

PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY

Lavrinenko Vitalii Anatolievich

Candidate of Science in Psychology (PhD),

Assistant Professor of the Psychology Department,

Poltava V. G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

TO THE QUESTION OF NEW PARADIGMS IN MODERN PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE JUSTIFICATION

In modern psychology it is possible to state significant changes in the methodological structure, understanding of the essence of the mental, the approach to the implementation of empirical research, which reflects the changes in the "paradigmatic framework" of psychological science. Such changes are due to the complex influence of modern psychological science formation internal laws and the new demands declared by society to modern psychologists, theorists and practitioners. The methodological reorientation of psychological science reflects a gradual departure from the previously prevailing Soviet methodological principles of activity or cultural-historical approaches, positivist views on the mental nature towards giving maximum attention to the human subjectivity and identity manifestations. To date, for psychological science is no longer sufficient consideration of the psyche as a "reactive organism that is realized in activity", or "a person who responds to environmental influences or is subject of unconscious impulses"...

Today's psychological methodology involves a comprehensive study of active and self-created personality, characterized by signs of subjectivity, activity, desire for self-realization. This involves, in essence, the restructuring of the modern psychology "paradigmatic framework". In addition, the wide variety of scientific psychological schools and theories that have lasted for more than a century, testifying to the multiparadigm of psychological science, complicates the achievement of scientific consensus by representatives of different schools, which

is "an essential feature of psychology as a science" and calls into question psychological schools and concepts. This has repeatedly been the subject of criticism by representatives of other sciences, because significantly different views on the nature of the mental, adopted in behavioral, psychoanalytic, humanistic and other approaches, so different and mutually negative. However, on the basis of each of these approaches, whole effective complexes of providing psychological assistance to the individual have been formed. Therefore, the paradigmatic composition of modern psychological science remains ambiguous and poorly defined, which actualizes this issue.

In modern methodological works, the state of psychological science could be evaluated as both pre-paradigmatic (a single paradigm has not yet been developed), and as multi-paradigmatic. The latter implies a fundamental multiplicity of psychological concepts – pluralism of scientific ideas – by virtue of the multilevel of the psychic and the inability of all psychological realities to be described within the framework of any one explanatory principle [4]. Researchers L.Garay and M.Ketchku believe that modern psychology is characterized by the confrontation of two major semi-psychologies: natural science and hermeneutic [1].

The basic features of the natural paradigm, which at one time constituted scientific psychology, can perhaps be summarized as follows:

1) psychology has a research object and a scientific subject similar to the objects and subjects of natural science;

2) the subject of psychology (as in any natural science) is subject to explanation;

3) a causal explanation should be used in psychology;

4) explicit or implicit reduction is assumed in psychology, ie the reduction of the mental to the non-mental;

5) in psychology, applicable general schemes of research are developed in the natural sciences (structural, functional, procedural, genetic, level, or certain combinations thereof) [1].

The hermeneutical paradigm in psychology assumes that psychology has another object qualitatively different from the objects of natural sciences. Therefore,

the explanations suggesting reduction in one form or another are inapplicable in psychology [7]. Descriptions should be used instead of explanations. In this case, an important place in the hermeneutic paradigm belongs to typologies.

At the same time, the hermeneutic paradigm acquires special relevance in modern psychology, which is expressed in paying special attention to such areas of research as the study of symbolism, verbal products of personality, its dialogicity and the desire for scientific psychological knowledge to synergy [6].

Typical examples of such a paradigmatic orientation of modern psychology are the scientific research of scientists concerning the essence of one of the most common categories of psychology – consciousness. According to V.Zinchenko, essential features of consciousness are dialogism, polyphony, spontaneity and reflexivity. By V. Zinchenko [2] the meaning, which is the basis of the word, is above the action, activity, including perceptual, mnemonic and cognitive. The word in the consciousness provides a planned activity, because it allows you to predict the mode of action and method of its implementation. He defines the word as endowed with an internal form of action – in a word that is considered as an internal form, both images and action are present in the form of internal forms. Thus, V.Zinchenko emphasizes the need for the integrity of consciousness and activity, the planned activities of language implementation.

The universal psychological mechanism of consciousness development, according to Z. Karpenko [3], is dialogue – a form of potential bisubjectivity of the person, a priori intention of "Self" as innate mood of mentality on perception of Other equal to itself acting as a source of generation and factor in enriching the consciousness of the individual. The psychological content of dialogic intention is the ability to personal anticipation – anticipation of another person spiritual perspective, belief in the possibility of achieving it, which is possible with an unbiased, loving attitude to the Other. And the internalization of the value positions of others "Self" is defined as a way to form a sign-symbolic, dialogical in essence, consciousness. In this case, consciousness is understood as having a communicative nature, and is an unstable, dynamic formation, which can change significantly depending on the communication context in which it is located.

V. Lavrinenko [5] the concept of value-meaning consciousness is used, which is defined as "topical", holistic, integrative personality formation, which reflects the main vectors of a certain structured comprehension of one's own "Self", surrounding objective and social reality in the form of meaning constructs and narratives based on integration of one's life, experience taking into account the current discourses of social existence and the context of activity.

Such scientific research reflects a pronounced hermeneutic paradigm in psychological science, the essential features of which are dialogicity, symbolism, linguistic conditionality of the mental nature, the diversity of social interaction processes and their representation in the mental. At the same time, the spread of the hermeneutic paradigm in modern psychology requires a significant restructuring of its methodological apparatus and research methods, because adopted within the natural paradigm means of understanding the mental do not allow to study the essential features of the psyche that are important in terms of hermeneutic paradigm. The very definition of such methodological principles will be the subject of further author's scientific research.

References:

1. Гараи Л.Кечку М. Еще один кризис в психологии! Возможная причина шумного успеха Л.С. Выготского. Вопросы философии. 1997. № 4. С.86–97.
2. Зінченко В.П. Слово та особистісне буття. Психологія і особистість. 2013. № 2. С. 6–28.
3. Карпенко З. Аксіологічна психологія особистості : монографія. Івано-Франківськ : ДВНЗ «Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника», 2018. 720 с.
4. Корнилова Т. В., Смирнов С.Д. Методологические основы психологии. М. : Издательство Юрайт, 2016. 490 с.
5. Лавріненко В.А. Особливості впливу міжособистісної взаємодії в неформальних об'єднаннях на розвиток ціннісно-сміслової свідомості підлітків. Психологія і особистість. 2019. № 1. С. 121–145.
6. Borsboom, D., van der Maas, H., Dalege, J., Kievit, R., & Haig, B. (2020, February 29). Theory Construction Methodology: A practical framework for theory formation in psychology. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/w5tp8>
7. West J.D., Bergstrom C.T. Misinformation in and about science. PNAS. 2021. Vol. 118 No. 15. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1912444117>