

Olga KOCHUBEINYK

SOCIAL DIALOGUE AS THE SOCIETY COMMUNICATION PRACTICE

The vision of social dialogue as a communication practice suggested in the article is based on the concept of procedural character of contemporary world, changeability; fluidity of its structures. In the frames of system theory of the society it is interpreted by means of self-reference notion (N.Lumann), communication action (J.Habermas), structuration (E. Hiddens). Perhaps we should also point out the fact that social dialogue defining feature is that the participants have no socially determined situational role patterns and hierarchy relations. It transforms fundamentally social dialogue psychological structure and modifies its social and psychological functions. Pragmatic determinant of speech behavior is focused on the mutual understanding. Social dialogue studied in the present article as a communication practice has threefold result. Technological result is an agreement, a program concluded convention, etc., i.e. an agreement between the parties, enabling the opportunity of implementing practical tasks (to implement the project, which was launched for social dialogue). Communication result is the creation of a common discourse order. This in turn means communication environment transformation: a kind of change in discourse parameters, enabling reproduction of conventional communication process and confrontation to manipulation or conflict communication strategies. Social psychological result is shaping solidarity, trust and tolerance in the society as an important benefit for civil society. From these facts, we can conclude that social dialogue is not just exchange of information, ideas and emotions by means of signs and symbols. But it is a mechanism facilitating connections between different segments of society. This is a specific form of social interaction realized as communication practice. To draw the conclusion, we can say that the possibility of social dialogue implementation (in the narrow sense as a tool for solving social issues, in the broad sense as a tool for creating social reality) is, on the one hand, an indicator of social openness (cooperation intentions, tolerance), on the other hand is an indicator of general communication disposition of society members to share achievements.

Key words: communicative space, discourse, mass media, identity, construction of social reality.

The urgency of the problem. The concept of social dialogue in Ukraine is regarded mostly in the context of relations between employers and employees. The focus is put on the notion that the social development state and prospects depend first of all on the nature of these relationships. Therefore, social dialogue is reviewed in numerous scientific works as identification and convergence process, achieving common agreements and co-

ordinated decisions in labor and social-labour relations between the entities representing the interests of the employees, employers and the state. An anchoring point of this vision is the Decree of the President of Ukraine "On the Development of Social Dialogue in Ukraine" dated 29 December 2005. It states that social dialogue is aimed at enhancing the role of trade unions and employers' organizations and associations in shaping economic and social policy, further development of social dialogue as one of the key factors of ensuring social stability, civil society development and social conflicts prevention [1].

Besides, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine approved an action plan for the development of social dialogue in Ukraine in August 1, 2006. The efforts of scientists and managers are aimed mainly to applied aspects of the problems, in particular to defining conditions providing arising branch and territorial trilateral additional bodies of social dialogue as agreed problem-solving in social and economic field related to the employees and employers rights and interests.

The focus on the practical aspect has diminished the possibility of considering social dialogue vision its features as a kind of expanded public discussion concerning a wide range of issues that are subject of interests of different social groups in particular and society as a whole. Social dialogue in the broadest interpretation can be a mean of solving social-relevant problems. Due to the latter the kind of social life providing high degree of social comfort and psychological well-being of its members is achieved or supported. A wide range of participants is considered: the representatives of various spheres of the society deal equally in partnership. Problems that are the reason for the communication are out of the aspect of labour relations.

If social dialogue is considered as a communication practice, including representatives of various communities (classes, groups and society sectors), it gives the possibility of analyzing such complex effects of social life as social relations coordination, social groups interaction, semantic codes coordination of this interaction, social values comparison, grounding social relations optimization possibilities etc. But this view means the need of understanding social dialogue specifics as a communicative practice of the society.

Thus, the *aim* of this scientific paper is determining social dialogue characteristics as a communicative practice of the society and analyzing differences of other similar practices.

