refuted by a number of specific studies. Thus, in the works of M. Deutsch, one of the most prominent conflict theorists, two varieties of conflict are named:destructive the definition of destructive conflict largely coincides with the common perception. It is this type of conflict that leads to a mismatch of interaction, a disintegration of the interaction.

Destructive conflict is more likely to be independent of the cause of the conflict and more likely to lead to a "personality shift", which is what generates stress.

It is characterised by a specific development, namely an increase in the number of actors involved, their conflict activities, a multiplication of negative attitudes towards each other and the acuteness of statements ("expansion" of the conflict). Another feature is the "escalation" of the conflict, which means a build-up of tensions, the inclusion of a growing number of false perceptions of both the opponent's traits and qualities and the situations of interaction themselves, and the growth of prejudice against the partner. It is clear that the resolution of this type of conflict is particularly difficult, with the main mode of resolution - compromise - being realised with great difficulty. A productive conflict more often arises when the clash is not about the incompatibility of personalities, but is generated by a difference in points of view on a problem or a way of solving it. In this case, the conflict itself contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the issue and also to the motivation of the partner defending the other point of view - it becomes more "legitimate".

The very fact of the other argument and the recognition of its legitimacy contributes to the development of elements of cooperative interaction within the conflict and thus opens up opportunities to regulate and resolve it, and hence to find the best solution to the dispute. The idea of two possible varieties of conflict interaction provides the basis for the discussion of the most important general theoretical problem of conflict: understanding its nature as a psychological phenomenon. In fact: is the conflict only a form of psychological antagonism (i.e. represented contradiction in consciousness) or is it necessarily the presence of conflict actions (Kudryavtsev, 1991. P. 37).

A detailed description of various conflicts in their complexity and diversity allows us to conclude that both of these components are necessary attributes of a conflict. The problem of conflict research has many practical applications in terms of developing various forms of attitude to it (conflict resolution, conflict prevention, its prevention, mitigation, etc.) and primarily in business communication situations: for example, in production (Borodkin, Karyak, 1983). When analysing different types of interaction, the problem of the content of the activity, within which these or those types of interaction are given, is fundamentally important. So, we can state a cooperative form of interaction not only in the conditions of production, but, for instance, also in the course of some asocial, illegal deeds - joint robbery, theft, etc. Therefore, cooperation in a socially negative activity is not necessarily a form that needs to be stimulated: on the contrary, activities that are conflictual in an asocial activity can be evaluated positively. Cooperation and competition are only forms of the "psychological pattern" of interaction, the content in both cases is set by the broader system of activity, in which cooperation or competition is included.

The Necessity of the Communicative Side of Communication in the Course of Joint Activities

Any consideration of human communication from the perspective of information theory captures only the formal side of the matter: how information is transmitted, while in the conditions of human communication information is not only transmitted, but also formed, clarified, and developed. Therefore, without excluding the possibility of applying some of the provisions of information theory in describing the communicative side of communication, it is necessary to clearly place all the accents and identify the specificity in the very of the process of exchange of information when it takes place in the case of communication. Firstly, communication cannot be regarded merely as the sending of information by a transmitting system or by another system because, unlike the mere "movement of information" between two Unlike the simple "movement of information" between two devices, we deal here with the relationship of two individuals, each of which is an active subject: their mutual information presupposes

the establishment of a joint activity. This means that each participant in the communicative process assumes activity also in his partner, he cannot regard him as an object.

The other participant is also seen as a subject, which means that, when sending him information, it is necessary to focus on him, i.e. to analyse his motives, goals, attitudes (except, of course, the analysis of one's own purposes, motives, attitudes), "address" to him, as V.N. Myasishev puts it. Schematically, communication can be represented as an intersubjective process (S S). But in this case it is necessary to assume that in response to the information sent, new information will be received coming from the other partner. In the communicative process, therefore, there is not a simple flow of information, but at least an active exchange of information. The main "additive" in the specifically human exchange of information is that here the significance of information plays a special role for each participant in communication information (Andreeva, 1981), because people do not simply "exchange" Leontiev (1972. P. 291). This is only possible if the information is not simply accepted, but also understood and comprehended. The essence of the communicative process is not just mutual information but but the joint comprehension of the subject.

