Sociality as a social-philosophical problem

Olga Alexandrovna Baklanova[1], Igor Spartakovich Baklanov[1], Alexander Ivanovich Kolomak[1], Alexander Dmitriyevich Pokhilko[2]

[1]North Caucasian Federal University, Kulakov Avenue 2, Stavropol, 355029, Stavropol Krai, Russia
[2]Armavir State Pedagogical Academy, Rosa Luxemburg Str., 159, Armavir, 352901, Krasnodar Krai, Russia

Abstract. Sociality is a specific quality of connections, relationships and dependencies between individuals and social groups that create and reproduce many times historically conditioned model of social relations, continuously maintaining the stability and unique character of the established social order. Features of the sociality can be given on the basis of four dimensions units that characterize the irreducible to each other biological, social, cultural and psychological features of the processes deployment in social space. Each of these dimensions was studied in proper disciplinary structured fields, and philosophical aspects can be characterized in three dimensions − structural, functional and dynamic (which are correlated with each other and can provide integral description of the existing social).

Problem of research of sociality and social aspect of social and cultural reality

The problem of studying sociality, when its typological, structural-functional, dynamic and other descriptions are stressed, is being made actual more sharply in times of crises, when a new sociality displaces an old one [1]. It is just happened when the revision of the society research methodological bases is required [2]. Various disciplinary directions respond differently to this requirement of social theory, offering their own tools and options to solve the problem [3]. As a result different approaches are arranged to the definition of the concept "sociality", among which there are at least four main approaches: philosophical, cultural, sociological and psychological [4].

Philosophical approach offers to use the system of people's general correlation. As a rule, sociological interpretations of sociality are focused on the description of the society institutional system and a functional component of the individuals which is included into it [5]. Russian culturological-sociological explications of the concept sociality more often are built on the role realization of an individual in the society [6]. The type of social system can be specified proceeding from the position how much is a man determined or free in the realization of social ties [7]. One of the significant markers of sociality's type is the indicator of that who is mostly responsible for the creation, realization and control of social interactions: an individual or community. In other words what has got major significance: ascription [8] or self-determination и free [9].

Most often, the authors mark out such universal descriptions of sociality as the "interdependence", "interconditionality", "co-existence of people," that is, they recognize the drift of certain social community coexistence as the main determinant.

However, it must be admitted that these definitions do not reveal to the full the substantial meaning of the concept "sociality". The higher the abstraction level of sociality derived definition is, the less informative and reflective (according to a logic law) it becomes, i.e. more nominal and demands additional qualitative analysis, which reveals its essence [10].

Therefore, philosophical analysis often requires an interdisciplinary support and in its unfolded form it is rested, as minimum, on three additional descriptions of sociality: the cultural, socal-structural and socal-psychological ones (the last one, as we believe, is relevant to a greater extent for analysis of the individual specific character, and the two first are more suitable in the description of the functional characteristics of large social communities) [11]. However, this division is very conditional – it does not reflect the real demarcation of an individual from the society but only the relativity of social studies macro-and micro-level [12].

The appearance of a peculiar social-theoretical matrix of social ties and conditions, allowing to give adequate and multivariate characteristics both of the society itself and several individuals and social groups as a part of it is the result of such "four-sided" analysis of sociality [13]. Not only the present condition of "today's" unfolded

sociality is considered in these characteristics [14] but those potential characteristics ("socal-cultural programs") which in hidden form are in the consciousness of an individual and society and they always correlate with past conditions of society and at any convenient moment are able to make a full-scale scanning of its values on all society scale [15].

The given measurements form a matrix of social ties, which is a system of vertically and horizontally built up relations. Integration, "coupling" of these relations within the whole is provided on the basis of agreed order principle operation. This principle can be qualified as a state of ties distribution between the elements of the system, in which the efforts of their mutual relation within the whole, ensure its sustainability.

It is considered that different measurements of sociality are actualized nonuniformly , there are always the dominants in each social system, which have the highest dynamics. The others are more dependent on it and they change their values against the dominant and endogenous factors, their mutual systemic interaction as part of the whole. Social-philosophic analysis of sociality differs from culturological or sociological ones. That's why we consider to specify what forms of coexistence and by means of what conceptual positions we can describe, perhaps, a socio-cultural approach.

The social aspect of sociocultural reality can be presented in such a way:
first, as vertical and horizontal society order (social structure, institutional and stratification disposition, functionality/dysfunctionality of social structures); secondly, regulating of social relationships (type and features of social communication, intensity and type of social exchange); thirdly, reflection of social orders(norms) in public consciousness (description of social system in the context of "development of deconstruction crisis stability-instability"; fourthly, the dynamic of social system changes (at macro level − the intensity and frequency of structural transformations, at micro level − changes of individual interaction, elongation or shortening of social distance between people, individual horizontal or vertical contacts frequency changes).

Cultural aspect of the analysis of cultural microdynamics of social and cultural space

The cultural aspect of sociocultural reality points to such collective human existence attributes that constitute the content of social life.

First, it is ordering of cultural space (the integrity of culture, its specialized and everyday levels, specific character of mastering and reproduction of cultural experience). Specialized level involves an object area activity content, technology, language, etc. Everyday level comprises the typical everyday situations, the content and specific character of human activity, habits, values and orders in domestic relations among people, ordinary language of daily interaction).