Theoretical analysis of the problem results. First of all, it should be mentioned that our appeal to the issue of social dialogue is due to high interest to the social and humanitarian sphere to the society global transformation. The pace of the latter is accelerating at the beginning of the new

millennium and is related to emerging new kinds, methods and means of communication. The latter are the response to increasing social mobility, the number of contacts, meeting people of different social groups, nations, religions, political parties, etc. Therefore, there is a need of establishing relationship between these communities. Thus the attention is raised to various ways of mass communication and search optimization ways.

The vision of social dialogue as a communication practice suggested in the article is based on the concept of procedural character of contemporary world, changeability; fluidity of its structures. In the frames of system theory of the society it is interpreted by means of self-reference notion (N.Lummann), communication action (J.Habermas), structuration (E. Giddens).

The main idea of social analysis sociality on the aspect of communication society is the fact that communication is becoming its productive force (Jürgen Habermas). N. Luhmann characterized this global trend and insisted on the idea that “no social system can exist without communication, thus social systems arising are run by non-probability communication process non-probability, ways of overcoming and transforming them into the probability. Sociocultural evolution process can be reviewed as transformation and increasing possibilities of prospective communication. Society creates its own social system around itself” [3].

Thus, we are dealing with penetration of communication in all life spheres of society but not with arising and development of new communication structures and processes. It's about fundamental in-depth transformation in shaping sociality character caused by cognition of social reality communication nature, reflection of strategic change of communication role in processes of social institutions configuration.

Considering abovementioned features of modern social sciences space, social dialogue is defined as communication society practice aiming at creating social relevant trends of social life and ensuring sequence of inter-subject significant interactions. (Term “*shaping*” in the given context defines processes related to inter-subjective ideas about social life phenomenon that finally is represented in a peculiar way of problem or situation determining.)

We believe that social dialogue in its developed form is possible under two conditions only. The first is local discourses parity that exists in the space communication. It is related to the specific social and historical development. First of all this kind of practice is realized by different social groups of the population i.e. different identity groups (men, women, the poor, the rich, educated, non-educated). All of them have no need in “the unique identity”, but the need to agree as for some social life significant trends. Social dialogue participants can be, for example, different profes-

sional groups as more competent in the problem solving. It refers to professional discussion only. Social dialogue can't be considered a professional discussion, because its main need is non-homogeneities involving. Thus, discussion of feasibility and need of vaccination can be considered a social dialogue because of the process meeting two criteria. The first, the problem is socially important (keeping children's health). The second, doctors, teachers, parents, journalists, psychologists, sociologists are involved in the discussion. So, functionally differentiated society is an important "frame" for the social dialogue.

However, social dialogue is "mass" due to the great number of participants but still it can't be regarded as mass communication. The main feature of the latter is the fact that mass as its defining feature creates new essences in the communication process. Communication process participants are not individuals, but so called mythologized "complex" subjects: people, government, army, oligarchs etc. In other words, the main function of mass communication is not informing, but uniting (and after it the ones of management, keeping social status, subordination and power). This is the ground for the possible use of the most kinds of mass communication as ideological influence tools. Social dialogue differs from mass communication and is not meant to creating common identity, as it is realized in other mass communication practices. The latter produce "mass" desires, needs, viewpoints, values etc., get audiences united around common ideas, political views, values, consumption patterns, etc. Social dialogue process enables local discourses preserving, and on the contrary it is the tool for improving procedures of identities diversity.

Thus, social dialogue differs from mass communication, because it has no management functions, social status maintenance, subordination (there is no manipulation / power component in communication); but parity position of the communicants enables local discourses preservation (there is no consciousness levels division).

The second condition of social dialogue, internal and psychological one is subjects' intention to understand for each other. It means a radical transformation of social relations implementation in the industrial society mediated institutions as a mean of fixing. In other words, the mentioned intention can be realized only in the case if social dialogue procedure is deprived of the governance impact (defined institutionally) positions of participants of the dialogue.