Therefore, in every communicative process, activity, communication and cognition are actually given in unity. Secondly, the nature of information exchange between people, rather than cybernetic devices, is determined by the fact that through a system of signs, partners can influence each other. In other words, sharing such The sign changes the state of the participants in the communication process, i.e. The sign changes the state of the participants in the communicative process, in this sense in this sense, "the sign in communication is like a tool in work" (Leontiev, 1972). The communicative influence that arises here is nothing less than the psychological impact of one communicant on another in order to his behaviour. The effectiveness of communication is measured precisely the extent to which this influence has been successful. This means that when information is exchanged, the very type of relationship which has developed between the communicators is changed.

Nothing similar happens in "purely" informational processes. Thirdly, communicative influence as a result of information exchange is only possible when the person sending the information (communicator) and the person receiving it (recipient) have a common or similar system of codification and decodification. In everyday language this rule is expressed in the words: "everyone must speak the same language". This is especially important because the communicator and the recipient are constantly changing places in the communication process. Any exchange of information between them is only possible if the signs and, more importantly, the associated meanings are known to all participants in the communication process. Only through the adoption of a common system of meanings will the partners be able to understand each other. To describe this situation, social psychology borrows from linguistics the term "thesaurus", which denotes a common system of meanings accepted by all members of a group. But the point is that even knowing the meanings of the same words, people may not understand them in the same way: social, political, age differences may be a reason for this. As far back as L.S. Vygotsky noted that thought is never equal to the direct meaning of words. Therefore, communicators must not only have identical lexical and syntactic systems - in the case of sound speech - but also an identical understanding of the situation of communication.

And this is only possible if communication is included in some general system of activity. This is well explained by J. Miller using an everyday example. It seems essential for us to make some distinction between interpreting an utterance and understanding it, because understanding is usually facilitated by something other than the linguistic context associated with that particular utterance. The husband, greeted at the door by his wife's words: "I bought some light bulbs today", should not limit himself to their Fourthly and finally, very specific communicative barriers can arise in human communication. They are not related to vulnerabilities in any channel of communication or to coding and decoding errors, but are social or psychological in nature. On the one hand, these barriers may arise due to a lack of understanding

of the communication situation, caused not just by the different language spoken by the participants in the communication process, but by deeper differences that exist between the partners. These may include social, political, religious, and professional differences which not only give rise to a different interpretation of the same concepts used in communication, but also, in general, a different worldview, world outlook, and world understanding.

Such barriers are caused by objective social reasons and by the belonging of communication partners to different social groups, and their manifestation makes especially clear the inclusion of communication in a broader system of social relations. Communication in this case demonstrates its characteristic that it is only a facet of communication. Naturally, the process of communication also takes place in the presence of these barriers: even military adversaries negotiate. On the other hand, communication barriers can also be of a more purely psychological nature. They may arise either due to the individual psychological characteristics of the communicants (e.g., excessive shyness in one of them (Zimbaro, 1993), secrecy in another, the presence of a trait called "uncommunicative" in some), or due to a particular kind of psychological relationship between the a special kind of psychological relationship: animosity towards each other dislike and distrust etc.

