

Rhetoric of crisis

Retoryka kryzysu

7 (1) 2020 EDITORS: AGNIESZKA KAMPKA, MARTA RZEPECKA

VARIA

PAWEŁ GONDEK

THE FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN, POLAND

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8644-3886>

pawel.gondek@kul.pl

Subjective basis for elucidating communication in the personalistic perspective

Subiektywne podstawy dla wyjaśnienia komunikacji w perspektywie personalistycznej

Abstract

The paper examines man's involvement in the communication process. While elucidating communication one needs to take into account the subjective factors which condition its existence. The article particularly highlights the personal dimension of human existence and an integrated action of his powers thanks to which man constitutes the subject and motive for all forms of communication activity. The basic types of communication are affected by virtue of a relation to human powers: intellectual-cognitive and volitive-emotive. Yet, it is persuasive communication that, methodologically ordered within the framework of rhetoric, seems to fully recognize the communication determinants characteristic of man's nature. The progressing technicization of the media also needs to be perceived through an integrated personalistic perspective accepting the subjective determinants of man participating in the communication process.

Artykuł bada zaangażowanie człowieka w proces komunikacji. Przy wyjaśnianiu komunikacji należy wziąć pod uwagę czynniki subiektywne, które warunkują jej istnienie. W artykule zwrócono szczególną uwagę na osobisty wymiar ludzkiej egzystencji oraz zintegrowane działanie władz człowieka, dzięki którym ustanawia on podmiot i motyw wszelkich form aktywności komunikacyjnej. Na podstawowe rodzaje komunikacji wpływa relacja ludzkich władz: intelektualno-poznawczych i wolitywno-emotywnych. Jednak to właśnie komunikacja perswazyjna, uporządkowana metodologicznie w ramach retoryki, zdaje się w pełni rozpoznawać determinanty komunikacyjne charakterystyczne dla natury człowieka. Postępująca technicyzacja mediów musi być również postrzegana poprzez zintegrowaną perspektywę personalistyczną, akceptującą subiektywne determinanty człowieka uczestniczącego w procesie komunikacji.

Key words

man, subject, communication, information, persuasion
człowiek, podmiot, komunikacja, informacja, perswazja

License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 international (CC BY 4.0). The content of the license is available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Received: 24 September 2019 | Accepted: 3 March 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org.10.29107/rr2020.1.5>

PAWEŁ GONDEK

THE FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN, POLAND

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8644-3886>

pawel.gondek@kul.pl

Subjective basis for elucidating communication in the personalistic perspective

Introduction

Reflecting on communication with regard to man's social and cultural determinants constitutes a topical but also a difficult research subject. The role of man as a participant of communication is particularly hard to define. Since the point is not only to assign man a place of occurrence in the communication process but rather to determine his actual participation status. This requires drawing attention to man as the subject of the communication process, and in him to these personal properties which determine this process. The issues stemming from this basis form a field of studies common to many disciplines, which frequently have a separate methodology, however, they are closely connected regarding their problems and terminology. Academics posit an interdisciplinary manner of studying communication within the confines of one field termed as the science of communicating or communicology (Craig 2008; Lanigan 2010). This area of studies concentrates on communication defined as a process whose scope encompasses its structure and the contexts in which it occurs. However, the problem of the reason for the existence of communication as well as its personalistic dimension are still not included in these studies.

While endeavouring to avoid methodological misuse, it is noteworthy to indicate that the aspect of research adopted in the text will concern the manner of man's existence in the communication process. This issue will be considered with regard to the necessity of the emergence of an interpersonal communication relationship, concerning man as a community-building being. Such a field of research falls within the framework of the philosophy of man whose study method is based on the analysis of man's ontological structure and the character of interpersonal relationships he builds. Thus, communication is conceived of as an interpersonal relationship which is initiated by man and takes place because of man. Without disrupting the order of the studies conducted in this area, it is necessary to consider the issue of the grounds for or rather the need for the existence of communication

in human life. At this juncture, the fundamental problem is to reply to the question of why communication exists. The aim of the paper will also be to determine the form of man's participation in communication and to present the negative phenomena because of which he is treated like an object. In this context, communication becomes an issue which requires applying philosophical justification.

