SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

INTERACTIVITY AND SELF-DETERMINATION IN CROSSMEDIA COMMUNICATION

Shevchenko Hanna[1]

One of the final stages in the transformation from mass media to mass communication, what we see now, has indicated the symbiosis of the driving transformational processes such as digitalization, convergence, interactivity, and crossmedia.

In the distinguished work of V. F. Ivanov "Mass Communication" (2013) we find a reference to R. Burkart, who initiated the definition of "Quaternary Media" and according to him this new definition contains digital media and online communication with emphasizing interactivity and dissolution of the traditional division between communicator and audience [5, p. 145]. Based on this complementary classification we can safely attribute crossmedia to fourth-level media, while the multimedia belongs to the third-level media, so-called "tertiary" media, and that seems obvious due to the classification.

E. Fürsich, the author of the article "Media Convergence as a Risk and an Opportunity", notes that the most valuable thing that is gained with the era of the cross-media is the first true opportunity for interactive communication with the audience. Instead of relict pseudo-feedback tools like as reader's letters to editorial offices or indirect often overly politicized supervisory oversight. It has now become possible to communicate direct with readers, listeners, viewers and users. While the feedback has still not being used constructive enough and the discussion standards in Internet culture leave much to be desired, blogging shows us now that attracting users to a common network offers new opportunities for communication [3, p. 62].

O. Stins and D. van Fucht provide their own understanding of the crossmedia: A sender of the message is not limited by features of the only one media channel. A message can be transmitted through multimedia channels that resend the content in various forms. Crossmedia invites a user (reader, viewer, etc.) to switch over from one media channel to another [9, pp. 98-101].

M. Geffken, the director of the Leipzig Media School focuses on an important transformational aspect: the crossmedia should be understood as a triggered via web 2.0 trend, where media loses its self-determination as pure "senders." In web 2.0 media senders are tied by network structures and therefore respond as recipients of news to the recipient's feedback [4, p. 12].

---

[1] Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Ukraine

Professor L. Vasylyk emphasizes the interactive component of crossmedia communication. Crossmedia changes the traditional reaction of the reader's audience to a journalistic text. The media monologue becomes dialogue; it becomes expanded in time and in space. The consumer feels attracted to the communication process at the same level as the media. The audience joins authors via crossmedia, the audience pays more attention, it becomes more loyal and it constantly keeps up interest. This process is also supported by using names of individuals who have become brands and who attract attention of hundreds of thousands online: such as bloggers, TV presenters, politicians, public activists – the individuals, who enjoy a high level of confidence in society [10, p. 299].

Accepting the opinion of German researchers, L. Vasylyk believes the crossmedia is a communication that not only leads a user via various media but also returns to the generator like a reverse channel [10, p. 298]. So the subjects of crossmedia communication become not only the media but also the users themselves.

A dynamic process of cultivating one's personality is sometimes like a loop where the person becomes a hostage of its virtual twin. However, "newborn" virtual individuals do not always manage to overshadow their real prototypes. In the article "The Digital Gospel" H. M. Enzensberger skeptically notes that 99.99% of all circulated messages in the Internet are only interesting for direct recipients, and even this is a big exaggeration [2, p. 95]. While leaving the actual requests of the addressee out of sight, the new media create a picture of the world, "where to send a message and to be a message and by the way to be a community means the same thing" [7, p. 101].

This large-scale process of presenting a virtual personality as a guarantee of his existence was called "narcissistic representations" by the follower of J. Habermas, professor of Yale University, Sail Benhabib [1, p. 14-15]. We are not just self-referring, we are gaining our new identity (in essence, ourselves) by creating the image of the new identity.

There is a process of self-recognition: it was much more complicated earlier, because a philosophical self-recognition was understood with some clause of metaphoricity [6, p. 63]. The individual recognizes namely himself today and this happens thanks to new media. The Facebook asks its users: "What are you thinking about?" And it suggests writing a reply – writing a post. An individual has never asked himself this question so often before. Demonstration of someone's approval or disapproval has always been something personal, often hidden. Social networks encourage to constantly expressing one's approval or disapproval today, deciding what one likes and what not. A Like – is a unit of a social approval – it has already acquired some reflexive meaning for a long time. New media and in particular the cross-media encourage us to understand who are we, what do we like and what is interesting for us.

Calls of traditional mass media for civil responsibility or appeal to universal human values today do not usually create a remarkable impression, because it is addressed to everyone (all but me = none). A crossmedia newspaper is a version of a personalized virtual newspaper. The reader can register, open a personal office,

choose news stories and interesting for him rubrics here – the calls for responsibility in such a newspaper become targeted and efficient.

A self-presentation is acceptable and demanded in the contemporary culture, but as F. Schönhagen reasonably states, a one-sided concentration on products which are self-made and placed locally in the network is obviously highly overestimated as well as this product's importance for public communication [8, p. 92]. And it is difficult to disagree with this statement, although the phenomenon of the producing public is undoubtedly a new, necessary and well-timed staging point in the development of communication.

References:

1. Benhabib S. (1992). Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics. New York: Routledge. 276 p.

2. Enzensberger, Hans Magnus (2000). Das digitale Evangelium. *Der Spiegel*, Heft 2, pp. 92–101.

3. Fürsich E. (2010). Medienkonvergenz als Risiko und Chance. Eine analyse des amerikanischen Journalismus im Crossmedia-Zeitalter / Elfriede Fürsich. *Wer bleibt auf der Strecke?* Berlin: Lit. Pp. 54–70.

4. Hohlfeld R., Meier K., Neuberger C. (2002). Innovationen im Journalismus: Forschung für die Praxis. Münster: Lit. 220 p.

5. Ivanov V. F. (2013). Massovaya kommunikatsiya: Monografiya [Mass Communication: monograph]. Kiev: Akademiya Ukrainskoy Pressy, Tsentr Svobodnoy Pressy, 902 p. (in Russian)

6. Moiseev V. N. (2016). Novie media: filosofija vzaimodejstvija cheloveka I sovremennih tehnologij [New media: philosophy of interaction of human and new technologies] (PhD Thesis). Moscow. 138 p.

7. Savchuk V. (2014). Mediafilosofiya. Pristup real'nosti [Media philosophy. Reality attack]. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo RKhGA. 350 p.

8. Schönhagen Ph. (2004). Soziale Kommunikation im Internet: Zur Theorie und Problematik computervermittelter Kommunikation vor dem Hintergrund der Kommunikationsgeschichte. Bern u.a.: Peter Lang. 350 p.

9. Stins O., Fukht D. Van. (2000). Novye media [New Media]. *Herald of VolSU*. Series 8, vol. 7, pp. 98–106.

10. Vasylyk L. J. (2013). Krosmedia jak trend suchasnoji zhurnalistyky [Crossmedia as the trend of modern journalism]. *Scientific notes of the Institute of Journalism*, vol. 52, pp. 297-300.