In this case, the link that exists between communication and attitude is particularly clear, that exists between communication and attitude, which, naturally, does not exist in cybernetic systems. All this makes it possible to raise the issue of communication training in a completely different way, for example, in the context of socio-psychological training, which will be discussed in more detail below. The above-mentioned features of human communication do not allow it to be considered only in terms of information theory. Some of the terms used to describe this process from this theory always require a certain rethinking, at least of the adjustments discussed above. However, this does not preclude the possibility of borrowing a number of concepts from information theory. For example, when constructing a typology of communicative processes, it is useful to use the concept of "directionality of signals". In the theory of communication, this term allows us to distinguish: a) axial communicative process (from Latin axis), when signals directed to single receivers of information, i.e. individuals. b) retial communicative process (from Latin rete - network), when signals are directed to a set of probable addressees (Brudny, 1977, p. 39). In the era of scientific and technological progress due to the gigantic development of the media mass media, the study of retinal Communication processes. As in this case sending signals to a group makes group members aware of their belonging to this group, therefore in the case of retinal communication there is also not just a transmission of information, but also social orientation of the participants of the communicative process. This also shows that the essence of the process cannot be described in terms of This also demonstrates that the essence of the process cannot be described in terms of information theory alone.

The dissemination of information takes place through a kind of filter of "trust" and "distrust". The dissemination of information in society takes place through a kind of filter of "trust" and "distrust". This filter operates in such a way that absolutely true information may not be accepted, and false information may be accepted. It is psychologically very important to find out under what circumstances a particular channel of information can be blocked by this filter, and to identify the means that help the information be accepted and those that weaken the filters, which weaken the effects of the filters. The totality of these means is called fasciation. As fasciation, there are a variety of collateral The information can be used as a "transporter", an accompanying medium, which creates some additional background against which the main information wins, because the background partially overcomes the filter of distrust. An example of fasciation would be the musical accompaniment of a speech, or the spatial or colour accompaniment of a speech. The information coming from the communicator itself can be of two types: prompting and ascertaining. Incentive information is expressed in the form of an order, advice, a request. It is designed to stimulate an action. The incentive may be of different types. First of all, it may be an activation, i.e. an

incitement to action in a given direction. Secondly, it may be interdiction, i.e. a stimulus to prevent certain actions, or a prohibition of undesirable activities. Finally, it can be destabilisation - a misalignment or disruption of certain autonomous behaviours or activities. The information which comes in the form of a message, it occurs in various educational systems and does not imply a direct change of behaviour, although it indirectly contributes to it.

The nature of the message itself can vary: the degree of objectivity can range from a deliberately "indifferent" tone of presentation to the inclusion of fairly explicit elements of persuasion in the text of the message. The communicator, i.e. the person from whom the information originates, determines the message. The place of communication in the whole complex system of human relations with the outside world. The analysis of the connection between social and interpersonal relations allows us to set the right accents in the question of the place of communication in the whole complex system of man's relations with the outside world. First, however, it is necessary to say a few words about the problem of communication in general. The solution to this problem is very specific within the framework of domestic social psychology. The term "communication" itself has no exact analogue in traditional social psychology, not only because it is not fully equivalent to the commonly used English term "communication," but also because its content can only be considered in the conceptual vocabulary of a special psychological theory, namely the theory of activity.

Of course, in the structure of of communication, which will be examined below, may be distinguished by such of its sides of it that are described or investigated in other systems of socio-psychological knowledge. However, the essence of the problem, as it is posed in domestic social psychology, is fundamentally different. Both series of human relations, social and interpersonal, are revealed and realized precisely in communication. Thus, communication is rooted in the very material activity of individuals. Communication is the realisation of the whole system of human relations. "Under normal circumstances, a person's relations to the surrounding objective world are always mediated by his or her relation to people, to society" (Leontiev, 1975. P. 289), i.e., they are included in communication. Here, it is especially important to emphasise the idea that real communication not only gives interpersonal relations of people, i.e. not only their emotional attachments, dislike and other things are revealed, but also social, i.e. impersonal in nature, relations are embodied in the fabric of communication. The manifold relations of human beings are not covered by interpersonal contact alone: a person's position beyond the narrow limits of interpersonal relations, in a wider social system, where his place is not determined by the expectations of the individuals interacting with him, also requires a certain construction of his system of relations, and this process can only be realised in communication as well. Human society is inconceivable outside of communication. Communication acts in it as a way of cementing individuals and, at the same time, as a way of developing these individuals themselves. Hence the existence of communication... as both the reality of social relations and the reality of interpersonal relations. Apparently, this enabled Saint-Exupéry to paint a poetic image of communication as "the only luxury that man has". Naturally, each series of relationships is realised in specific forms of communication.