Our research will concentrate on the personalistic approach according to which the subjectivity of the human person is fundamentally emphasized in the analysis of social relationships. We will focus mainly on the Polish tradition of personalism and its interpretation of the communication process (Krapiec 1983, Styczeń 1986, Wojtyła 1993, Drożdż 2009, Duma 2016). Considering the issue of communication in this manner will enable us to reach the most essential constituents of this process. Referring to man as a conscious and free subject as well as to the ways he exercises his personal powers in communication gives a new insight into this process. While studying the issue it is necessary to distinguish the socially functioning term "personal media" which defines a communication action oriented towards the person as an individualized media user. It may assume the form of a person's self-presentation in the media or it may be a way of getting through to media users e.g. for marketing purposes (Thumim 2017). In order to avoid such an approach to personalizing, we propose that the person be conceived of in the text as the subject in communication processes.

Personalistic Dimension of Communication

A personalistic approach in studies refers to a personal manner of comprehending man. Its fundamental feature is presenting man as the subject of all acts which express his existence and actions (Wojtyła 1993, 221-225). Through acts man expresses himself and perfects himself. This leads to understanding relationships created by man in which the essential role is played by conscious and free acts. Comprehending man as a person becomes instrumental in elucidating such phenomena as society or culture. In each of them, there are relational interpersonal links as crucial motives for their creation. Simultaneously, each of them involves a significant contribution of communication processes which are a prerequisite for their functioning. For this reason, perceiving social processes acquires a significant meaning in formulating theses concerning human social life. However, the very assertion of the necessity of communication processes does not exhaust the research field in this respect. Communication processes are not a straightforward and evident phenomenon and that is why they themselves require elucidation.

The etymological reference for the term 'communication' is Latin *communio* understood as a community and communication itself (*communicatio*) means

participation in which conscious and free interpersonal relationships occur. They are present in a particular way in each form of social organization, providing the basis for it to function (P. Gondek 2015). By the same token, though, on a different scale and to a different extent, they function in communication. Participation, then, is executed in an interpersonal communication of content that has the form of a message. However, the sender of the message is not sufficient in order to bind the extremities of such a relationship. For a message to be communication it is necessary to create a specific relationship, which will also take into account the participation of the receiver. This is why a relational manner of the existence of the media requires one to focus not only on the analysis of the possible forms and techniques of constructing a message, but also on the subjects creating such a relationship. It is thanks to the sender and because of the receiver that such communication may occur. This type of interaction constitutes the departure point for analyzing the specific character of the communication process from the vantage point of its participants.

Man's participation in communication processes is too often inappropriately qualified in studies. It is most commonly confined to the role of a statistical participant who is required for the purpose of presenting communication itself as a relationship. As a result of such an approach, we obtain theories interpreting communication as a mechanical interactive process which enables one to depict it properly but only externally (Ollivier 2007). According to it, man is merely a static point of a relationship which marks the beginning and the end of the process. Whereas studies also need to include man's structural elements which are engaged in this process. Such a manner of conceiving communication, to a certain extent, occurs in classical rhetoric, in which the forms of argumentation involve both a reference to the receiver's intellectual sphere (*logos*) and to his emotional one (*pathos*), since all relations of man as a participant of communication processes are important. Even while appearing in the role of the receiver, man remains the subject in whom dynamic changes of attitudes occur, conditioned by his psychophysical nature. This is why the receiver of a communication cannot be interpreted only in terms of a static and passive participant of the process.

In order to attain the desired dimension of understanding man as a participant of the communication process one needs to concentrate on his ontological nature. Discerning his psychophysical nature is not enough in this respect but it is necessary to draw attention to the specific character of his existence. From this perspective, man is conceived of as the subject of conscious and free acts by virtue of which he creates a personal field of his existence. Therefore, man understood in the personal dimension cannot be reduced merely to the sphere of natural or contextual acts (Galvin, Wilkinson 2006). This is why it is essential not to fix solely

on man's sensual-emotive sphere in communication because it is not a determinant of his attitude. From the personal perspective, the communication process is a variety of human action which involves cognitive and appetitive factors. They cumulate in the act of decision or a choice of appropriate means to reach a desired end. The end of the action is determined not only by the agent but it also occurs as external determination for taking action. The end is perceiving a concrete situation which will constitute a motive for taking action. Generally speaking, it is the receiver who is the motive for communication to take place. For this reason, action assumes the form of a relationship between what constitutes the end of action and the agent who undertakes intellectual and volitive actions executed in the decision act. The moment of decision becomes the most complete manifestation of man's personal action and the degree of involvement in communication appears to be the key to its understanding.

