Tetiana Kryzhanovska

Ph.D. in Philosophy,

Associate Professor of the Department of Art Studies and General Humanities,

International Humanitarian University,

Odessa, Ukraine

orcid.org/0000-0002-6391-6871

COMMUNICATIVE PRACTICES IN SOCIAL GROUPS: CONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS ASPECTS

Abstract. The work is referred to the post-non-classical conception of social reality and implies, firstly, studying the communicative-pragmatic issues, and secondly, interpreting the social world as an intersubjective sphere, and thirdly, appealing to the researches within various branches of knowledge, including depth psychology. Communicative practices are studied in the first part of the work. The author emphasizes the fact that communicative practices exist everywhere in social world. The general philosophical meaning of communicative practice is defined. Communicative practice is regarded as an important social phenomenon, which has several levels of research, including ethical, moral, and deep unconscious one. In the second part, the author refers to the phenomenon of social group and marks out the models that represent certain types of relationships, connections, interactions and communicative practices in them. The author also considers the conscious and the unconscious of a social group, the concept of communicative matrix and mythical epic of a group. The author comes to a conclusion about the theoretical and practical significance of a methodological approach that takes into consideration both ethical-moral and natural-unconscious aspects of communicative practices in social groups.

Introduction.

The topic of this section concerns several important and urgent issues. The first of them is the issue of communication, which has been drawing attention of researchers in various fields of knowledge for more than half a century. The interest of scholars and practitioners for the matter of communication contributed to the pragmatic and communicative turn in philosophy in the second half of the twentieth century. Actually, the communicative issues caused the transition from non-classical to post-non-classical philosophy. Today, despite all the profound exploratory work on this subject, the concept of communication is changing. It involves psychoanalytic studies and the researches of other schools of depth psychology that reveal new meanings and give more profound explanations of communicative phenomena and processes.

What do they mean when saying or writing the word "communication"? There are plenty of meanings and they are different – from direct interpersonal verbal communication to the wide-scale dissemination of information in society and various phenomena of virtual space. Philosophical comprehension of communication was developed mostly in two directions.

Firstly – as a general, constantly existing social process that results in creating the society as a certain integrity, as well as establishing social relations and maintaining the structure. Secondly, philosophers understand communication as the generating of meanings in communicative interpersonal interaction. It should be noted that the concept of communicative practice in general is not well-developed in social and humanitarian knowledge, whereas it has both theoretical and practical importance.

Social groups as primary communities or organized groups, in which a person actually acquires communicative experience, personal qualities, gets involved into cultural codes and values have not received proper philosophical comprehension yet. However the communicative practices occurring in social groups are essential for the establishing, existence and functioning of these groups in society. The groups, in their turn, have a variety of influences on general social processes. The attention of philosophers to communicative practices in social groups reveals a whole series of features that will give a clue to some important general social phenomena and processes. Philosophical study of the conscious and unconscious aspects of communicative practices in social groups provides an opportunity for a more profound vision of the processes taking place in them, because conscious and unconscious phenomena of social life are closely interconnected and constitute a vivid and diverse image of social reality.

Thus, the main *tasks* of this section are, *firstly*, philosophical comprehension of the communicative practices and *secondly*, defining the models of social groups and revealing the specific features of communicative practices in such groups.

It should be noted that the topic of the section has a complex interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary character, so it is impossible to avoid such areas of knowledge as communication theory, sociology, social psychology, social group theory, social communication, psychology, depth psychology. Transdiscipline (lat. *trans* – through, behind) is understood as an epistemological and methodological overcoming the boundaries of a particular discipline, e.g. social philosophy and a certain intellectual movement through problem fields of the doctrines and theoretical approaches of those branches of the humanities in which the specified problems are developed. The core of this movement is the problem itself. "The disciplinary investigations concern only one level of reality. Transdiscipline, instead, extends its action through several levels of reality…" [1, p. 15]. The levels and pictures of reality that represent certain branches of the humanities or even different approaches within the same branch, become the fields for scrupulous and efficient study.

The communicative problematic and appeal to the unconscious refers this research to the post-classical paradigm of human studies. One can call it *post-logocentrism*, when the linear movement of thought is not regarded as the only possible and true one and the research does not have single-vector character. The researcher is more interested in folds and breaks, unexpected turns and numerous bifurcations, undergrounds and stops. Unconscious in this perspective not only becomes the subject of research interest, but also gets engaged in the sphere of cognitive practices.

1. Communication and Communicative Practices

Before giving philosophical point of view on communicative practices, we should define the concepts of *practice* and *communication*. Taking into consideration that the word *practice* has the older tradition of conceptualization, we would like to begin with it.

Practice is a basic concept in philosophy. As a rule, grounding on the Ancient Greek tradition, practical philosophy is understood as a complex of economics, politics and ethics. The power of the Aristotelian thought still attracts our attention regardless the cardinal social, historical and civilizational changes. This endless return to the sources of Western civilization is made over and over again with an effort to find a connection between its history and present moment. Ancient Greek word πράξις is used by *Aristotle* in connection with ethical issues such as purpose, good, goodness, values, individual and collective integrity [2, p. 7]. Aristotle defines practice as opposing on the one hand to τέχνη, i.e. the art of craftsmanship, skill, ability to artificially create objects and manage them, and on the other hand to θεωρία, i.e. speculations [2, p. 431], which the Ancient Greek thinker considered to be a matter the highest satisfaction. One of the meanings of the concept of *practice* is correlated, *firstly*, with the virtuous act that always exists in the matter of specific circumstances, in the uniqueness of place and time, in the uniqueness of the individual who executes it. Good deeds do not emerge by themselves, it is necessary to work on them. Therefore, *another meaning* of the concept of practice arising from the first one, implies the efforts that relate to the internal world of a human being. Πράξις is associated with individual work on oneself, which is done to maintain the common wellness. That means that a person is in some way determined by the practice of others. And thus, *the third meaning* reveals itself: practice is an interaction by which people create and educate each other in order to achieve a just relationship. The political organization of society emerges owing to such mutual work. Let us not forget that according to Aristotle, sphere of fair relations did not expand on those who were not full-fledged citizens of the polis.

