ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2022, Вип. 22
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2022, NO. 22

UDC 316.6:008.2:101.1

T. V. DANYLOVA[1*,2*]

[1*]The Graduate School for Social Research, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences (Warsaw, Poland),
[2*]Institute for Social and Political Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine),
e-mail danilova_tv@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-0297-9473

Social Forecasting and Elusive Reality: Our World as a Social Construct

Purpose. The paper attempts to investigate the constructivist approach to the social world and its implications for social forecasting. **Theoretical basis.** Social forecasting is mainly based on the idea that a human is "determined ontologically". Using the methodology of the natural sciences, most predictions and forecasts fail to encompass all the multiplicity and variability of the future. The postmodern interpretation of reality gave impetus to the development of the new approaches to it. A constructivist approach to social reality began to compete with essentialism. Social constructivism asserts that reality is a set of mental constructs, that it is ultimately a text. Radical constructivism interprets reality as a specific system of meanings emphasizing the artifact aspects of our reality. An interpretation of the social actors' behavior is based on the ways of understanding accepted in a given society/community and do not possess ontological universality. The creators of social space are also its creations. **Originality.** Within the framework of the postmodern approach to reality, the second-order forecasting, or forecasting of forecasting, is particularly relevant. That means that the observers-forecasters must be included in the forecast as a part of one-unified process. At this stage, a forecaster must realize that he/she is a part of a larger system, a part of the world he/she observes (and actually creates). The situation changes dramatically – the forecaster is forced to take responsibility for his/her own observations. This ultimately leads to the "humanization" of forecasting. Acting in our world full of uncertainty, unpredictability, and turbulence, modern researchers of the future should be mindful of powerful social constructs of reality. **Conclusions.** Social forecasting should be embedded in a wider context, which requires a joint effort of philosophers, foresight practitioners, historians, psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, religious scholars, anthropologists, etc. To develop promising visions and scenarios of the future, it is necessary to answer the question "Why?", which is the task of philosophically oriented research, because without this answer, we will deal with the consequences; and the implementation of the negative scenarios will reproduce itself in new socio-cultural and historical conditions. An in-depth understanding of this "Why?" provides opportunities to be in the flow of transformations. The study of the deep mental processes of the actors of social changes, the multidimensional influence on the transformation of social structures can gradually expand an answer to the question "Why?", that can cause positive changes and, accordingly, allow to create fruitful projects of the future and form effective behavioral strategies that correspond to the desired level of social development.

Keywords: human being; social forecasting; future; social world; social reality; social constructivism; social constructionism

Introduction

Forecasting the future has always been one of the most exciting and at the same time risky activities of humankind. Many swords were crossed during the discussions on the world order projects, the place of the individuals in society, their rights and responsibilities, the role of economy, politics, science, and culture in the civilizational projects. History knows a decent number of utopias, which are impossible to put into practice. An attempt to predict social phenomena is a difficult task, as far as various manifestations of the human condition are the core of this complexity. Human beings are not machines, their behavior is determined by a large number of factors, which leads to a high degree of unpredictability. Furthermore, social contexts are very diverse and social situations undergo such rapid changes that it is difficult to keep up with them. Thus, forecasting is a conditional and limited process, and social forecasts themselves are sometimes extremely "subjective and unreliable" (Arnopoulos, 1979, p. 31). However, we cannot

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

avoid social predictions, no matter how imperfect they are. Nowadays, the threats to humanity and long-lasting consequences of social problems are becoming more and more obvious and acute, therefore, any society has to be ready for the future unforeseeable situations (Flaherty, Sikorski, Klos, & Vus, 2019; Flaherty, Sikorski, Klos, Vus, & Hayduk, 2020; Khmil & Popovych, 2019). Some events/situations can be predicted with a high degree of accuracy, while others are beyond our prediction. In fact, there is a wide range of the degree of predictability: from absolute determinism to complete randomness. All other options lie within this continuum. As P. Arnopoulos stated,

> One has to exclude both extreme determinism and chance as the basis of human action. Instead, we have to assume that man acts as a result of his own "free will" as well as external forces beyond his control. According to this view, man is neither a "plaything of the gods" nor is history "full of sound and fury signifying nothing". Rather, human behavior can be better understood to range somewhere along this hypothetical continuum between randomness and determinism. In this way, we can discern some pattern in human activities and some reason in social events, without expecting to know exactly what is happening or be able to foresee precisely what is coming next. For purposes of social forecasting, we can safely assume that human activities range somewhere within these limits and thus is somewhat predictable. (Arnopoulos, 1979, p. 33)

But this predictability depends on both the interpretation of the phenomenon of a human and awareness of the social space in which he/she operates.