In this context the communication process may be perceived as action in which the act of the decision of the subject taking this action becomes the crucial factor. Such an approach to communication should not be identified with Habermas's theory of communicative action as achieving a social consensus defined by the normative social perspective (Habermas 1984). The personalistic approach seeks to depict man's role as the subject of communication and of the ensuing interpersonal communication relationships. The emphasis placed on a personal subject does not lead to subjectivisation of communication but is a depiction of the constituents of the process. This is why one may define communication tentatively as an interpersonal relationship in which a person's participation involves an engagement of conscious and free acts. What specifies human conduct is the interpenetrating cooperation of personal acts in arriving at a decision. Recognizing good as the end of action, reflecting on the possibilities of performing it, and the decision act of choice are the constitutive elements of human action (Krapiec 1983, 206-218). Adopting this scheme to the communication process one may posit that it is a deliberate action of the sender in which the receiver is the end and motive. Whereas the decision moment is the selection of the form and content of the message which is conditioned by the thus conceived end. However, the originator of communication is the sender who conveys to the receiver the content selected by himself by deliberately chosen means. The selection of the content and means becomes the pivotal moment of the whole communication process.

Formulating a message is grounded in the cognitive experiences of the sender but it is constructed because of the receiver. Thus, the process requires simultaneously the expression of the speaker's intention and the recognition of the receiver's attitude. However, the real motive of the occurrence of this action is the receiver, since it is to him that the intention must be adjusted in terms of content and form.

Every communication is oriented to producing a specific effect with the receiver. This is why the means selected by the sender must involve the receiver in such a manner that the message should affect his personal acts. The receiver's mechanism of personal acts is consistent with the acts performed during the initiation and construction of the communication process by the sender (Drożdż 2009). The cognitive identification of the content of the message and the end involved in it are to lead the receiver to the decision of accepting or rejecting it. Each communication engages the receiver cognitively and volitively. Even a purely informative communication requires a decision of its acceptance or rejection. For that reason, man as a receiver may not accept even information on obvious facts. This is why communication should not be confined solely to the cognitive plane, since in cognition itself there is no causal power resulting in action. A message is an expression of a testimony formed by a sender based on their own experience. The conviction of the value of the experience and the resulting formulation of a message is conditioned by the relation to the receiver, in whom the sender recognizes as a participant of this experience (Styczeń 1986). The factor binding the communication process is man conceived of as the subject and the agent of conscious and free acts. The freedom of the sender and the receiver is manifested through the decision act which thus becomes the core of the communication process.

Communication has a uniquely personal profile and it cannot be reduced to technological tools enhancing the media. The analysis of the workings of communication processes demonstrates that it is not a superficial exchange of communication signs occurring in an autonomous sphere in which man may (but does not have to) participate. Communication as a process emerges from man's potential nature and his inherent capacities to create and convey substance. The thus conceived structure of man as a participant of the communication process involves all the cognitive and volitive powers. This process relies heavily on sensual-emotive reactions which aid the decision moment in communication. Their involvement is an indispensable element of each communication, conditioning the cognitive-volitive contact between the sender and the receiver. This is why indirect forms of communication strive to develop substitutive modes of expressing these reactions. This is particularly visible in the context of audio-visual mediators being increasingly involved in communication processes and of the expansion of communication tools as part of CMC (computer mediated communication) thanks to which one seeks to apply artificial sensual stimuli receptors or popular emoticons (Skovholt, Grønning, Kankaanranta 2014; Derks, Bos, Grumbkow 2008; Lécuyer 2017). They constitute a certain form of complementing the missing elements in indirect communication aided by modern information technologies.

The phenomenon described above points to the need of perceiving the subject of communication in a comprehensive but, at the same time, integrated manner. Complements in the form of emoticons or virtual reality would not be demanded, were they superfluous in messages. Whereas the modes in which man functions in communication indicate various degrees of his involvement in the process. What remains its characteristic feature is that it involves the sensual-emotive powers which affect directly the decision act of a man entangled in communication. Man's decision processes overlap with communication processes. This is why the human dimension of communication requires taking into account the cognitive-volitive and sensual-emotional aspects which comprise the personal decision subject. He is the reason why the communication relationship and the social interactions and technological means used in it come into being. Technological means are frequently given the status of autonomous existence since they are something separate and employed for specific tasks. However, if a video camera did not record image and sound perceived by appropriate human senses, it would be useless in media messages. Its audiovisual dimension corresponds with man's sensory and cognitive powers, which imparts it with communication value.