When reading *The Critique of Practical Mind* by *I. Kant*, one can find both coinciding and contrary approaches to the understanding of practice comparing with Aristotle's thoughts. The first approach in a certain way develops the idea that practice includes a moral meaning: the world of practice is a world of moral imperatives and maxims. Aristotle used the term *ethics* which differs from the concept of *morality*, although they relate to one scope of problems. The second approach reflects the idea of the need to build a fair society, and practice is regarded as a necessary means for this. However I. Kant, in contrast to Aristotle, associates practicality with the inner world of a person and regards it as an entirely rational phenomenon. Kant made a *Copernican revolution* not only in epistemology, but also in ethics. Kant's intention is to prove the supersensible character of the practical, to clear it from the material, from rational goals and means. The world of practice is the world of intelligent will, which defines imperatives and moral maxims as objective laws for "all cases and for all rational beings" [3, p. 29].

The task of a human as a rational being is to practice with his inner world, restraining "*the pathological* element associated with our sensual nature" [4, p. 502]. Practice is related to the form of moral requirements, but not to the content of specific life situations and cases where none of empirical phenomena can serve as the criterion of estimation.

Karl Marx makes a turning point in understanding of practice. The concept of *praxis* occupies central position in Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach*. He criticizes both idealistic and materialistic philosophers for the abstractional and contemplative approach to understanding this concept. Practice, according to Marx, refers to the sensuality, the substantive activity of each subject, i.e. a particular person. Practice is now understood as "reality and power", the basis of which is "non-metaphysical character ... of thinking" [5], social activity, changing of the surrounding world. That means that practice "descends" from the transcendental heights of the moral imperative to the sensual and substantive reality and transforms a particular social subject. The concept of practice is actually negated and equated with action.

It should be noted that the concept of practice was also developed in sociology (*P. Bourdieu, P. Berger, T. Luckmann, E. Giddens, T.Parsons, A. Schütz* and others) by theoretical means of this field of knowledge. In sociological knowledge practice is understood primarily from the instrumental point of view as *knowledge how to do something. Pierre Bourdieu,* for example, believes that practice is caused by the structure of society [6]. Anyway, the concept of *practice* in sociological studies concerns the phenomenal world and is understood as actions within the framework of social institutions or organizations.

Modern philosophical perspective of practice correlates with internal moral intentions of the subject of action, as well as with the ethical and moral component of social phenomena and processes. Ukrainian researcher Anatoly Yermolenko notes: "The problem of practical philosophy is on the borderland of many disciplines – the theory of action and decision theory, linguistics and the philosophy of speech, economic theory and philosophy of law, political science and sociology, cultural studies and ecology. However, practical philosophy combines them all with the moral and ethical issues" [7, p. 9]. However the inner world of people, their relationships and moreover intentions and mechanisms of interaction are not limited by ethics and morality. Ethical and moral orientations, norms, principles, beliefs are very important, but they are not the only regulators of social practice in its various manifestations. Moreover, the ethical and moral side of human relations has its practical sources. Philosophy is interested in ideas and meanings that lie in the root of human practice. And they are ambiguous. So, studying practice from the socio-philosophical point of view is first of all an attempt to get closer to the mechanisms of meaning generating, to the phenomena that concern inner world of people, to the context of their various actions and interactions, and ultimately to their dreams and desires, both individual and collective.

Communication is a term that has today a variety of interpretations in human studies, depending on the branch of knowledge in which the research is done and on the meaning of the term that is used by a researcher. A Polish researcher of communication *T. Goban-Klas* gives seven basic definitions of communication: communication as a transmission (broadcasting, reproduction) of information, ideas, emotions, skills; communication as mutual understanding; communication as an influence by signs and symbols; communication as association (creation of a community); communication as interaction; communication as the exchange of meanings; communication as a component of the social process, that establishes group norms, carries out social control, distributes roles and coordinates efforts [8, p. 23]. The different meanings of communication are well stated in the book by *John Durham Peters*, a contemporary American philosopher, *Speaking into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication*. We are interested in the philosophical meaning of communication. But, as noted by John Durham Peters, "the philosophically richest thinking about communication, … is often found in those who make little use of the word" [9, p. 17].

Communication as a condition for the genuine existence of a person is at the center of *K. Jaspers'* attention. Of course, the thoughts of the philosopher reflect a specifically existential point of view on man, society and the world with an emphasis on the instability, unsettledness of human life, which is almost constantly balances on the verge between life and death. Basically, existentialists were critical of the existing social relations and were reasoning the monologism of human existence. However, the meanings of communication that this thinker outlines have heuristic importance for contemporary research, in particular social ones. Communication, according to Jaspers, is the heart of human nature and existence. Communication is closely connected with freedom, which enables communication, and communication becomes a certain guarantee for the actuation of freedom. Communication is the basis of various social relations, which Jaspers sees in "three complementary dimensions: within the primitive community, objective purposeful and rational action, which is the embodiment of a particular spiritual content" [10, p. 135]. The first dimension of communication, which reflects the "naive" state of people, is based on the substance of common being. There is no place for doubt in it, no place for questions that bring dissonance with oneself and social continuum. All beliefs about the world have a common nature, thoughts and intentions are standard, a person thinks and acts like the others do and there is no need in self-consciousness, independence. In this dimension of social relations, communication loses its essence, it cannot be fulfilled without freedom. The second dimension is connected with the development of rational thinking, logic and the ability to distinguish between oneself and community, to oppose oneself to others. Jaspers defines such social condition as non-personified community, "where each *me* (due to the formal membership) in fact can replace another" [10, p. 134]. The essence of interpersonal relations is the dominance of the strong over the weak.