Human survival depends on our ability to predict the outcomes of our actions in order to make the best decisions. While ancient people turned to oracles and consulted with sages, the development of positivist science led to the fact that philosophers, oracles, and visionaries were "replaced" by computer models and model visualization. Advances in mathematics, computer science, engineering, and other disciplines have made it possible to implement large-scale, empirically tested computational models that transfer a large array of data into practice (Börner, Rouse, Trunfio, & Stanley, 2018). The attempts to embrace as much data as possible and elaborate various scenarios for the development of humankind seem to be the most productive launch pad for a new paradigm of the future. However, the depth and contradictions of the human nature and social world require a broader understanding in the context of the synthesis of philosophy and contemporary sciences (Danylova, 2017).

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2022, Вип. 22
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2022, NO. 22

Purpose

The paper attempts to investigate the constructivist approach to the social world and its implications for social forecasting.

Statement of basic materials

The vast majority of social forecasts are based on the idea that an individual has an unchanging essence, a constant set of qualities and properties that make him/her who he/she is. The strict determinism of human behavior due to his/her innate nature and motives is consistent with essentialism. Therefore, human actions are determined by the principium rationis sufficientis agenda, or the law of motivation: a motive causes a desire, which is necessarily followed by a behavioral act (Schopenhauer, 1891). Thus, individuals are seen as stable, predetermined objects of research; and the similarity of their characteristics stems from the natural parameters that exist objectively and retain their immutability or, at least, significant stability.

This approach arose due to the fact that the social sciences and humanities borrowed their theoretical and methodological models from the natural sciences, which from the end of the 18th to the second half of the 20th century had served as the "precedent and paradigm" for the scientific knowledge. The influence of positivism with its focus on naturalism and empiricism was manifested in the absolutization and universalization of the worldview, in the search for general laws of social life. Such a tendency presupposes the existence of completely independent objective reality, where the individuals act according to its laws. But does this invariable, predetermined reality exist?

The polylogue of postmodern is largely a reaction to the confidence in science, which can explain the physical and social worlds and determine the place of a human being within these worlds. In fact, it stems from the recognition that the reality we perceive is not reality per se, but, rather, is constructed by the mind itself. That is why the postmodern age is very skeptical of explanations that claim to be the absolute truth. Instead, it focuses on the relativity of truth for each person. Through the lens of postmodern, everything is an interpretation – we create our own reality by interpreting the world around us. Reality emerges through our interpretation of what the world means to us personally (Mlodinow, 2013). Giving priority to specific experience over abstract principles, postmodern thought asserts that the results of one’s own experience are relative rather than final and universal and attempts to offer a new understanding of the world and a human within its discourse.

The proponents of the postmodern turn criticize traditional culture, theory, and politics, while the defenders of modern traditions ignore this challenge, fight back, or try to fit their concepts into the new discourse. Although critics of the postmodern turn claim that the new worldview is just a tribute to fashion, the invention of intellectuals in search of a new discourse as a source of cultural capital, or another ideology created to devalue the ideas of the modern era, postmodern thought has posed questions that cannot be dealt with constructively within the existing paradigms.

Nowadays, the universe is considered from a syncretic perspective: it is impossible to separate humans from nature, consciousness from matter, subject from object. An American physicist and deep ecologist F. Capra (2010) claims that the main themes of modern physics, as well as all mystical traditions, are the fundamental relationship and interdependence of all phenomena and the inner dynamic nature of reality; thus, there is nothing primary or secondary in the

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2022, Вип. 22
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2022, NO. 22

universe. Our world is a unified whole, which consists of processes instead of things. Objective knowledge does not exist, because the observers have an impact on the processes and objects of observation.

An American scientist D. Bohm (1984), who is known for his works on quantum physics, philosophy, and neuropsychology, believes that on the "folded up", "pre-quantum" level of reality the world loses all properties, which the human brain attributes to it. Bohm's ideas on universal integrity and his assumptions about hidden order have influenced various scientific disciplines. They became the core of what is known as the holographic paradigm. On the basis of the holographic paradigm, an American neurosurgeon, neurophysiologist, and psychologist K. Pribram (1971) elaborated the "holonomic brain theory".