Personal powers and determinants of communication

Perceiving man as a participant of the communication process in an integrated way requires that one should, first of all, present the basic references to human personal powers. Hence, it is important to draw attention to forms of communication expanded with regard to the subjective aspect, engaging man's sensory-emotive and intellectual-volitive spheres. This is why not all forms of communication are identical. Proof of this is both the methodology of producing messages and particularist aims fulfilled in messages. The end of communication becomes especially important since the end is the reason why communication activity is undertaken and its various forms are created. In the context of teleologically conditioned forms of communication one can distinguish two types of communication: informative and persuasive (Jowett, O'Donnell 2012, 28-33). It is in the area of these two modes of communication that interpersonal communication processes occur.

Information, even though it seems to be basic, from the point of view of participation in the communication process, has a limited impact. Communication is not understood here as quantitative data transmission but as a message determined by appropriately selected content. Information as a message plays the function of the structural basis for the operation of communication processes. It reflects the process as the transmission sender-message-receiver relationship in which the message constitutes the content of information. Information is an indispensable

condition for communication to occur, but it does not have to be identical with communication. The etymology of this word refers to the Latin verb *informo* which can be translated as “to give shape”, “to create”, “to present” or even “to envisage”. Such a meaning emphasizes the process of processing what is discovered in reality and what is conveyed in content by capturing the sense of things, which is proper to man in an act of cognition. Therefore, the factor distinguishing information communication is the content of the message, which needs to be formulated unambiguously, and whose terms need to have a restricted semantic field. However, for a communication to play a purely informative function, it also has to meet specific formal conditions. First of all, the neutral character of the message needs to be preserved; it cannot affect the receiver’s attitude in any form, and it cannot involve any extra-informational communication factors. This is why information communication is a valuable tool for describing and presenting scientific findings, where research reliability requires that the language be constantly specified and disambiguated. This is communication oriented to purely cognitive processes, the basis for which is factual accuracy and logical valuation of statements as true or false. This is significant for comprehending the very process of communicating information, and in particular for the conditions of the adequacy of its reception.

With regards to the substance of a message, such a type of communication seems to be ideal for performing such a process in a reliable and objective manner. It is verifiable since it enables concentration on the very substance of the message, eliminating all the non-information forms. However, it requires that man as a participant of the communication process should adjust to the specificity of intellectual cognition, which is, in a sense, a contradiction of the cognitive and affective way of functioning of his integrated nature. This can be the nature of the processes of constructing and communicating scientific knowledge, which require that the sender and the receiver should undertake a special intellectual effort consisting in explicating reality in an essentially rational way. Does that, however, mean that all messages should be reduced to information communications? The balance between the fact which the information concerns and the sender and the receiver in whom specific reactions occur, remains individualized. This is why in information communication the message created is reliable, however incomplete with regard to its participants’ involvement. Man’s personal structure does not constitute a straightforward, purely intellectual sending-receiving mechanism. Apart from intellectual-cognitive powers, man also has other powers whose specific character enables one to participate in communication in an individualized manner. Volitive and emotive references conditioning human freedom and individuality, and, to a large extent, also creativity, steer this process in the direction of persuasive communication.

Remaining at the level of neutrality and objectivism in communication is difficult to achieve in an everyday discourse. The system of signs occurring in communication, out of necessity, has the layer of a material carrier. This has a significant impact on the individualization of communication processes, however not from the semantic standpoint but from the standpoint of the means of expression. The meanings of the things being cognized conveyed by the intellect are replaced with signs in which man expresses the content of his cognitive acts. Formulating a message as a system of symbolic signs connected with their graphic or phonetic presentation and with the rules of their use is aimed not so much at objectivism but at inter-subjectivism. Whereas the process of communicating itself is dependent on the structure of the sender's and the receiver's personal powers. And this is the reason why persuasive communication arises. However, persuasion should not be interpreted solely negatively as a form of forcing someone to do something, though it will encompass also such a form of communication activity. Persuasion, rather, concerns making somebody do something or referring to the ancient rhetorical understanding, authenticating something. Aristotle emphasized that belief (*πίστις*) is a human act based on which we accept something as our own. This is why authenticating is a kind of proving in which by using arguments and testimonies we persuade someone to do something (Aristotle 2006, I, 1-2; Grimaldi 1972, 54-68). This act results not so much from the intention taken by the sender to persuade but from taking into account personal powers participating actively in the communication process.