We mean that factor that is "contrary" to this psychological intention implementation is for example, dialogue's subjects belonging of the professional sphere, because the interaction in the frames of the latter is absolutely institutionalized. Therefore, it is implemented by means of relationship regulation in clear division of functions, rights and duties of the interaction

participants. It is the mentioned clear division of functions, rights and responsibilities that makes potential parity impossible, and thus destroys the symmetry in the participants' positions. Any institutional discourse gets fixed hierarchy positions of social roles in some way (a doctor – a patient, a teacher – a pupil, a parent – a child).

So if we are speaking in more detail about suggested interpretation of the social dialogue, its specific feature should be variation of participants' local discourse. Indeed, any communication in one social institution is mediated by the objective of its activity, specific features that ensure its achievement, a set of social positions and roles, typical for her and supported her system of norms, sanctions, incentives, etc. These systems, in fact, cause normative behavior of communication participants, finding consensus, setting forms and ways to meet their needs or resolve conflict. We highlight that communication that represents the institution as a social position also serves as a tool for ensuring equilibrium and consensus within any segment of the public space. However, this communication is not a dialogue in the meaning suggested in the article because there are no symmetry (parity) position and participants' intention of understanding. Social hierarchy in the professional discourse automatically makes interaction asymmetric, and hence communicants have to be guided by the intention of understanding the need to keep to defined social roles and positions.

The term of “social dialogue” seems to be questionable regarding to the communications in the business environment. Although its subjects are likely representatives of local discourses of identity, but there is no intention to understanding, or at least it is not a decisive psychological intention. Communication in the business environment first of all serves other prominent motive – to get a financial benefit.

In our opinion, communication in politics (although there is an expression of the “political dialogue” in the Ukrainian language), is not a dialogue in the suggested in this article meaning. It is due to the thing that interaction in this context is first of all aimed at the political struggle power, establishing leadership, i.e. parity is impossible considering the nature of the contacts themselves.

Thus, social dialogue is possible only when there is a plurality of different “languages”, but without “different rights to broadcast”. The latter causes the possibility of censorship or quasi-censorship i.e. usurping pre-emptive right to speak in this or that situation, report news, make judgment.

It is important to note another difference between business and political communication on the social dialogue: as far as the first are focused on the accumulation of symbolic capital (P.Bourdieu), providing receiving further economic capital and because the intention for understanding is not crucial for them, so there is a possibility of multiple strategies of communi-

cative behavior that are derivatives from the communicant status in the division of the symbolic power, from different rights to broadcast etc. Social dialogue differs because it is realized mostly by means of conventional strategies and tactics. Although it is evident that a variety of possible strategies can be used in the first phase is the one of entry. The strategies before mentioned are adjusted according to the common order of discourse and elimination power effects of social roles and positions.

When social dialogue is interpreted as a communication practice related to the possibility of parity representation of local discourses in the common space, it is necessary to explain the need of an appeal to the discourse as a way of explication social relations and way of the analysis its investigation. The most transparent discourse in this function is revealed by E.A. Kozhemiakin, who defined it as “specially organized and thematically focused sequence of statements created in the special historic and social framework, and it modifies the pattern of subjective human experience, beliefs, behavior and inner representation of the world” [2, 98]. Two aspects are important in this definition: that discourse is a sequence of statements, rather than their static structure, and that this sequence is defined by internal and external factors.

It means that if social dialogue is analyzed by means of discourse, at the same time the problem of keeping situation of generating utterances is solved. Because according to the definition the discourse is “built in” the situation that initiated the creation of the communicant’s text. According to the fact what it is the main problem of discourse, how problem appears in it possible answers to the main questions are distributed in the discourse field; all the parameters of discourse and relations between them begin function in the social dialogue regulating “mode”. That is why discourse is studied as a local communication space, revealing itself as a way of articulation a certain social aspect, its stage in the life of society with its traditions, attitudes, axiologisms. (We mean mutually set main parameters of discourse domain, goals, means and speech acts cognitive mechanisms, distinguishing features of texts, special features of context and characteristics of communication situations, etc.).