An American theoretical physicist J. Wheeler (1990) assumes that an immaterial source is the basis of all objects or phenomena in the physical world. Everything that people recognize as reality is created by themselves in the process of measurement, that is, all physical entities are information-theoretical, and the universe requires our participation in their manifestation. Thus, people create their own worlds using an endless number of individual facts. Habitual reality appears to be the result of collective representations or agreements. A Finnish philosopher and mathematician J. Hintikka (1989) emphasizes that all our statements about the world consist of notions created by people. Actually, the knowledge of reality cannot be separated from the methods of its conceptual comprehension.

Postmodern thinkers M. Foucault, J. Derrida, R. Barthes, U. Eco, G. Deleuze, J.-F. Lyotard urged to abandon dogmatism, one-sided perception and explanation. As J. Derrida (1998) argues, philosophizing often arises as a result of the uncompromising struggle against binary oppositions, and binary thinking is based on our desire to reduce the world to a comprehensible and compelling scheme. The idea of deconstruction really seems to be a fundamentally new approach to the analysis of social and cultural life.

> The recognition of pluralistic interpretation of reality in postmodern era casts doubt on complete and absolute truth of any worldview represented by the only one position. Understanding that human self-determination is a probabilistic model, involvement in the situation and attachment to things are features of modern mass psychology, human consciousness is a set of artificial clichés forces us to reconsider the entire scientific worldview. (Danylova, 2014, p. 95)

Both the scientific concepts and the methodology of scientific research.

As a rule, the natural sciences do not examine objects from the different, often opposing, angles. They base cumulative explanations on "facts", because the objects they study are "indifferent" to the observers. As a Canadian sociologist W. Little rightly pointed out,

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

> The chemical composition and behavior of a protein can be assumed to be the same wherever it is observed and by whomever it is observed. The same cannot be said of social phenomena, which are mediated by meanings and interpretations, divided by politics and value orientations, subject to historical change and human agency, characterized by contradictions and reconciliations, and transfigured if they are observed at a micro or macro-level. Social reality is different, depending on the historical moment, the perspective, and the criteria from which it is viewed. (Little & McGivern, 2013, p. 23)

The postmodern interpretation of reality gave impetus to the development of the new approaches to it. A constructivist approach to social reality began to compete with essentialism. If within the essentialist approach the individuals lose their subjectivity, then within the constructivist frame they are considered as those who determine their own way of life, who form and transform their own society. Thus, the social world is fundamentally different from the natural world. It is a social construct that is generated by the inner world of an individual: "what is 'real' to a Tibetan monk may not be 'real' to an American businessman" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 15). Reality is not reflected and represented by language and consciousness, but is created in the process of observation or cognition.

Developed in the 1960s within the methodology of the social sciences, social constructivism asserts that reality is a set of mental constructs, that it is ultimately a text. Sociologists P. Berger and T. Luckmann (1966) point out that all social constructs as historical products of human activity are mutable; changes occur as a result of human activities; the existence of constructs has its foundation in the lives of the individuals and does not have any empirical status beyond these lives. In the postmodern era, there is a growing awareness of the relativity of all worlds, all realities, which are perceived as one of the possible options, and not the ultimate truth. This implies sensitivity to the socio-cultural contexts of the bearers of specific social constructs.

Undoubtedly, social constructs have become a reality for their carriers creating a kind of world, within which they are objective, independent and directly affect all spheres of life of a group or society. Certain ideas about the world are habitualized and typified, eventually turning into social institutions that are perceived as an external fact, "forced reality" by the following generations and the creators of these institutions themselves. P. Berger and T. Luckmann (1966) emphasize the fundamental relationship between three dialectical moments in social reality: society is a human product; society is an objective reality; man is a social product (p. 79). The researchers note that the analysis of the social world should embrace all three components. In the process of development of the social institutions, there is a segmentation of the institutional order, which gives rise to different semantic sub-universes constructed according to different crite-

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2022, Вип. 22
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2022, NO. 22

ria, such as age, gender, religion, profession, etc. These sub-universes acquire objective meanings/existence for their carriers, which leads to competition and conflict within a large group – different realities collide with each other, "the chiropractor has a different angle on society than the medical school professor, the poet than the businessman, the Jew than the Gentile" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 103).