An act of belief engages man's intellective and volitive powers leading to authentication that is to accept something by the intellect under the influence of a free choice. The dominating factor in this case is the decision to accept a judgement as true. In this context, extra-logical valuation of a proposition occurs, that is accepting something because of predilection or desire, not infrequently connected with an emotional approach. This is the way in which the process of persuasive communication is formed. Man as a participant of this process may fully engage his powers, both intellective and emotive. This is a communication situation, natural to man, in which the knowledge of how each of the powers functions is of fundamental importance. At the moment, when such an interactive order occurs in an unconscious manner, there is a possibility of yielding to manipulation in which, for example, by means of a message reduced to emotional activity one attempts to exert pressure on the receiver's decision. For this reason, since antiquity, rhetoric has been a method of ordering the mechanisms in which persuasive communication functioned. In rhetoric, the focal point was not only the substance of the message, but also on the sender and the receiver as well as their forms of participation in communication. This whole process also affected the moral and social context of human existence.

The communal dimension of man's existence is grounded in interpersonal relationships, which are the basis for forming a society. This distinction involves building relationships of understanding and cooperation, essential for communication, which are conditioned not only by man's intellectual sphere but also by his decision. This is, in the first place, a reference to the end, which for the sender in the case of agreement is the receiver, and in the case of cooperation a common motive of action (Wojtyła 1993, 240-252). We discover, however, that action involves ambiguous manners of exercising human freedom. This is why various decisions may occur, conditioned by the impact of diverse factors. This results in the end becoming the fundamental reference for all human actions, which translates into communication processes, and especially into the mode in which persuasive communication functions. In its field, the way of regulating communication from the subjective perspective is rhetoric in which even individual types of speeches have specific teleological conditions (M. J. Gondek 2018). In rhetoric, each message occurs on account of the auditor, taking into consideration the context of his involvement in communication and a reference to the common motives of action.

In order to meet such challenges, methods of argumentation consistent with the personal structure of man are formed as part of rhetorical means of communicating. The intellectual order essential for man is emphasized by creating the *logos* forms of argumentation. They do not require logical rules of proving the substance of the message. However, they strive for accuracy by applying analogous reasoning in which we proceed from probable premises and we seek to arrive at a general principle guaranteeing the credibility of the adopted judgements. Also, volitive-decisive elements are engaged in rhetoric argumentation of the *ethos* type. This is achieved by building the sender's credibility in personal and social terms, which provides the basis for accepting the communications he creates. *Pathos* is a no less important or frequently employed in communication type of argumentation. Communication activity oriented to emotions is not only to be aimed at arousing them but also at treating them as an element of a broader process leading to taking specific decisions. It also needs to be borne in mind that all these powers act in one personal subject, due to the fact they do not occur in a pure form. The moment linking them together is the act of authenticating, which conditions the acceptance of the message. However, they are distinguished separately due to the mechanism according to which they function in communication.

We may go even further than ancient people postulating not so much authentication but identification of the sender and the receiver. This is the direction in which Kenneth Burke's proposal is oriented in which not argumentation itself is important but all the ways of identifying the sender with the receiver (1969). This is, in a sense, a total approach since it requires such an adjustment to the audience

which is executed in spite of a shortage in fully recognizing it. Yet, even in identification, the adequacy of the message to the recognized end, which is the receiver, is important. Exceeding or imposing the end may damage not only the value of the message, but also disrupt the communication process as a moral action. The analysis of the modes of functioning of persuasive communication shows recognizing the human factor as a guarantee of the value of the message. Rhetoric is not based on true and false propositions, but on ones which are consistent or inconsistent with the end of communication, which is always the person. And in this respect, rhetoric may provide the grounds for discovering and forming the personal dimension of communication.

An additional factor confirming the existence of such a state of things is the persuasive organization of communication space. Not infrequently in the communication process there occurs a situation in which there is no direct access to the facts which are the basis for it to be formed. It concerns particularly messages formulated by the mass media which have the technological means for authenticating the messages and creating their contexts. Gunn Enli indicates that the conditions for creating communication space in the mass media are grounded in the social construction of creating the illusion of authenticity and even though they are symbolic, they are accepted by the receiver (2015). Developing the harmony of the factors participating in communication is the guarantee for the messages authenticated. However, there are boundaries of their acceptance on the part of the receiver. A change of the conditions of the contract may result in a breakdown of this construction and a loss of the authenticity of the context. This is why developing the harmony of the factors requires that one should constantly adjust and accept the subjective conditions of authentication, violating of which leads to a loss of trust in the receiver. This is another condition for the functioning of the communication process which requires that the specific nature of man's personal powers be taken into account.

