

Review of: "Methodological principles of research of social communication processes"

Olena Vadymivna Klymentova¹

¹ National Taras Shevchenko University of Kiev

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of the article:

Methodological principles of research of social communication processes

The proposal of new scientific methodologies and analytical tools is always an event in scientific discourse. New knowledge finds its way to followers more easily if it represents a formed concept. In this regard, I would like to give some advice to the author of the article.

- I suggest making certain changes to the order of presentation of the text of the article. Perhaps, before the analytical part, it is worth stating the purpose of the research, what tasks were set to achieve it and on what material the research was conducted. This is partially presented in another section of the text, near the end of the article. I suggest submitting it at the very beginning of the article. This will add to the perception of the analytical material and clarify the author's logic for solving the problem.

There are certain questions regarding the source base of the research. The author notes that the theory and methodology of social communications have been actively formed over the past 15 years. Because of this, the question arises: does the situation that developed 50 years before this period reflect modern trends? Does it have a diagnostic value for solving the problem?

- Perhaps it is worth arguing chronological parameters in the choice of analytical material.

The author notes that «Today, among scientists who study social communications in detail as processes of regulation of information exchange for the functioning of society, there is a stable understanding of the instability and low level of effectiveness of the involved methodological tools». To confirm this opinion, the author refers to works in which researchers use a large number of various methodological tools. At the same time, the main semantic marker of compliance with the set goal is the phrase "social communication". It seems to me that this is a very formal approach.

- In this part of the article, clear author's definitions explaining the logic of combining such different approaches to the study of information influence should be added.

In the greater part of the article, the author continues to consider various methods, different definitions of social

communications as a science, objects of its study and information technologies, etc. However, the description lacks phrases that focus attention on the specifics of information technologies. A large array of such eclectic information creates a chaotic perception.

- It is worth explaining these methods through the prism of the author's definitions.

Most of the article is a description of the methods without analyzing the level of their universality and application conditions. In my subjective opinion, the available contexts objectify the conclusion about the imperfection of these methods, since they are not rooted in the informational, quantum, and holistic model of the universe, which the author develops.

- Perhaps this concept should be presented more broadly.

The chaotic perception also takes place in relation to the parameters of influence. Methods are represented by the state of communication participants, communicative situations, means of information influence, social effects, pathological effects in interpersonal communication, etc.

- In my opinion, it would be good to choose one analytical model to represent the methods.

If I understand the author's logic correctly, many methods create a problematic research situation. I am impressed by the hypothesis about the possibility of applying the holistic method. At the same time, the author's presentation of this method does not make it possible to understand what prospects this method has for the study of objects of social communication.

- This aspect should be revealed more convincingly.

I wish the author inspiration in editing the article. I am convinced that scientific statements acquire maximum transparency precisely at this stage. Complex theories become simple and understandable not only to us, but also to a large number of people. Good luck!