Communication as a realization of interpersonal relations is a process more studied in social psychology, while communication between groups is rather studied in sociology. Communication, including in the system of interpersonal relations, is forced by the joint life of people, so it must be carried out in a wide variety of interpersonal relations, i.e. given both in the case of positive and negative attitude of one person to another. The type of interpersonal relationship is not indifferent to the way communication is constructed, but it exists in specific forms, even when the relationship is extremely acute. The same applies to the characterisation of macro-level communication as the realisation of social relations. And in this case, whether groups or individuals communicate with each other as representatives of social groups, the act of communication must inevitably take place, forced to take place, even if the groups are antagonistic. This dual understanding of communication - in a broad and narrow sense - stems from the very logic of understanding the relationship between interpersonal and social relations. Here it

is appropriate to appeal to Marx's idea that communication is an unconditional companion of human history (in this sense we can speak of the significance of communication in the "phylogenesis" of society) and, at the same time, an unconditional companion in everyday activity, in everyday contacts between people (see A.A. Leontiev, 1973). In the first plane, we can trace the historical change of forms of communication, i.e. their change as society develops along with the development of economic, social and other social relations. Here The most difficult methodological question is solved here: how does a process appear in the system of of impersonal relations is a process which, by its nature, requires the participation of individuals?

As a representative of a certain social group, a person communicates with another representative of another social group and simultaneously realises two kinds of relations: both impersonal and personal. A farmer, when selling a commodity at the market, receives a certain amount of money for it, and money here acts as the most important means of communication in the system of social relations. At the same time, this same peasant bargains with the buyer and thus "personally" communicates with him, and the means of this communication is human speech. On the surface of the phenomena there is a form of direct communication - communication, but behind it there is communication forced by the very system of social relations, in this case by the relations of commodity production. In the socio-psychological analysis it is possible to abstract from the "second plan", but in real life this "second plan" of communication is always present. Although it is itself a subject of research mainly in sociology, it must also be taken into account in the socio-psychological approach.

The Essence of the Ontological and Epistemological Model of Communication

In social practice, communication is an ontological form of mental existence, relevant in its content to the psychological activity of the subjects of social interaction. Communication reproduces the content of human psychology in its entirety and integrity. Naturally, the question arises about the representation of this wholeness in scientific research. For this purpose, it is necessary to refer to the model construction of communication as a subject of cognition. Among the basic methodological models, ontological and epistemological models of cognition are considered. The former represents the phenomenological content of the subject as some complete integrity in the objectified forms of its existence. The gnoseological model reproduces the logic of the cognitive process in research activities in the system of key concepts. The ontological model of communication first appeared in the practice of theatrical art, theoretical representation of which was made by K.S.Stanislavsky in "The actor's work on himself" in 1948.

He believed that at the heart of artists' professional skill lies the ability to psychotechnically activate the natural patterns of "organic communication" in the subconscious. This requires observing all the "moments" of communication on stage, which correspond to the "stages" of life's communication. Subjecting the natural process of communication to technological analysis, Stanislavsky identified five stages in the ontological model of communication. 1. "The moments of the artist's exit ... looking at all those present, orienting himself in his surroundings and choosing an object ...". 2. "The moments of approaching the object, attracting its attention by means of actions sharply conspicuous ...". 3. "Moments of probing the soul of an object with the tentacles of the eyes, preparing that soul for ... perception of the subject's thoughts, feelings and visions ...". 4. "Moments of transmitting one's visions to the object by means of beaming, voice, words, intonation, devices; the desire and attempt to make the object not only hear, understand, but also see with the inner vision what and how the communicating subject himself sees ...". 5. "The moment of the object's response and the reciprocal exchange of ray-emission and ray-perception of mental currents ...".