Communication in such a community concerns the general understanding of the objective world and coordination of everyday actions, the purpose of which is achieved together. This formal rationality generates certain ideas as social constants and regularities. The community united by the idea can achieve certain goals and people due to a common idea are getting closer to each other. Jaspers regards such a social state as more advanced, but even in this case communication cannot be fully performed. It is *a semblance of communication*, where *the Other* is forced to be silent and behave like a controlled thing. True communication "is possible only in its free dimension" [10, p. 139]. Communication is the root cause of human self-consciousness, when the process of creating each other begins. Communication cannot be pre-arranged or corrected afterwards, because it exists here and now in its uniqueness. Communication can occur when the person represents himself, not someone else, or some social ideas. The true image of communication follows from the understanding of its boundaries: it unites people, but everyone must be independent. I cannot absorb *the Other*, and vice versa. Personalities grow in recognizing each other. So, Jaspers represents such an understanding of communication, in which the main criterion is the independence of personal opinion, which is the basis of a particular type of communication.

The comprehensive meaning of communication is represented in such a modern approach as communicative practical philosophy (*K.-O. Apel, D. Böhler, J. Habermas, V. Hösle, H. Jonas, V. Kuhlmann, P.Ulrich*). One of its founders, *Jurgen Habermas*, regards communication as a certain methodological principle, grounding on which it is possible to avoid many problems existing in modern society. The concepts of communicative action, intersubjectivity and the lifeworld are central in his doctrine. Intersubjectivity, according to this philosopher, forms the basis of social life. The communicative mind is *immanent*, so it cannot be found beyond a specific language game and institutions, and at the same time, it is transcendental as a regulatory idea we are directed towards. From this point of view, social space is not given to us definite once and for all, but it must be produced by our own, "though not contradictory, but solidary joint efforts" [11, p. 284], which imposes on us responsibility and does not insist on our assertiveness. A common feature of activity, which can be defined as communicative, is its distinction from purposeful rational activity, which is oriented towards the goal and in fact is the invasion of the subject to the opposing objective world. Communicative action is at the same time a linguistic process that has its own informational component, and the ethical mutual orientation of communication participants. Habermas insists that rationality, the basis of which is the goal, and rationality aimed at mutual understanding, cannot substitute one another as these two types of rationality lie in different fields [12, p. 291]. In the strategic action, according to the thinker, communication appears as an informational means of influence that stimulates particular behavior, and the language becomes reduced to the means of transmitting the information, encouragement, threats, manipulation, etc.

The coordination of activities within the communicative action is based on rationally grounded consensus and that makes the difference between the communicative and strategic action. In other words, communication is regarded as an act expressed in language practice and having rational and ethical nature, and Habermas insists on the necessity of universalist formal ethics that prefers universal standards of morality, as opposed to the particular substantial ethics that protects the actual ethos.

Let us also view the main postmodernist ideas concerning communication. Criticism of the essentialist, rational, discursive, subjective or objective nature of communication in postmodernist studies reflects the ambiguity of communicative processes and practices, and also reveals a lot of difficulties that communicants face.

The interpretation of communication developed in classic universalism, should be substituted by the practice of differences. "There are only contexts, an infinite number of contexts, without any center of absolute anchoring" [13, p. 56], when no discourse has privileged access to the Truth. The process of communication is an endless semiosis, the infinite creation of meanings, in which everyone acquires a right to express an opinion, even those who were denied this right in the classical paradigm. In this light, it is necessary to review the ethical guidelines of communication. Jacques Derrida draws attention to the fact that ethics was subjected to metaphysics in the classical era. But ethics "not only has nothing to do with metaphysics, but also it is organized quite differently, at an earlier, more radical level" [14, p. 161], and if to think about the relations with *the Other* in metaphysical categories, they lose their ethical features. Authority expressed in metaphysical categories, phrases of force, discipline or law should give place to freedom of questioning, and such freedom, that is not appealed in order to "imply hypocrisy of the answer under the mask of the inquiry" [14, p. 158]. Ethicality, namely, the practice of communication is expressed in exercising varied questioning.

Communication is an interaction, according to *Paul Vatzlawick*, an Austrian and American psychologist and psychotherapist, and his colleagues at the Mental Research Institute Palo Alto. Communication is carried out constantly – in conversations, non-verbal forms, thoughts and silence. Even when it seems to someone that he or she is not sending any communicative signals to another person, it does not mean that communication is not taking place. It is impossible to avoid communication when living among people. According to Vatzlawick, "a metacommunicational axiom of the pragmatics of communication can be postulated: one cannot not communicate" [15, p. 51]. Four more axioms of human communication are derived from this postulate. The first one mentions two levels of communication - level of meaning and level of relationship. Communication not only provides information, but at the same time it bounds the communicants to have obligations to each other, expressed in two aspects – *the report*, which refers to the content of communication and *the command*, concerning the kind of message (true, false, sincere, flattering, etc.).