If social dialogue is reviewed as inter-discourse space, it will mean increasing the role of interpretation as a cognitive process providing “order” establishment and maintenance in the world of the interpretator. It can be expressed in understanding communication context properties and “transmitting” the results of such cognition into the inner world of the interpretator. In particular, social and psychological factors related directly to the communicants can be an independent research field of research. Those are: the level of background knowledge, knowledge of precedent texts of all of the dialogue (all discourses), power lines and power positions each dis-

course specific knowledge code, the amount of verbal and nonverbal communication unit and the ability to use and interpret this or that code, content and level of motivation and so on.

The importance of researching interpretation mechanisms that are mediators of shaping social reality is growing. First of all it is due to the “digital revolution” that changed totally the nature of access to the messages. Nowadays text has totally changed because of technological tools of mass media in the information environment. Diachrony (possibility of saving undistorted message in time), diatopnism (possibility of transferring long distance messages), multiplication (possibility of multiple, unlimited playback of the same authentic content) simultaneity (possibility of delivering message to many people at the same time), replication (possibility of regulating effects by the means of mass communication themselves) are distinguishing features of the new text. [4, 303]. Thus, the up-to-date messages (new text) as well as text field are presented simultaneously in the space of social dialogue. However, deliberate or accidental *selection* is represented in this space as an individual way. That’s why semiosis is regarded as unlimited and the one having hyper-interpretation risks.

We emphasize that total transformation of social dialogue in the communication situation happens mostly as a result of mediation by mass media. We consider simultaneity to be the feature that contributes to social dialogue easy-structured communication situation that influences its procedural features.

We mean that free of prescriptions communication defined by institutional relations is free of established and fixed social consciousness of verbal interaction. That’s why we face a situation when there is no exchange of communication roles considering the “simultaneity” of speaking / listening (or at least roles change “I say, You listen / You say, I listen” poorly expressed and therefore has low influence on the information field. At the same time it makes minimal “rhetor’s power”). Situational roles distribution based on social communicator’s functions is not carried out, because social dialogue is the space of parity communication. Therefore power relations disappear (the power of rhetor as well as the one of institution) that usually cause hierarchy in the interpersonal dialogue. Thus, the order of performing communication roles is impossible in the social dialogue because the latter is characterized as simultaneous communication process shifting the process of shaping the context of meaning-creation into the “neutral” discourse field.

We would like to highlight that there is no communication roles exchange in strictly structured communication situation (for example, within the frames of pedagogic discourse: “teacher / student”). It is due to other reason: communication roles features of the participants are directly related

to the maintenance of their situational roles. And also owing to the rigid differentiation of participants' situational roles their repertoire differ greatly and has its own set of appropriate types of speech acts and means of their realization. So, the interlocutors can neither share situational and communication roles nor perform communication acts to each other with equal illocutive force nor express directive intentions by the same means. Instead, rigid social conventions as for communication interaction are removed in the social dialogue. That's why "normatively set" change of communication roles between the interlocutors disappears.

Some features of social dialogue as a communication practice are generated by the simultaneity. We mean that the number of perlocutionary effects caused by one message is non-calculated and is equal to the number of potentially possible local discourses, i.e. it is infinite. (Besides, perlocutionary effect can't occur in some situations as a result of non-clear roles division between situational participants of low-structured communication situation). In addition, unlike the strictly structured situations where obligatory execution of the prescription is defined by communicants situational roles (for ex., professional communication in certain institution) and their hierarchy, imposes restrictions on arbitrary communication strategies and tactics, social dialogue participants can use different strategies and tactics to achieve the most powerful perlocutionary effect.