The institutional order requires legitimation that gives cognitive validity to objectified meanings. In the process of legitimation, a symbolic universe emerges. It organizes the past, present, and future of an individual. Individual's openness to the world implies the conflict between order and chaos, which must be restrained, because any social reality is unreliable. Such duality "order – chaos" and efforts to overcome it permeate all history from traditional archaic cultures to modern civilized societies. Binary oppositions are the primarily notional division of the world into two opposing parts. Literally, all objects and phenomena fall into this system. An American psychologist C. Osgood (1979) stresses that human consciousness is characterized by bipolarity (i.e., the meanings of the words are differentiated in terms of binary oppositions) and the opposite poles are not equal in value: one of the poles is evaluated as a positive and the other – as a negative. According to a French anthropologist and ethnologist C. Levi-Strauss (2008), binarity is universal, and our thinking is based on this scheme. Thus, binarity acquires the status of the fundamental principle of consciousness. Binary paradigms make people experience ontological dissonance, which is perceived as a fact of human existence (Danylova, 2014). The sources of the symbolic universe are rooted in the human nature, and the symbolic universes vividly demonstrate that any kind of reality is very meaningful to individuals.

At the beginning of the 1980s, radical constructivism represented by P. Watzlawick, E. von Glasersfeld, H. von Foerster emerged. Interpreting reality as a specific system of meanings, the proponents of this movement emphasize the artifact aspects of our reality. According to an Austrian physicist, mathematician, and one of the "fathers" of cybernetics as epistemology H. von Foerster, the world, as we perceive it, is our construction. Arguing that truth is an invention of a liar, H. von Foerster stresses that it is not only a matter of what we do not know. It also happens that we do not know that we do not know. This is double ignorance, or second-order ignorance. Each observation primarily says something about an observer. Anyone who claims to be in possession of truth says something about himself/herself, but not about truth (Lafrentz, n.d.). It is not given to us to know what reality is, so we construct our present making sense of the world to the extent of our cognitive capabilities (Foerster & Pörksen, 2002).

An Austrian-American psychotherapist and psychologist, theorist of communication and radical constructivism P. Watzlawick (1980) notes that his constructivism is radical because it violates convention and develops a theory of knowledge, in which knowledge does not reflect "objective" ontological reality. In his opinion, there are many different versions of reality, which can contradict each other. In fact, the individuals construct reality, but they do not understand it and believe that they only "reflect" the objective world. Any reality is actually an interpretation constructed by and through communication. We are "imprisoned" in a systemic construction that frames our world.

An American philosopher, psychologist, and one of the founders of radical constructivism E. von Glasersfeld (1984) notes that radical constructivism is one of the possible models of cognition inherent in intelligent living beings capable of making a more or less reliable world out of the material of their own experience. Thus, the "real world" is a system of constructs that is generated by an individual during processing his/her sensory experience.

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2022, Вип. 22
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2022, NO. 22

Therefore, in contrast to the essentialist approach, within the constructivist approach, methodology and cognitive practices are perceived as a factor contributing to the "construction" of reality. If through the lens of premodern and modern a tendency towards stabilization and sustainability of social objects was observed, then postmodern opened the doors to the blurring of their boundaries, to constant changes that was vividly reflected in social constructivism, which rejected the criteria that set boundaries. The hierarchical space of transcendence has given way to the space of transgression, which has affirmed immanence and has revealed the possibilities for the new definitions of reality. The transgressive model of the world structure provides "not one universal meaning, but "multi-meaning", the configuration of a multitude of simultaneously existing semantic perspectives, none of which acquires the status of a defining and dominant semantic instance" (Faritov, 2016).

Social forecasting is mainly based on the idea that a human is "determined ontologically", just like our material world, the so-called natural world. Being based on the idea that human beings are a part of nature and mechanically "transferring" to them and the world created by them the methodology of the natural sciences, most predictions and forecasts have failed to encompass all the multiplicity and variability of the future. However, according to J. Lotman (Lotman & Clark, 2005), the phenomenon we call nature is an artificial construct. Nature per se is beyond cognition since it is continual, whereas culture is always discrete. In the process of cognition, we single out an object from the one unified stream of being, bringing it out of the realm of nature into the sphere of culture. This entails the need for reconciliation of the continuity of being with the discreteness of consciousness (Danylova, 2013). Therefore, when developing research tools and conducting research, it is advisable to move away from the essentialist understanding of humans and their worlds and rely on the "interpretativeness" of the social world, in which we act.