This model reveals the one-way path of the subject to the object of communication, and only in the last stage is the complicity of both parties in this process considered. While psychological science considers the subject-subject determinacy of psychological phenomena of communication as determinant. This points to interaction as the essence of communication. This model has been used to systematize and interpret psychological phenomena of communication and construct its integrity. Empirical data from scientific research allow us to edit the names and substantive content of these stages of communication. The first stage is the "choice of a partner for interaction". In stage behaviour it is associated with the moment when the artist enters the stage. This is the stage of choosing a potential subject of social interaction. It begins with the process of human perception, which is subordinated to the goal of selecting a partner for joint life activity. Therefore, in the process of perceiving a potential partner, we try to clarify those qualities which we need in him as a subject of a concrete situation of social interaction. This transforms the psychophysical perception of a person into a predictive perception. In order to choose a partner, one has to distinguish him or her from the background of other people - to see him or her and understand his or her personal potential. This process is subject to the psychophysical laws of perception in accordance with the thresholds of distinction, recognition and recognition.

At the same time, the partner's personality is psychologically interpreted in terms of the qualities required for successful interaction, and the resulting assessment of emotional and aesthetic appeal, psychological qualities, business potential and social status is made. All of this is included in an exclusive psychological portrait that functions as a first impression. The second stage is the "manifestation of oneself to the partner". Stanislavski associated it with the moment of attracting the partner's attention, so that the contact necessary for communication arises. For this, the person initiating communication must first distinguish himself from other people, declare to the potential partner his interest in him and present his merits for the intended social interaction. It is the stage of presenting oneself to others that has been thoroughly developed in public practice of social interaction. The results of these developments constitute the content of image-maker technologies for shaping a positive attitude towards oneself. This stage is subordinated to the tasks of education and maintaining contact, without which communication is impossible. This requires presenting oneself as an "interesting" person, and the interest must be mutual. The third stage is "formation of psychological acceptance of each other by the partners". This stage, according to Stanislavsky, is aimed at preparing the 'partner's soul' for the perception of the thoughts, feelings and visions of the subject of communication. He refers to the "tentacles of the eyes" as the means of such preparation. He believed that communication at this stage was direct from soul to soul through the eyes. However, it is more complicated than that. The fact is that in the processes of communication, the mere visual perception of people communicating turns into an "emotive gaze" that expresses a person's attitude towards a person. In communication processes, partners confidently note a wicked or disposing gaze. Research has found that an important quality of facial features is their expression.

It turns out that the eyes do not only look, but also express some internal states of the subjects of communication and their attitude towards each other. In the expression of gaze is read the evaluative relationship of partners. In scientific psychology we can talk about psychological mechanisms of influence, among which are studied emotional contagion, suggestion, hypnosis, based on the unconscious sphere of the psyche. The tools of influence are not "tentacles of the eyes", but expressive (expressive) behaviour of a person, which he manifests in facial expressions, gestures, intonation, poses and all other bodily movements, as well as in speech. The various forms of these tools contain psychological content as a symbolic message of the people communicating. At this stage, both partners play the role of both correspondents and recipients of a psychological transaction. The conscious influence includes persuasion and various forms of coercion - either as educational measures or as punitive measures to put the partner in his/her place. This is already designed for the rational potentials of human mental organisation. Messages here are transformed into statements and message texts, where cognitive rationalization begins to dominate over the emotive processes of communication. At this stage, the psychological attunement of partners to the situation of social interaction and the formation of psychological readiness to accept the

partner's attitudes to forthcoming cooperation take place. The fourth stage is the "exchange of knowledge, thoughts, feelings, plans".