And after all, communication reflects the relationship of communicants. Vatzlawik notes that the more open relations people have, the greater part of the informational (semantic) aspect can be found in the process of their communication. The more distrustful the relationships are, then more competitive aspect they involve. It can be expressed in internal tension, even in struggle, and therefore the semantic aspect of communication is greatly reduced. The following axiom is defined as "punctuation of the partners communication". This means that participants perceive communication as a sequence in which there is a beginning and end, the main and secondary phenomena, causes and consequences, etc. Moreover, for each person such communicative punctuation can be different, i.e., it is always subjective. Another axiom relates to the symbolic nature of communication and states that there are both digital (logical and symbolic) and analogue (direct and sensual) modalities. American researchers suggest that analogue communication is rooted in the archaic period of human existence and has a more universal character and value compared to digital. The last axiom tells about symmetry (equality) or complementarity (subordination) of the communicants' relations, and the interaction in a complementary way does not mean that they are opposed to each other, but that they have different models of communication. In general, communication is understood by P. Vatzlawik in quite a wide sense, as something that a person cannot avoid, and communication is not necessarily deliberate and intentional. Any verbal or non-verbal actions, conscious or unconscious phenomena and processes can be communicative.

The communicative practice, with regard to the previous study, reveals its meaning in the form of a certain rhythm, which is expressed in several semantic accents. *First*, communicative practice is present everywhere, where there is a social world. It is born from many life worlds, and, in its turn, forms and nourishes these worlds with meanings, mutual aspirations and joint creation. Language is what expresses and in some way determines the meanings, consolidates, and, at the same time, differentiates. However, without the layer of "inexplicability", a joint creation is impossible. Speech and silence, views and gestures, thoughts and desires weave a web of numerous relationships, attachments, interactions that are expressed in the ubiquitous diversity of communicative practices. In the structuring of the world, both natural and social ones, their power is shown, the main and the minor things are outlined, the semantic cores are formed.

Secondly, the sense of communicative practices is ambiguous. It is mainly determined by a semantic circle of common meanings, symbolic codes, cultural features. The ambiguity of interpretations can cause misunderstandings and subsequent actions of different, even violent, character if these interpretations are "closed", i.e., separated from other visions by thick curtains that divide the world into "habitually-mine" and "hostile-theirs". At the same time, without the ambiguity of interpretations it is impossible to exercise freedom, which in fact is the essence of communication. The informative field in which communicative practices are carried out has no limits.

It is everything and, at the same time, nothing; it is a range of open opportunities and a framework of limitations, semantic field and failure of understanding, creative intentions, unexpected turns and fear of new and unknown. This brings us to the perspective of *the Other* in his delicate, but such essential difference.

Thirdly, ethos of communicative practices lies where the different lifestyles and values meet. The everlasting human need for maintaining a certain moral order in the world, the social organization of life is based on, makes a person feel more confident. Metaphysics of self-identity and declaration of greatness and independence of thought leads to institualization of many Selves who "are aliens for themselves" (Julia Kristeva). The ethics of self-identity is possible only through *the Other*, when careful listening to one another and an attempt to find the variety of meaning in joint creation moves internal worlds towards communicative praxis as such. *The Other* always remains *the Other*. *Others* will always be different. I can show my independence only by trying to see, hear, feel, and only then – to make an attempt to understand him or them and to do what I can in order he or they to understand me. Our interpretative horizons may be quite different, communicative practices may not always achieve the goal but nevertheless they take place in a tolerant attitude towards other life worlds and in joint constitution of mutual obligations and responsibilities.

Fourthly, communicative practices of any kind occur in a certain social space. This space is created by the participants in this communicative practice and is filled with their intentions and desires, and is maintained by their life worlds. In a social space one can try to differentiate it closely interwoven various manifestations and dimensions. *The rational dimension* of interpersonal relationships in the form of thematic meanings and linguistic-discursive orientations manifests itself in the technical, instrumental, subjective worldview that corresponds rather to cognitive requirements and analytical methods with their attempt to reduce the world to elements and create objects from them. That makes a peculiar world of never-ending artificially separated and artificially created objects. Meeting with *the Other* manifests the ethical and moral dimension of social space and communicative practices. Rational goal-setting and intentions are getting filled with moral content and ethical relationships. By practicing together we create a certain sphere, our common *intersubjective* world, which we fill with our own differences and efforts to reach agreement. The construction of intersubjectivity requires ethical and moral attitude to each other, it is work at oneself that is combined with sensitivity to *the Other*. Intersubjectivity as an area of equality, requires ethical and rational basis of mutual obligations and personal responsibility. The subjects arrange their social unity in the form of rationally regulated interpersonal relations. The instrumental use of *the Other* is prevented by a communicative action that makes it impossible to achieve selfishly one's own goal. The sphere of *inter* is understood rather not as something existing, actual, material, but as a specific horizon in the form of a certain ideal. *Interpersonal* dimension of social space not only means the relations of two persons.

Personality is both an internal spiritual, existential essence of a human being, and a social phenomenon, which is formed in many respects due to the environment, including the influence of *the Other*. Interpersonal worlds are born in close relations and in common motives of the internal worlds of each person. The ethical and moral rational meaning of intersubjectivity is supplemented by the exchange and reciprocal enrichment by the values of life worlds. Such a more deep attitude faces the ethical difficulties that can be called as *inviolability of the intimate*, which requires from each participant in interpersonal relations respecting the inviolable limits. The deepest dimension of social space lies in completely or almost unutterable *unconscious*. In these depths an intimate natural association in the primeval human group was born. And whatever civilization layers occur in human history, all social entities unconsciously try to maintain this association. Collective and individual phenomena proved to be interconnected. Nature and culture go alongside. Contradicting them or suppressing one of them at the expense of another leads us to the wrong way.

Fifthly, communicative practices are not linear, but simultaneous. Past, present, future are conventional marks of social time that reflect its sensual perception in the historical perspective. The synchronism of communicative practices determines their *non-temporal temporality*. Despite the fact that most communicative situations have their beginning and end, we cannot say, for example, where, when and in what way our conversation might be continued in communicating with other people. In this sense communicative practices are endless [16]. The linearity of causative relationships cannot be determined. The past "comes to life" in the present, or even in the future. And the future might happen to be the archaic past.