An American social psychologist K. Gergen (1997) notes that although the basic processes of cognition, motivation, and prejudice are inherent in human nature (and therefore they can be considered from the standpoint of essentialism), their expression is variable. It is not possible to predict and understand human behavior in the same way as the law of universal gravitation, because it is unstable, should be considered "within the context", depends on historical and sociocultural conditions, the "horizon of understanding" and "paradigm of understanding" of its interpreter:

> There is no reading of a "psychological interior" save through the presumptions one brings to bear. People’s actions do not transparently reveal the character of their subjective worlds or mental processes; however, once psychologists bring a given theory to bear, they locate "internal events" in its terms. These theories have no basis in fact; any facts about the mind used in their support would have necessitated the use of such theories. In effect, the psychological world so dear to the heart of many social psychologists is a social construction, and the findings used to jus-

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2022, Вип. 22
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2022, NO. 22

> tify statements about this world are only valid insofar as one remains within the theoretical (and metatheoretical) paradigms of the field. Research findings don't have any meaning until they are interpreted, and these interpretations are not demanded by the findings themselves. They result from a process of negotiating meaning within the community. (Gergen, 1997, p. 118)

An interpretation of the social actors' behavior is based on the ways of understanding accepted in a given society/community and do not possess ontological universality. The creators of social space are also its creations. This space is a kind of reality that is constructed and described due to the conceptual apparatus of the subjects of cognition: words are the tools that people use to address reality. People unconsciously begin to assume that to name something is to gain a certain amount of power over it. Linguistic conventions shape the perception of reality. To live together, people create their own working languages that are conventional, which can eventually lead to the objectification of a particular way to construct the world. Linguistic conventions lay the framework, within which we understand ourselves, others, and the world around us.

The perception of the world is its description. Anyone who interacts with children acts as their teacher constantly describing the world, until children begin to perceive the world as it has been described (Castaneda, 2012). Thus, people learn to transform and create their own flow of perception in accordance with the culturally adopted description. The world as description becomes their supreme reality; they, in fact, enter the linguistic realm of being. People forget their children's holistic perception of the world because it does not correspond to the structure of culturally adapted description. Therefore, people have no terms to interpret it (Wilber, 1999).

From the very beginning, our consciousness is immersed in the world; the background through which it identifies itself is made up of other people. The vital necessity compels consciousness to see all things as certain "weapons", "tools", reinforces the trend to view the world as "equipment" and the other people, as M. Heidegger (2008) states, – in the "context of belonging". This situation objectifies the specific ways to construct the world and requires to be in total agreement regarding these ways that hinders self-reflective assessment and development. Those who do not share the "created reality" fall into the category of "They", "Others". In this case, the value orientations, beliefs, and preferences of the supporters of the "dominant reality" come to the fore. The members of this group identify themselves with a certain paradigm, and, accordingly, perceive the potential creators of the "alternative reality" as strange, hostile, worse, often experiencing anxiety, misunderstanding, and aggression (Danylova, 2013). These "Others" are excluded from the cultural dialogues that leads to the narrowness of the functional field of social forecasts, as far as "dominant" forecasts will defend the moral and ideological values of the dominant group and be the result of social programming.

According to K. Gergen, social constructionist approach in psychology is capable of initiating a reflexive dialogue both in psychological science itself and in culture as a whole. The creation of new cultural forms requires value self-determination, which the vast majority of sci-

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

ences try to avoid. From the standpoint of social constructionism, which attempts to embrace ethical and political aspects, participation in social transformations is more important than detached analysis:

> For the constructionist, the discourses of the profession are themselves constitutive of cultural life. When they serve to mold the intelligibilities of the culture – making distinctions, furnishing rationales for action, and implicitly evaluating forms of conduct – they also prepare our future. This may be a future which simply recapitulates the past, which sustains the taken-for-granted assumptions of the culture. Such are typically the effects of a social psychology based on a realist (or objectifying) account of science. However, for the constructionist, social psychological inquiry can enter into the creation of new forms of cultural life. With the development of new theoretical languages, research practices, forms of expression, and practices of intervention, so does the field invite cultural transformations. (Gergen, 1997, pp. 121-122)