Secondly, the content of communication (symbolic form of information codification, methods of its transmission, features of understanding and information exchange effectivity, cultural differences of communication players).

Thirdly, integrated hierarchy of cultural levels (general culture, culture forming idea at the basis of culture, other cultural and subcultural units, cultural areal, system characteristics of culture, organized by complexity degree) and fourthly, cultural macrodynamics (changing of cultural paradigms: dialectics of traditions-innovations, variability of the local and basic cultural configurations, cultural diffusion processes at the level of ordinary practices, securing / rejection of cultural patterns).

The cultural macrodynamics of sociocultural space is described by means of a cultural aspect, while a social aspect outlines the order of the given sociocultural medium social relations. This and another dimension is very important to determine the study strategy of ordinary consciousness problem since these aspects are becoming main components of the study united by common logic.

The complementarity of social and cultural aspects in philosophic representations of sociality is clear: the researchers periodically as and when necessary turn to the cultural aspects of society (in the research of norms, values, cultural dimensions of the social structure etc.). The theorists of culture, in its turn, are forced to turn into the society social attributes (institutional features, social action, forms of communication and so on). There are also a number of interdisciplinary problems of individual and group sociation which are wider than the disciplinary frameworks of culturology or social theory and accordingly they require a multidisciplinary support for its solution (for example, it is impossible to depict sufficiently public changes without referring to the cultural determinants because it is impossible to understand the mechanisms of cultural diffusion in culturology without considering them in plane of the structuring and shaping of social interaction).

Conclusion

Similar understanding of sociality leads to several important conclusions. First, social is represented as a special and specific quality of ties, exchanges and relationships between individuals and social groups which create and reproduce repeatedly a certain historically conditioned model of social

relations, giving it every day and every hour stability and peculiar originality of the existing social order.

Secondly, the description of sociality types can be given on the basis of the four dimensions uniformity specifying biological, social, cultural and psychological features of social processes evolution and the formation of social phenomena irredundant to each other. Moreover, we guess that each of these four components has its own structure however it can be described as both by "vertically" and by "horizontally" of social system integration (which in the whole are correlated and given the basis of social order).

Thirdly, similar methodological model of sociality study should include not only the structural and functional, but also the dynamic aspect that reflects best of all the quick changing features of modern society, its "fluidity", constant transformation.

Fourthly, the present-day researcher has a multivariant, alternative conception of sociality. Philosophical approach assumes the reveal of social communication different types complicated interaction as well as an intersubjective notional structure, i.e. the values and vital meanings that constituting the studied social organism. It requires a complex combination of both socio-structural (sociological) and culturological and socio-psychological analysis because modern sociality is an intricate constellation of different typological features of traditional, industrial and post-industrial societies, which form a relatively stable integrity.

Therefore, a queer combination of traditionalistic, modernist and postmodernist archetypes of social reality perception lies at the bottom of modern man social thought, the investigation of which requires a difficult interdisciplinary approach.

Corresponding Author:
Dr.Baklanova Olga Alexandrovna
North Caucasian Federal University
Kulakov Avenue 2, Stavropol, 355029, Stavropol Krai, Russia

References
1. Beck, U. and E. Grande, 2007. Cosmopolitan Europe. Cambridge: Polity Press.
2. Lash, S. and J. Urry, 1994. Economies of Signs and Space. London: Sage. 368 p.
3. Dillon, M., 2011. Introduction to Sociological Theory: Theorists, Concepts, and their Applicability to the Twenty-First Century. Woburn MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 586 p.
4. Urry, J., 2005. The Complexities of the Global. Theory, Culture & Society, 22 (5): 235-254.
5. Castells, M., 2009. The Power of Identity: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture Volume II, 2nd Edition with a New Preface. Woburn MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 584 p.
6. Mikeeva, O. A., 2009. Problem of personal identity institutionalization in the aspect of individual historicity. Philosophy of law, 6: 65-69.
7. Baklanova, O.A, 2011. Comparative analysis of sociality historical types. Bulletin of Kosta L. Khetagurov, 3: 219-223.
8. Pokhilko, A.D., 2010. Bases of social self-determination. Humanitarian and economic sciences, 3: 26-29.
9. Kolomak, A. I., 2011. Phenomenological and personal anthropological study of freedom.Bulletin of North Caucasus state technical university, 3: 126-130.
10. Baklanov, I. S., 2008. Social dynamics tendencies and cognitive processes on the way to ultramodern society. Bulletin of North Caucasus state technical university, 4: 67-73.
11. Knowledge and Communities, 2012. Eds., Lesser E., Fontaine M., and J. Slushe, Woburn MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 263 p.
12. Toelch, U., M. J. Bruce, L. Newson, P. J. Richerson and S. M. Reader, 2014. Individual consistency and flexibility in human social information use. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 281 (1776) 20132864; 1471-2954.
13. Castells, M., 2000. End of Millennium, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
14. Mazower, M., 2006. An international civilization? Empire, internationalism, and the crisis of the midtwentieth century. International Affairs, 82(3): 553–66.
15. Shebzukhova, T.A. and N.G. Bondarenko, 2013. Moral, legal and political aspects of freedom in the context of the principle of determinism. Middle East Journal Of Scientific Research, 14 (4): 498-501.

6/26/2014