Against the background of the above presented issues, there arises a question of how the personalistic manner of interpreting communication processes is affected by applying new technologies in this area. The opportunities provided by ICT (information and communication technology) enable messages to function in a way that goes beyond the framework of simple communication processes. Persuasive communication itself benefits from the use of advanced audio-visual means and from the new interaction possibilities. This, however, results in the fact that the receiver does not always cope with the flow of information and with assessing its value. At the same time, we observe the phenomenon of shrinking of the real area of social discourse and creating its virtual space, which complicates the problem of the authenticity of the context and the identity of the participants

of communication (Pečiulis 2016). We are also dealing with the occurrence of advanced interactions in the form of network societies, which are not constrained only to simple social relationships. Creating an e-society is becoming synonymous with constructing new ways of operation of the social system, which also includes economic transformations. Utilizing technologically advanced communication processes to create economic instruments results in such phenomena as network capital (Menshikov, Lavrinenko, Sinica, Simakhova 2017). The dynamics of capital network development affect the transformations in the area of perceiving social interactions. The existence of inequality in the access to digital technologies results in an even greater social and economic stratification. Attempts at redefining the subject and regulating the processes of participation in e-society seem to intensify this phenomenon even further.

Therefore, it is not only communication processes but also the processes of participants' social involvement that undergo transformations. Creating alternative forms of social participation does not, however, result in the disappearance of man's subjective determinants. Participation in an e-society gives an opportunity for communication methods to develop, but it also introduces constraints which affect human decisions. The greatest danger while using ICT is yielding to the charm of their virtual possibilities thanks to which we lose the end of communication. Due to the fascination with technological devices in communication the means become the end, which the receiver also becomes subjected to. The introduction of ICT based methods of participation in society may lead to various forms of social exclusion. Then, man is deprived of the possibility of fulfilling oneself as the subject and of discerning subjectivity in another man (Wojtyła 1993, 252-256). This may result in loss of control over communication processes and become the reason for creating depersonalized messages. This is why an adequate recognition of the end of communication constitutes the guarantee for formulating the message appropriately. For the end constitutes the motive of every communication activity and determines the selection of means to achieve it.

Conclusions

Communication as a process is conditioned by multiple factors. Recognizing them appropriately guarantees the possibility of an adequate understanding of the process. While seeking the methodology of creating messages, we must concentrate on fundamental factors which enable the process to be performed efficiently. This is why, in the text, attention has been drawn to man as the subject of communication. Comprehending man as a person and emphasizing his subjectivity, freedom, and ontological completeness provides the grounds for a personalistic

approach to communication. Communication should not be treated solely as transmission processes in which the dominating factor is the moment of sharing meanings. What we are rather seeking are subjective conditions and causes of the agency of the occurrence of such processes. They culminate in human personal actions, the fundamental role in which is played by the motive of action and its effective performance. Therefore, in the personalistic approach, communication is conceived of as an intentional relationship of the sender to the receiver. Hence, it is not so much the informative grounds that impart dynamism to communication processes as the personal decision sphere by virtue of which such a process may actually come into being.

In communication, man engages his personal powers of cognition and action and transfers them onto others in a creative manner. Thus, he forms a unique interpersonal relationship, consisting not only in informing but also in persuading someone to do something. A limited access to facts is the reason for formulating persuasive messages, which are dominated by acts of belief. They not only refer to man's intellectual sphere but also absorb his emotive one. This is why their verification does not consist in a rational justification of the messages formulated. The specificity of this form of communication is extra-logical valuation of utterances. It results from a lack of access to facts and from the manners of authenticating which take place in man himself. Authentication processes involve not only man's cognitive sphere but also the appetitive one. Due to this fact the mechanisms of persuasive communication most fully reflect man's communication possibilities. At the same time, they point to their integral cooperation in one personal subject, who, regardless of the role of the sender or the receiver, determines the process of communication.

