

Известия Балтийской государственной академии
рыбопромыслового флота. 2025. № 4(74). С. 151–153

Научная статья

УДК 378

Doi:10.46845/2071-5331-2025-4-74-151-153

Коммуникативные процессы в современном обществе и науке

Татьяна Ивановна Гусева

Пермский институт ФСИН России, Пермь, Россия

lang_fsin@mail.ru

Аннотация. Рассматриваются коммуникативные процессы в современном обществе и науке. Существует множество разных способов общаться и обмениваться информацией, каждый из которых имеет свои особенности, преимущества и недостатки. Важно учитывать, что доступ к информации и участие в коммуникации не всегда равномерны, и «ключевые фигуры» могут иметь больше возможностей. Сам термин «коммуникация» известен всем давно и имеет множество трактовок. Коммуникация или, другими словами, межличностное общение – это процесс, абсолютно необходимый для современного человека, во время которого происходит обмен идеями и информацией. Используется сам термин в различных отраслях науки. Коммуникация бывает разных видов: устная, письменная, очная, заочная, формальная и неформальная.

Ключевые слова: коммуникация, информация, обмен, общение, наука, общество, научные коммуникации.

Для цитирования: Гусева, Т. И. Коммуникативные процессы в современном обществе и науке // Известия Балтийской государственной академии рыбопромыслового флота. – 2025. – № 4(74). – С. 151–153.

The study of communication in Soviet and Russian science began in the 1970s with scholars like Batygin and Kelle. However, it wasn't until the early 1990s that scientific communication became a focus of systematic sociological research. This field encompasses the various ways scientists interact professionally, including written, oral, and electronic methods, with modern technology playing an increasingly crucial role. The fall of communism finally granted access to technologies like the internet, but sociological data suggests that only a small number of Russian scientists could afford to fully participate in computer interaction. This implies that both the volume and quality of scientific communication have significantly improved in recent years, although Russian science, particularly outside major cities, continues to lag behind Europe and the United States in terms of access to modern computing resources.

An important role in scientific communication in the work of scientists is represented by the internal specifics of science, namely the process of reproduction and acquisition of new knowledge, which later become important and recognized after discussions and various kinds of information exchange. An equally important role here is also played by the peculiarities of the interaction of science with economics, politics, law, morality, i.e. with the need to organize and manage science, its financing, and the practical application of scientific achievements. Today, the effectiveness and results of the scientific apparatus as a whole, as well as various research institutions, departments and individual scientists, directly depend on the level of information support and interaction of participants in the scientific process, because accumulated experience is important for any science.

Accordingly, it can be assumed that modern science is not able to develop using only the experience of previous generations. Undoubtedly, it can be argued that the most significant for the development of a particular field of science is the process of providing each of the participants with prompt, high-quality and reliable information about the state of affairs in this particular scientific field and subject. Based on the above, we can conclude that scientific communication is the exchange of information, and communication relations, in turn, are impossible without the transmission of information.



When studying scientific literature, we came across detailed forms of scientific communication, namely: formal and informal, oral and written, face-to-face (direct) and correspondence (indirect), primary and secondary.

Scientific formal communication implies written and oral forms, according to the established rules in a particular community. In addition, this type of communication is documented. In this context, we are not talking about business correspondence, but about articles published in scientific journals, collections, monographs (individual or collective) and other publications (including their electronic versions). Oral formal communication can also include public defenses of master's, PhD, or doctoral theses, their texts, and abstracts, which for some reason have the status of a manuscript in Russia, despite the fact that abstracts are officially printed in the same way and according to the same rules as articles. All of these forms are formal channels of primary scientific information, while scientific reviews, book abstracts, and scientific reviews are secondary formal ways of information. Examples of informal communication in science include the following: conversations between scientists during work or in their free time, in the "nooks" of scientific organizations or other places of institutes and libraries. As for communication in the form of speeches by scientists at scientific seminars, conferences, symposiums and congresses, its status is ambivalent. In principle, this communication is formalized. But the more informal moments there are in it, the more productive it is for each participant of this type of communication. Informal communication often involves a more free and rapid exchange of information, which is not related to status and role expectations, and scientific communication is direct, interpersonal in nature. But at conferences and symposiums, it is also possible to illegally collect the most up-to-date information on the topic, which is a violation of the norms of scientific communication. The informal type of communication also includes electronic correspondence of scientists, communication on social networks, blogs and other forms of computer communication. It is also necessary to mention teleconferences via various means of mobile and computer Internet. They also follow certain rules of etiquette, but the specifics of virtual communication are such that there are many opportunities for informal communication. Virtual communication is poorly structured and is not associated with regional, disciplinary or stratification restrictions, but only with legal restrictions and moral and aesthetic self-restraint. Direct and indirect forms of scientific communication relate rather to the distribution of the roles of their participants, in the sense that the first form involves direct contact between participants exchanging information in the cases mentioned above, while the second form involves the presence of one or more indirect links. The indirect type of scientific communication and communication can be attributed, with some stretch, to the communication of modern scientists with representatives of previous generations in science through their publications, as well as correspondence communication of participants in scientific discussions in journals or electronic teleconferences. However, in science, both in the past and in the present, disciplinary communication groupings are traditionally formed (named differently by different authors - local scientific communities, "invisible colleges, etc.). They have different levels, but at least two. "The first level consists of the so-called "key figures" - representatives of the scientific elite, who are directly connected to each other across the entire community of a given subject area. They are members of the editorial boards of leading journals, are members of the governing bodies of professional associations, and maintain constant personal contacts." Today, we add, they have been distributing grants from various foundations in this scientific discipline for a long time as experts from different foundations or members of expert councils. Because of this, they naturally have significant information advantages over the rest of the disciplinary community. The second level is formed by those who are usually grouped on the spot around each key figure – employees of the department, department, graduate students, who, through the leader, indirectly find themselves connected with all other participants in communication and also receive information, but in a measured manner. The third level is formed by nonresident or foreign scientists, who are informationally connected to the first two levels in different ways. Informatization of society and science has not destroyed this traditional structure, has not led to systemic changes, although the use of electronic communication methods has significantly accelerated the passage of information, increased its bandwidth and volume.