According to Stanislavsky, at this stage the subjects of communication seek to convey their visions to the partner in order to be understood and accepted. There is extensive informational communication up to and including intemperate revelation. The goal is absolute understanding and agreement for the sake of psychological unity. As a result, motives, attitudes, each other's world view, and many other psychological factors that can affect the psychological compatibility of partners and the sustainability of their group formation become clearer. This stage takes the form of an ongoing dialogue, which continues even in the physical absence of the partner. The outcome of communication at this stage is transformed into agreement-disagreement, trust-distrust, friendship-hate, and many others. The fifth stage is "relationship building". Relationships are of particular value in people's life together. They emerge and function in the processes of communication, characterising the psychological outcome of social interaction. The partners reach this result through a complex collision of psychological activities of communication. This process begins with the emergence of an attitude of "acceptance and rejection" of each other by the partners, first on the basis of the reflection of emotional and aesthetic standards of appearance. Then this relation is censored by psychological cognition and understanding of partners' pragmatically important qualities.

The gnoseological model of communication contains a range of problems interconnected by cause-and-effect relationships that form a chain of basic phenomena of communication as a special form of activity of interacting subjects. It includes contacts, channels of communication, signs, meanings, meaning, relations, forms of manifestation, personality. This chain of problems is reproduced in any process of communication. It begins with contacts and everything that happens in it is interiorized by partners of social interaction in psychological qualities of their personalities and exteriorized in subject actions, non-verbal and verbal forms of behavior. They emerge and function in the processes of communication, characterising the psychological outcome of social interaction. The partners reach this result through a complex collision of psychological activities of communication. This process begins with the emergence of an attitude of "acceptance and rejection" of each other by the partners, first on the basis of the reflection of emotional and aesthetic standards of appearance. Then this relation is censored by psychological cognition and understanding of partners' pragmatically important qualities. The gnoseological model of communication contains a range of problems interconnected by cause-and-effect relationships that form a chain of basic phenomena of communication as a special form of activity of interacting subjects. It includes contacts, channels of communication, signs, meanings, meaning, relations, forms of manifestation, personality.

This chain of problems is reproduced in any process of communication. It begins with contacts and everything that happens in it is interiorized by partners of social interaction in psychological qualities of their personalities and exteriorized in subject actions, non-verbal and verbal forms of behavior. Contact is a prerequisite for communication. Contact can be direct, based on the physical perception of the other, and mediated by other people, object communication, and technical means of communication. In all cases, contact involves feedback, without which communication cannot be called communication. Addressing and responding are the basic actions of implementing feedback between partners. In one partner's address there is already a response to the other partner's address. This is possible due to the multi-channel interconnection of the people communicating. Sensory organs, non-verbal behaviour and speech are the natural channels of communication between people. In addition, technical means of communication have been invented (print, radio, telephone, Internet and others). The channels of spiritual and aesthetic communication include art. The choice of communication channels is large and virtually unlimited. Communication channels are characterised by the instrumentality of communication and may not become a means of communication if there is no feedback.

Any communicative act through the symbolic function of signs is transformed into an information process, where signs perform the function of a translator of some meaning. Signs are conditional forms of objectification of ideal content of mental activity, which is made by subjects of social interaction in the processes of communication. Through signs and the meanings attributed to them, the ideal reality of human subjective representations is transformed into the virtual reality of the information space through the linguistic function of signs. Languages represent meanings assigned to a systematised system of signs. If meanings are enshrined in signs, then meaning is enshrined in meanings, which connects, for example, a word as a conventional sign with the understanding of the essence of the phenomenon which it denotes (names). Through the definition of the essence of the phenomenon, consciousness paves the way to the material reality, in the relations with which the meaning of human existence is realised. In communication, such reality is presented by the partner first as a physical object, then as a socially significant person. But for this, the partners must manifest their corporeal and psychic potential in various forms of joint life activity. People's attitudes towards each other comprise the socio-psychological outcome of joint activity and communication.