The relationships which occur in communication are constantly being enhanced by the technological advancement of the media. The technological possibilities of the media disproportionately exceed man's perception capacities. This is why the communication process is interpreted mainly from the perspective of technological means. This results in the fact that technological advancement of the media becomes the fundamental purpose of the development of communication. What becomes of secondary importance is the status of man as the subject and his participation in these processes. The means are turned into ends due to which man ceases to be the proper subject of communication. This gives rise to the phenomenon of mediatization or the dominance of the technological means of communication over participants of the communication process. This phenomenon also significantly affects the way in which the forms of organization of society are shaped. Depersonalizing communication, which assumes a global dimension in an e-society, is the reason for social exclusion. And even though we are becoming

increasingly aware of the mediating role of the media and we accept this state of things, we are not able to keep up with ICT development. This is why it is important to be aware of the role of man as the subject in the communication process and of his personal determinants it involves.

References

- Aristotle.** 2006. *On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, Kenneth.** 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Craig, Robert T.** 2008. "Communication in the Conversation of Disciplines." *Russian Journal of Communication* 1 (1): 7-23.
- Enli, Gunn.** 2015. *Mediated Authenticity: How the Media Constructs Reality*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Derks, Daantje, Arjan E. R. Bos and Jasper von Grumbkow.** 2008. "Emoticons and Online Message Interpretation". *Social Science Computer Review* 26: 379-388.
- Drożdż Michał.** 2009. "Homo Communicans – Personalistic Determinations of Communication in Context of Media." *Nowy Sącz Academic Review* 5: 17-31.
- Duma Tomasz.** 2016. "Personalism in the Lublin School of Philosophy (Card. Karol Wojtyła, Fr. Mieczysław A. Krąpiec)." *Studia Gilsoniana* 5 (2): 365-390.
- Galvin, Kathleen M., Charles A. Wilkinson.** 2006. "The Communication Process. Impersonal and Interpersonal." In *Making Connections: Readings in Relational Communication*, ed. Kathleen M. Galvin, 4-10. Oxford: University Press.
- Gondek, Maria Joanna.** 2018. "A Teleological Interpretation of the Applicability of Rhetoric in the Peripatetic Tradition." *Studia Gilsoniana* 7 (2): 181-199.
- Gondek, Paweł.** 2015. "Communio and Communicatio: the Role of Communication for Participating in Public Life." *Studia Gilsoniana* 4 (1): 17-28.
- Grimaldi, William M. A.** 1972. *Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
- Habermas, Jürgen.** 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. I: *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon.
- Jowett, Garth S., Victoria O'Donnell.** 2012. *Propaganda and Persuasion*. London: Sage Publications.
- Krąpiec, Mieczysław Albert.** 1983. *I-Man. An outline of Philosophical Anthropology*, trans. Marie Lescoe, Andrew Woznicki, Theresa Sandok et al. New Britain: Mariel Publications.
- Lanigan, Richard L.** 2010. "Theoretical and Applied Aspects of Communicology." In *Consultant Assembly III: In Search of Innovative Subjects for Language and Culture Courses*, ed. Zdzisław Wąsik, 7-32. Wrocław: Philological School of Higher Education.
- Lécuyer, Anatole.** 2017. "Playing with senses in VR: Alternate perceptions combining vision and touch." *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 37 (1): 20-26.
- Menshikov, Vladimir et al.** 2017. "Network Capital Phenomenon and its Possibilities under the Influence of Development of Information and Communication Technologies." *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 6 (4): 585-604.
- Ollivier, Bruno.** 2007. *Les sciences de la communication. Théories et acquis*. Paris: Armand Collin.
- Pečiulis, Žygfintas.** 2016, "Digital era: from mass media towards a mass of media." *Filosofija, Sociologija*, 27 (3): 240-248.

- Skovholt, Karianne, Anette Grønning, Anne Kankaanranta.** 2014. "The Communicative Functions of Emoticons in Workplace E-Mails: :-)". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 19: 780-797.
- Styczeń, Tadeusz.** 1986. "C'è notizia senza esperienza?." In *Il libro del Meeting'86*, ed. Emma Neri, 175-183. Rimini.
- Thumim, Nancy.** 2017. "Personal Media." In *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effect*, ed. Patrick Rössler, vol. IV, 1609-1530. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Wojtyła, Karol.** 1993. "The Person: Subject and Community." In *Person and Community. Selected Essays*, trans. Theresa Sandok, 219-261. New York: Peter Lang.