The specificity of communication in science is determined by the orientation of scientific work as a kind of spiritual production to the production of a non-standard, previously unknown product - new scientific knowledge. In our opinion, it is necessary to identify the following blocks of moral problems of scientific communication: ethics of scientific research, ethics of scientific publication and co-authorship, ethics of scientific discussion, polemic, scientific criticism.

As for the research process, the key ethical points here are related with the motivation to enter science and the choice of this particular research topic, the choice of research methods, methods of

verification and examination of the data obtained. There is always a moral or immoral choice in them, which is manifested in the researcher's attitude to the object of research, to his colleagues, to the results of their work, in assessments and judgments, in behavior.

The forms of communication in science vary and have different effects on the effectiveness of research. All the real and potential advantages of direct contacts can turn into barriers for scientists to understand each other due to the fact that live communication, as a rule, is associated with strong emotions and, consequently, with strong psychological pressure from opponents on each other. Olympic calm and academicism disappear in the dispute, which changes the course of rational evaluation activities and not always in a positive way. Irritation, labeling, and the use of disparaging comparisons, epithets, and labels interfere with logical reasoning, and sometimes replace it. When reading a text, emotions remain with themselves, and in a written dispute, in a response article or book, it is possible to provide more convincing counterarguments, arguments, etc. Moreover, it is the reading of texts that opens up a real scope for all forms of dialogical interaction, since it allows any scientist to choose a circle of interlocutors, allies and possible opponents, to conduct a dialogue and discussion with them, while at the same time remaining alone with their own thoughts. Only the written form of the communication dialogue allows us to polish and bring to a certain level of logic and persuasiveness the author's argumentation.

List of sources

1. Березин, В. М. Массовая коммуникация: сущность, каналы // Действия. – Серия: Практическая журналистика. – Москва : РИП-холдинг, 2010. – 130 с.
2. Данилина, Ю. А. Трансформация коммуникативных технологий на современном этапе развития информационного общества (на примере рекламы и «паблик рилейшнз») : автореф. дисс. ... канд. социол. наук. – Москва : 2009. – 300 с.
3. Дзялошинский, И. М. Деловые коммуникации. теория и практика : учебник для бакалавров / И. М. Дзялошинский, М. А. Пильгун. – Люберцы : Юрайт, 2016. – 433 с.
4. Емельянова, Н. Н. Научные коммуникации: к проблеме демаркации границ публичности. – Москва : Философская мысль, 2014. – № 11. – С. 85.
5. Коноваленко, М. Ю. Теория коммуникации : учебник для бакалавров / М. Ю. Коноваленко, В. А. Коноваленко. – Москва : Юрайт, 2013. – 415 с.
6. Медведева, С. М. От научного творчества к популяризации науки: теоретическая модель научной коммуникации // Вестник МГИМО – Университета: журнал. – 2014. – № 4(37). – С. 284.
7. Решетникова, Е. В. Научные коммуникации: эволюция форм, принципов организации [Электронный ресурс]. – Новосибирск : Сибирский государственный университет телекоммуникации и информатики, 2014. – 120 с.
8. Чамкин, А. С. Основы коммуникологии (теория коммуникации) : учебное пособие / А. С. Чамкин. – Москва : НИЦ ИНФРА-М, 2013. – 350 с.
9. Шарков, Ф. И. Основы теории коммуникации. – Москва : Социальные отношения, Перспектива, 2009. – 248 с.

Информация об авторе

Т. И. Гусева – старший преподаватель.

Статья поступила в редакцию 01.10.2025; одобрена после рецензирования 01.11.2025; принята к публикации 07.11.2025.