In conclusion, let us say that communicative practices are born in interaction, whether direct or indirect, and reflect the internal intentions of communicants. Communication itself is rather about super-subject processes, while communicative practices are closely related to their direct participants and reflect a complex of ambiguous, both conscious and unconscious relationships, attachments, influences, etc. The communicants fill the intersubjective space with their inner worlds and, for this reason, their ethical and moral guidelines are the important part of communicative practices. Language shapes human relationships into logical and symbolic constructs, which in each language have their own features. At the same time, there is a universal dimension of language, which remains unchanged up to this day. Language embraces communicative practices to create the future, to revise and redefine the past, to make the human *here and now* bright and vivid.

2. The group unconscious and distinctive features of communicative practices

Social groups as a social phenomenon are an essential element both in the general social structure and in the life of each individual. Personalities and social groups create each other. Human phylogenesis as well as ontogenesis are impossible without a social group. The individual and the group were surviving owing to each other during a very long period in archaic times. That period, in fact, took the most part of human phylogeny.

This interrelation cannot be called dialectical, when in a wise and purposeful way on each stage of development the best social achievements are kept and put into practice. Such an idealization (both the theoretical idea and the life ideal) just skillfully masks the diversity and ambiguity of social phenomena and also conceals important social problems.

The first human groups had a natural solidarity; people were united on the basis of the collective unconscious, which preceded the individual unconscious. In that bygone period, the group needed individuals with certain qualities that raised the group's chance of survival. These qualities were built in organization of the body and inner world of a person that gradually was taking shape from generation to generation. The group needed a leader, the one who inspired and could go ahead without fear, the one people believed and trusted their children to (in other words – the future of the group). The leader took responsibility for everyone. The other side of this natural state was absolute obedience to the leader. The person was staying a leader in the group until he coped with these very difficult and important responsibilities. An important role in the group was played by a shaman, a priest who was a healer, a sorcerer, and also a magician and "whisperer". With the increase in the number of people in the group it was necessary to have a person who reported the leader's orders to everyone, and later – the opinion of the leader. The group also needed people who guarded it, who could see the enemy or prey at a long distance, who organized group's everyday life, people who could be called "group memory custodians", etc. These skills were honing by many generations and shaped into creative abilities, various talents, specific worldviews, crafts that a person had to fulfil in society. The development of language, consciousness and self-consciousness eventually led to the individualization of a person in social groups. Memory has become not only collective, but also individual. The collective unconscious as the basis of natural unity of people began to fill itself with various manifestations of the individual unconscious. Those primeval inclinations, cravings, desires have remained and with time transformed into certain dispositions, abilities and talents. People are similar, but due to these various natural inclinations, which have phylogenetic character, they are also different in their desires, in a way of thinking and even in the kind of intelligence.

Social groups are very different, they can be classified according to their size, formality of relationships, importance for a person, real or nominal character, etc. Socio-philosophical perspective makes it possible to outline some basic models of social groups depending on the types of relationships (including ethical and moral aspect), connections, interactions, communicative practices. These models have been developed throughout human history and are caused by the process of individualization of a person and strengthen the role of the conscious. We certainly appeal to some kind of idealizations and generalizations as they can reveal some common features in great variety of existing social groups. It should be noted that these idealizations and models are quite a flexible researching method.

The first model can be called *value-normative*. It is based on substantial principles, it has a sufficiently firm structure and consolidates individuals within a certain framework. Public relations, according to these views, should consolidate people to a community like a family. Those who support this viewpoint on society and social groups criticize individualism. For example, *G. Hegel* considered a mistake the process of separating a person from his position in an organized society, where he or she has responsibilities, as well as a status corresponding to such a position. When an individual is viewed in this perspective, he seems to be just capricious [17, p. 212]. So, in order to understand the human personality properly, it should be considered as a member of a group. The personality is inseparable from the social group and society as a whole. Freedom of the individual is a social achievement that arose through the moral development of the community. The value of a person is derived from the position he or she occupies in society. The moral basis of communicative practices in this model is responsibility *for*, i.e., for intimate friends or relatives, for those who are dependent, need care and help. This kind of ethics is called *ethics of responsibility*. The moral intentions are limited to the specific frame. The relationships in social groups are mostly vertical and asymmetric, when the top position has an undoubted advantage.

The second model of social group corresponds to an individualistic view of human relations. It derives its ideas from the Modern Age thoughts on social atomism. This model can be called *constructive-procedural*. The social group consists of separate people and there rather prevails the difference, plurality in opposition to unity. When the mind of one is the mind of all, it is impossible to complement each other, to cooperate for the full realization of the idea of sociality as such. In Modern Age *T. Hobbes* was among the first who introduced the vision of society as a social construct. Society, believed the philosopher, is constructed from individuals through their consistency, agreement [18, p. 105]. The main theoretical idea of this model is social constructivism, which assumes the existence of independent personalities, guided by mental principles. A person as an active being has to fight for freedom, which is not a natural fact, but must take its shape through the activity of the human mind. The moral ground of this model is the universal ethics as a sense of responsibility and social commitments *to* the members of a social group. This kind of ethics is called *ethics of beliefs*. Relationships in this case are, for the most part, horizontal, symmetrical. Social groups are constructed on the principle of strict observance of rights and responsibilities, which implies both ability to obey and govern properly.

The third model grounds on the idea of a particular sphere of *inter* as a shared social space. This model of a social group can be called *intersubjective* one. A person fills the sphere of *inter*, first of all, with his or her worldviews and meanings, on which ethical and moral relations and rational arguments are based. Unlike two previous models, the intersubjective model does not imply either affinity of souls or rationally estimated conflict of interests.