They are transformed into multifaceted forms of social interaction, understood by the subjects of communication as psychological qualities of personality. Each such quality in the verbal and conceptual form reflects the evaluative attitude of partners to each other on the results of joint activities. Personality is an integral synthesis of human relations formed in the joint life activity through people's communication. Each quality of personality is a socially acceptable or rejected normative of human relations, which are determined by the results of behavior and activities of the subjects of social interaction. These norms objectify the evaluative function of human psychological cognition, where the interests of adequacy are inferior to the values of fairness, which subjectivizes human psychological cognition.

Conclusion

Thus, the subject area of social psychology of communication has undergone some changes due to the development of modern technology and the emergence of youth slang. In fact, it is not uncommon for abusive language to be formed in slang. This is happening as new cultural trends, new economic phenomena and technologies emerge. These changes, experts say, are inevitable and their noble function is to renew language, but the consequences of such renewal often have a negative impact on the quality of modern speech and the culture of communication. Slang makes it easier to communicate, but harder to understand. At the threshold of the twenty-first century, communication has become especially common due to the development of communication technology and the creation of communication theory, which studies information processes and the means of their implementation. Information processes take place in the pictorial world, in technical systems - wherever information is transmitted and received.

When it comes to human communication proper, however, the word "communication" is predominantly used. In the last decade, many scholars have been active in developing the problem of communication and its formation, offering practical recommendations. Various aspects of the problem of communication were studied by A.A. Bodalev [3], I.S. Kon [14], A.A. Leontiev [15], N.D. Tworogova [25], A.L. Svetsitsky [22], etc. However, the analysis of scientific literature has shown that the directed formation of communication in non-pedagogical universities is particularly relevant, as they do not use the possibilities of educational process, there are no unified requirements for the organization of educational work, etc. All the above-mentioned allows ascertaining the fact that the problem of forming communication is conditioned and closely connected with the necessity of improving the quality of specialists' training, that students' assimilation and application of universal, humanistic, ethical values, as well as their realization directly in communication, contribute not only to personal and spiritual development of youth, but also reveal the social and professional potential of a specialist.

References

- Andreeva G.M. (1981) The place of interpersonal perception in the system of perceptual processes and peculiarities of its content // *Interpersonal perception in a group*. Moscow.
- Bodalev A.A. (1982) *Human Perception and Understanding*. Moscow.
- Danilin K.E. (1981) Formation of Intragroup Attitudes and the Reflexive Structure of a Group. The Formation of Intragroup Attitudes and the Group's Reflexive Structure // *Intrapersonal Perception in a Group*. Moscow.
- Gibsch X., Forweg M. (1972) *Introduction to Marxist social psychology*. Moscow.
- Gozman L.Y. (1987) *The Psychology of Emotional Relations*. Moscow.
- Internet edition of www.rian.ru based on information from RIA Novosti
- Kelly G. (1984) Process of causal attribution // *Contemporary Foreign social psychology*. Texts. Moscow.
- Kon I.S. (1978) *The Discovery of the Self*. Moscow.
- Murotmusaev K. (2021) *Psychological Aspects Of Human Health And The Power Of Love*.
- Muzdybaev K. (1983) *Psychology of Responsibility*. L.
- Petrovskaya L.A. (1989) *Competence in Communication*. Moscow.
- Porshnev B.F. (1968) *Social Psychology and History*. Moscow.
- Rubinstein, S.L. (1960) *Principles and Ways of Development of Psychology*. Moscow.
- Solovieva O.V. (1992) *Feedback in Interpersonal Communication*. Moscow.
- Stefarenko, T.G. (1987) Social stereotypes and interpersonal relations // *Communication and optimization of teamwork*. Moscow.
- Vygotsky L.S. (1983) *History of the Development of Higher Psychological Functions*. Collected Works. Moscow, vol. 2.
- Zhardamalieva J.B., Orynkhanova G.A., Nurpeisova A.T. (2015) CULTURE of communication and its features // *International Journal of Experimental Education*. - № 2-3. - pp. 375-379.
- Zhukov Y.M. (1978) Problems of measuring the accuracy of interpersonal perception // *Bulletin of the Moscow University. Psychology*. № 1.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).