Social dialogue mediation by means of mass media also makes specific the role of feedback. The latter is an important condition for communicants' interaction (due to the adjustment of their behavior) in the interpersonal dialogue. But considering the fact that there is no communication roles change in the social dialogue we have a specific case concerning the feedback: the process of exchanging content and evaluation reaction of the partners on the information and behavior of each other loses its immediacy.

Besides, communication loses its multichannel property as a specific feature of interpersonal communication in the space of social dialogue. Several channels of information exchange during personal communication can be used. The nonverbal communication channel plays an important role. Social perception processes influence gradually the result of interpersonal communication. A "shift into the anonymity" happens in the social dialogue and thus such regulation of communication process loses its power. On the other hand, representation of the personality as the "top" one is often in the local discourse. In future the specific features of discourse and messages initiating are identified with before mentioned personality.

Thus, social dialogue in contrast to the interpersonal one is characterized by: 1) the lack of communication roles change, 2) a plurality perlo-

cutionary effects for one communicative act 3) the lack of immediate feedback and consequently hyper-interpretation risks.

Finally, we emphasize that social dialogue studied in the present article as a communication practice, has triple result.

Technological result is an agreement, a program concluded convention, etc., i.e. an agreement between the parties, enabling the opportunity of implementing practical tasks (to implement the project, which was launched for social dialogue).

Communication result is the creation of a common discourse order. This in turn means communication environment transformation: a kind of change in discourse parameters, enabling reproduction of conventional communication process and confrontation to manipulation or conflict communication strategies.

Social psychological result is shaping solidarity, trust and tolerance in the society as an important benefit for civil society.

Thus, we can conclude that social dialogue is not just exchange of information, ideas and emotions by means of signs and symbols. But it is a mechanism facilitating connections between different segments of society. This is a specific form of social interaction realized as communication practice.

CONCLUSIONS

To summarize, our opinion is that the need for social dialogue and expansion of social functions of communication are caused by multiple factors i.e. the movement of society towards post-industrial stage, increasing trends of communities' differentiation and de-universalization as well as identities diversification. Different genres of discourse in general and multiple local discourses participation in particular make favourable conditions for achieving common constellation of meanings of communicative action as well as possibility of social convention. Thus, the possibility of social dialogue implementation (in the narrow sense as a tool for solving social issues, in the broad sense as a tool for creating social reality) is, on the one hand, an indicator of social openness (cooperation intentions, tolerance), on the other hand is an indicator of general communication disposition of society members to share achievements.

Social dialogue defining feature is that the participants have no socially determined situational role patterns and hierarchy relations. It transforms fundamentally social dialogue psychological structure and modifies its social and psychological functions. Pragmatic determinant of speech behavior is focus on the mutual understanding.

Thus, communication process dynamics in the social dialogue appears as an open field for new research. In fact there is no clear answer the question of the mechanisms "serving" the process of creating social world

considering the features we mentioned? We consider attention to the interaction of the individual parts of “social designer” will enable deeper understanding the process of social reality creation.

Finally, we note that social dialogue interpretation as “teamwork” with communication space will enable highlighting some specific features of local discourses interaction defining creating social psychological and ethical effects. In practical terms this approach opens access to regulation the dialogue by means of management strategies and communication tactics.

References:

1. On the Development of Social Dialogue in Ukraine: Decree of the President of Ukraine. Dated December 29, 2005 // Government Courier. – January 25, 2006.
2. Kozhemiakin E.A. Institutional Discourses: Programs of Comparative Research/ E.A. Kozhemiakin // Man. Community. Management. – 2007. – №2. – P.97-106.
3. Luhmann N. Non-probability Communication / N. Luhmann: [Electronic Resource]: Access mode: http://soc.pu.ru.8101/publication/pts/luman_c.html/
4. Olshanskiy D.V. Mass Psychology / D.V.Olshanskyy. – StPb.: Peter, 2002. — 368 p.

© **O. Kochubeinyk**