The issues of coexistence of values and ethical life worlds are central in this model. The plurality of meanings is a dynamic and flexible process of their coordination, supported by the moral guidelines of *each person as dignified* to *the Other as equal in his/her inequality* [19]. Moreover, the moral guidelines of each person include three interrelated intentions: attention and respect for the Other in his/her otherness; filling the intersubjective sphere of a social group with values and meanings that support its dignity as a whole; entering the general social intersubjective sphere as a general social person, which cannot be passed over. It is possible to draw some parallels between these models and real social groups. *Value-normative model* reflects the traditional type of social relations; also in many cases it is the core of *primary groups* – a family, a group of friends or people holding the same views. *Constructive-procedural model* reflects the type of relations that have developed in an industrial society; relations in *secondary groups* are often built on such a basis – a student group, a professional team, etc. *Intersubjective model* reflects the emergence of a new understanding of the social group, social relations, that concerns the post-metaphysical, post-non-classical orientation in contemporary social research where the power, including the power of reason, gives way to a careful listening to the world, to *the Other* and to oneself. However, in each type of social groups the primeval natural background of the group unconscious inevitably exists and its importance cannot be concealed or ignored. The sphere of *inter* of a social group includes both rational and irrational, conscious and unconscious component.

The group unconscious became the subject of scientific research in *Sigmund Freud'*s works. In the work *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* he uses the ideas of psychoanalysis to explain social phenomena for the first time. The founder of psychoanalysis believed that the unconscious of groups (he used the terms *masses* or *hordes*) was the oldest type of human psychology [20], although did not see substantial difference between the individual and the social unconscious. He used the same methods for researching the group and the individual unconscious (*Id*) that he considered to be a specific supertemporal noumenon of the inner world of a person that has a tendency to substitute the outer reality with the inner one. *Id* partially manifests itself in the preconscious (*Super Ego*) and objectifies itself in the conscious (*Ego*), in the intervals, in the discontinuities of conscious processes. The unconscious is pure natural energy, a force that gives impulse to life, or to death (*libido* or *mortido*). In a group, according to Freud, the chief had the greatest libido, and he, due to this natural force, united the individuals. In the unconscious there are only the energies of appetencies and desires of unknown origin, and they constantly are moved by the energy towards the conscious.

The first who began to study the collective unconscious as a separate phenomenon that cannot be reduced to the personal unconscious was *Carl Gustav Jung*. The psychoanalyst believed that the personal unconscious is a certain superficial layer that belongs to a deeper stratum of the unconscious.

This stratum is immersed into the inner world of a person. It has a transpersonal collective character and expresses the archetypes of the entire social group. Such a stratum is a part of cultural achievements of the whole nation, or even the mankind. They are the primeval, identical for all people forms of understanding the world, which have a transpersonal nature. They are common to all people, regardless their social background and worldviews. The content of the personal unconscious consists mainly of sensory complexes that form the intimacy of the inner life of a person, while the content of the collective unconscious is archetypes, i.e. the primeval archaic images that have been existing from ancient times to the present [21, p. 12]. The collective unconscious has absorbed the precedence of mythological themes, images and symbolic ideas that indicates not only its energy character, but also information one.

Modern researchers in the field of depth psychology point out that the consideration of only the energy component is not enough for the successful study of both individual and group unconscious. There is a need to include the information component – *Superconscious (Super-Id)*. "This area of space beyond the time, consisting of an indefinite and infinite set of symbols and general thoughts organized according to the principle of the Collective Unconscious, in fact, is the Collective Superconscious" [22, p. 168]. The introduction of an information component is important for this survey. It is impossible to investigate communicative processes separately from informational ones. Not only energy of the unconscious brings the group together, but also the informational space of the Superconscious. The consciousness shapes and the group supports values, ideals, goals, knowledge, images of the past and future that are derived from the Superconscious. Information flows are a breeding ground for the intellectual process that occurs in consciousness, and in its turn, consciousness feeds the general information space, "gives" there its own intellectual product. It is difficult to separate information and energy from each other, they constitute the essential characteristics of the world.

The group unconscious as a special phenomenon was studied in the works of *Michael (Sigmund) Foulkes*. An English psychoanalyst believes that a person is entirely determined by the world in which he or she lives, as well as by the groups he/she belongs to. The network of relationships determines the child development from the early age in family and continues to play predominant role in the life of an adult person, who is always involved in a variety of social groups. In the group there is a special network system of conscious and unconscious structures and communicative relations. Such a system is called *a group matrix*. "The matrix is a hypothetical network of communications and relationships in a particular group. This network includes everybody; it ultimately determines the meaning and significance of all events, it involves all verbal and nonverbal contacts" [Cited by 23]. A group matrix can be understood as a certain context that makes background for the development of personality. Individual consciousness constantly refers to the matrix of group unconscious, transforming itself if necessary. A group matrix can renew as well as

ruin its own forms and structures, it can generate both creative and destructive processes in a group. There are several types of destructive matrices. 1) *Web* – a monster is in the center of the matrix created by it. Such a web is needed to capture, paralyze and devour careless victims. 2) *Labyrinth* is an entangled and dangerous network, and it is very difficult to find a way out of it. 3) *Fishing net* is a network that catches from time to time such strange and aggressive creatures that fishermen cannot cope with. 4) *Bird cage* is a matrix, which, on the one hand, provides protection, and on the other hand, does not presuppose freedom. In addition, the matrix can be decomposed, distorted or deformed [23], which is closely related to the communicative practices in the group.

It is obvious that the phenomena of the group unconscious feature groups of any size and level of organization, but they are the most evident in groups with strong connections and interdependencies [24, p. 31].

We will try to study **the specific features of communicative practices in social groups**, grounding on the abovementioned group models. Each of these models implies its typical relationships, connections and styles of communicative practices that are based on conscious motives, ideas, goals, and unconscious feelings, inclinations, desires, etc.

Communicative practices have in their basis some general ideas, meanings, a certain picture of the world, which is expressed in group myths. They reflect the main values and priorities of a group, the relation to the past, the vision of the future, the types of relationships existing in a group. We can say that the myths of a group are closely related to its structure and communicative matrix. Group myths consolidate a group, they actually bring into existence the social phenomenon of *We*. Due to the myths, a group acquires subjectivity, i.e. becomes a comprehensive figure in the social space. This takes place through the process of a group identifying, determining its specificity and differences from the other groups. Identity of a group is very important for its formation and existence. Clear group identity indicates the high level of development of the collective entity. Vague identity leads to the off-centering processes and, eventually, to the collapse of a group. Myths exist in every social group, but they have different meanings and orientations in their essence.

Myths, in a strict sense, reflect a special state of consciousness, that is historically and culturally determined [25, p. 169]. What we call legends, epics, tales, etc., does not correspond to the essence of myth, because myth was a prehistoric phenomenon and there were no narrative in it. Narrations that have the beginning and the end, in which events happen at a definite linear time, are no longer myths, but the historical phenomenon of epic character. Most likely, the original syncretic mythological component still remains in the group unconscious. Obviously, the bigger its proportion is, the closer relationships there are in a group. On this unconscious basis the specific group epic is formed. It seems fair to say that modern social groups have their own mythical epic, which includes both mythological, syncretic component, and epic, linear historical one.

Mythical epic of the groups based on the value-normative model is mainly directed towards the past. The past of the group is the main value, the sort of implicit reference point for the members of the group, especially its leaders. In case the past of the social group does not have sufficiently deep roots, the group addresses to the past of so called "ancestral groups". Such "ancestral groups" are chosen according to a variety of similar characteristics such as territory, occupations, structure, group symbols, etc. The "ancestral group" must necessarily have a social value at present time expressed in great achievements and historical significance, and such value and significance should be supported not only by this social group but also by a wide range of other groups. It is better if the significance of the "ancestral group" is panhuman. It provides a kind of totemization of the past, when instead images of animals, birds, trees or objects the image of a certain social group from the past is chosen, and what is more – in its idealized version. If the value-normative group does not have the past, it is actually created by means of group epic. Moreover, there are special persons who officially or non-officially are responsible for creating the heroic-epic legends of the group. The future in such groups most often takes the form of the past rewritten anew. In the unconscious of groups of this type there is a large proportion of *Id* that supports the irrational, emotional and mystical grounds of communicative practices that in most cases are irreversible and often encounter certain secrecy and subjects forbidden in a group. Identity of the group is based on the *We–They* opposition. The communicative matrix in this case is rather rigid, it has poor potential for internal changes.

Communicative practices in groups of the constructive-procedural type are rather logical and discursive, but this does not mean that such groups do not have their own mythical epic. Its main focus is success, and collective success is inseparable from the personal one. We can say that the success of the group consists of the success of its individual members. Personal and group goals and their accomplishment are important. Group rhetoric proclaims progressive ideas. The main thing is a constant development, or, even, imitating it. The past and present work for the future when they are connected by close cause-effect links. Personal narratives and personal epics are of great importance, and the most significant for the group storytelling becomes the group mythical epic. The ability to give reasons for one's ideas, persuade others and raise one's significance in the group is highly priced. The argumentation often has a competitive character, especially among group leaders. Group *We* has constructive and sufficiently dynamic character, the identity of the social group is supported by constant achievements. Imitating takes place in the communicative practice of a group when there is no successes or it is not so great. However, imitating continued for a certain period of time, when some members are no longer satisfied with it, can lead to the collapse of the group. The proportion of Super-Id, i.e., the informational component of the unconscious increases in the constructive-procedural groups. The communicative matrix of such groups is a moving structure that can be deconstructed.

The intersubjective model of a social group implies a communicative practice where communicants due to their conscious inner intentions and external, including language manifestations, as well as unconscious but not less influential movements, create the sphere of *inter*. Every act of communicative practice, whether the communicants understand it or not, whether they want it or not, fills the sphere of *inter* with a certain content, both conscious and unconscious. The mythical epic of a social group, according to such a model, includes both personal mythical and epic constructs, and the general group's ones. Personal and general constructs form a polysemantic context, not always explicit, but influential for the separate persons and for the group as a whole. According to this model, there is the consciousness that realize the existence of the unconscious and tries to take it into consideration in communicative practices. If not mystifying or rejecting the unconscious, the conscious part, that is aware of its unconscious roots, increases. An intersubjective social group is a group where participants realize the existence of the sphere *inter* that is extremely important and is co-created in a group. There is a certain balance between the collective *Id* and *Super-Id*, when energy and information enrich each other. The past and future meet here and now, they are actualized in the present, in language communicative practices that help to realize reciprocities and discontinuities. "… language is not simple a package in which communications are wrapped, but the medium in which experience is brought to life in the process of being spoken or written" [26, p. 201].

Conclusions.

In conclusion I should emphasize some points that, in my opinion, are important within the subject studied in this section.

I have studied the social group from the general theoretical point as a necessary and significant element of the social world. There are many groups in social reality and they are different in form, content, features, number and size, importance for a person, influence, etc. An attempt to see some common features in the diversity of real social groups and to mark out their basic patterns reflecting the character of relationships, connections and communicative practices was made in this section. I believe that the ethical and moral component of human relations plays a very important role. It is obvious that among the real social groups it is difficult to find those that fully correspond to the presented models: *value-normative*, *constructive-procedural* or *intersubjective*. In real groups at present time, we rather find a definite interlocking of these models. However the general prevalence of one or another model can be seen, and it can help to understand the general background of processes occurring inside the group.

Communicative practices in a group represent human intentions that are expressed not only in language, but also in the unspeakable. At the same time, language and the unspeakable have both a conscious and an unconscious side. The intersubjective sphere of a group is filled with personal intentions, interwoven into the vivid web of relations, connections, communicative practices.

In the social group communicative practices of different kinds emerge and actualize individuals and their ethical and moral world. Admitting that the natural unconscious background inevitably exists in each person and in each group, helps to broaden the understanding of deep unconscious and unspeakable reasons that determine particular communicative practices. Language and speech increase the conscious part and, in a way, objectify the information component of the world.

It should be said in general, that efficient approach to the study of communicative practices in social groups takes into account both ethical-moral and natural-unconscious aspects. In this regard, a predictable question developing into the methodological problem and task arises: how these two worlds, ethical-moral and natural-unconscious, relate to each other. As the experience of Western culture shows, contrasting them, or suppression of one by another, does not solve the personal, social, environmental and other problems, but rather makes them more urgent. It is necessary to find the borderland between these two worlds, and this borderland is in the space of a social group and a personality.

References.

1. Manfred A. Max-Neef (2005). Foundations of Transdisciplinarity. *Ecological Economics*, 53, 5–16. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.01.014

2. Aristotel (2002). *Nicomach ethics*. (V. Stavnyuk, Trans.) Kyyiv: Akvilon-Plyus [in Ukrainian].

3. Kant I. (2004). *Critique of Practical Reason*. (I. Burkowski, Trans.) Kyyiv: Yunivers [in Ukrainian].

4. Barbara Cassin, Kostayntin Sigov (Eds.) (2009) *Vocabulary of European Philosophies: Dictionary of Untranslatables*. Part 1. Kyyiv: DUKH I LITERA [in Ukrainian].

5. Marks K. (1955). *Theses on Feuerbach*. In K. Marx & F. Engels. Works (Vol. 3, pp. 1–4). Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian].

6. Bourdieu P. (2001). *Practical sense*. (N. A. Shmatko, Trans.) Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteyya [in Russian].

7. Yermolenko A. M. (1999) *Communicative Practical Philosophy*. Kyyiv: Libra [in Ukrainian].

8. Kosenko Yu.V. (2011). *Fundamentals of the theory of linguistic communication*. Sumy: Sumy State University Publishing House [in Ukrainian].

9. Peters J. D. (1999). *Speaking into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from: https://ru.scribd.com.

10. Jaspers K. (1996). *Communication*. (L.Sitnichenko, Trans.) In L. Sitnichenko. Primary sources of communicative philosophy (pp. 132–148). Kyyiv: Lybid [in Ukrainian].

11.   Habermas J. (2006) *The Inclusion of the Other: Studios on political theory*. (A. Dakhniy, Trans.). Lviv: Astrolabe [in Ukrainian].

12.   Habermas J. (1999) *Actions, speech acts, speech interactions and the world of life.* (A.M. Yermolenko ,Trans.). In A.M. Yermolenko. Communicative Practical Philosophy (pp. 287–324). Kyyiv: Libra [in Ukrainian].

13.   Taylor V. E. & Winquist C.E. (2001). *Encyclopedia of Postmodernism*. London and New York. Retrieved from: https://ebookppsunp.files.wordpress.com.

14.   Derrida J. (2004). *Writing and Difference*. (V. Shovkun, Trans.). Kyyiv: Osnovy [in Ukrainian].

15.   Watzlawick P, Bavelas J.B., Jackson D.D. (1967) *Pragmatics of Human Communication: A Study of Interactional Patterns , Pathologies and Paradoxes*. New York: Norton & Company. Retrieved from: https://ru.scribd.com.

16.   Ischuk S.M. (2010). Philosophy of communication: analysis of the main paradigms. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu. Seriya: Filosofiya. Kulturolohiya,* 2. Retrieved from: http://jrnl.nau.edu.ua [in Ukrainian].

17.   Hegel G. W. F. (2000). *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. (R. Osadchuk, M. Kushnir, Trans.). Kyyiv: Univers [in Ukrainian].

18.   Hobbes T. (1651). *Leviathan or the Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill.* London: Green Dragon. Retrieved from: https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca

19.   Ricker P. (2002). *Oneself as Another*. (V. Andrushko, Trans.). Kyyiv: DUKH I LITERA [in Ukrainian].

20.   Freud S. (2016). *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. (I. Yermakov, Y. Kogan, Trans.). Moscow: Azbuka [in Russian].

21.   Jung C. G. (2012). *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. (K. Kotyuk, Trans.). Lviv: Astrolyabíya [in Ukrainian].

22.   Kryzhanovskyi M. (2015). Origin of Desires in Archaic Depths of the Psyche. *Scientific Notes of the International Humanitarian University*, 2, 167 – 170 [in Russian].

23.   Kennard D., Roberts J. & Winter D. (2000). *A Workbook of Group-Analytic Interventions*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

24.   Gornostay P. (2007). The problem of group unconscious in social psychology. *Naukovi studiyi iz sotsialnoyi ta politychnoyi psykholohiyi*, 18, 30 – 39 [in Russian].

25.   Rudnev V. P. (1997) *Dictionary of Culture of the Twentieth Century. Key concepts and texts*. Moscow: Agraf [in Russian].

26. Ogden, T. H. (1999). *Reverie and Interpretation: Sensing Something Human*. London: Karnas Books.