Originality

Within the framework of the postmodern approach to reality, the second-order forecasting, or forecasting of forecasting, is particularly relevant. That means that the observers-forecasters must be included in the forecast as a part of one-unified process. At this stage, a forecaster must realize that he/she is a part of a larger system, a part of the world he/she observes (and actually creates). The situation changes dramatically – the forecaster is forced to take responsibility for his/her own observations. This ultimately leads to the "humanization" of forecasting. If within prevailing epistemology, the subjects of cognition seem not to have biological, psychological, or cultural characteristics, then, within the frame of constructivist approach, these characteristics, human activity, and responsibility for scientific constructs are considered. Acting in our world full of uncertainty, unpredictability, and turbulence (Bergquist, n.d.), modern researchers of the future should be mindful of powerful social constructs of reality.

Conclusions

Social forecasting should be embedded in a wider context, which requires a joint effort of philosophers, foresight practitioners, historians, psychologists, sociologists, political scientists,

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

religious scholars, anthropologists, etc. To develop promising visions and scenarios of the future, it is necessary to answer the question "Why?", which is the task of philosophically oriented research, because without this answer, we will deal with the consequences; and the implementation of the negative scenarios will reproduce itself in new socio-cultural and historical conditions. An in-depth understanding of this "Why?" provides opportunities to be in the flow of transformations. The study of the deep mental processes of the actors of social changes, the multidimensional influence on the transformation of social structures can gradually expand an answer to the question "Why?", that can cause positive changes and, accordingly, allow to create fruitful projects of the future and form effective behavioral strategies that correspond to the desired level of social development.

Acknowledgments

I am thankful for the support from the Institute of International Education's Scholar Rescue Fund (IIE-SRF) and the Graduate School for Social Research, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences for enabling my research. I would like to thank Prof. Irina Tomescu-Dubrow, the Director of the Graduate School for Social Research at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, for her reliable help.

REFERENCES

Arnopoulos, P. (1979). Toward a model procedure for social forecasting. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 13*(1), 31-42. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-1625(79)90004-0 (in English)

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin Books. (in English)

Bergquist, W. (n.d.). *Psychology and the Social Construction of Reality.* The Professional School of Psychology. Retrieved from https://psychology.edu/programs/the-edge-of-knowledge-psps-research-center/psychology-and-the-social-construction-of-reality/ (in English)

Bohm, D. (1984). *Causality and Chance in Modern Physics*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. (in English)

Börner, K., Rouse, W. B., Trunfio, P., & Stanley, H. E. (2018). Forecasting innovations in science, technology, and education. *PNAS, 115*(50), 12573-12581. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1818750115 (in English)

Capra, F. (2010). *The Tao of Physics: An Exploration of the Parallels Between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism*. Shambhala. (in English)

Castaneda, C. (2012). *Journey to Ixtlan: The Lessons of Don Juan*. Washington Square Press. (in English)

Danylova, T. V. (2013). Overcoming the Cultural Differences: Parable as a Means of Intercultural Dialogue. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research,* (3), 42-51. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr2013/14318 (in English)

Danylova, T. V. (2014). Eastern Spiritual Traditions through the Lens of Modern Scientific Worldview. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research,* (5), 95-102. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr2014/25202 (in English)

Danylova, T. V. (2017). Eastern Mysticism and Timothy Leary: Human Beyond the Conventional Reality. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research,* (11), 135-142. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i11.105498 (in English)

Derrida, J. (1998). *Of Grammatology*. USA: JHU Press. (in English)

Faritov, V. T. (2016). The Philosophical Aspects of the Work of M. Bakhtin: Transgression Ontology. *Voprosy Filosofii*, (12), 140-150. (in Russian)

Flaherty, M., Sikorski, E., Klos, L., & Vus, V. (2019). Peacebuilding and Mental Health: Moving beyond Individual Pathology to Community Responsibility. *Mental Health: Global Challenges Journal, 1*(1), 27-28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32437/mhgcj.v1i1.13 (in English)

Flaherty, M., Sikorski, E., Klos, L., Vus, V., & Hayduk, N. (2020). Peacework and mental health: from individual pathology to community responsibility. *Intervention, 18*(1), 28-36. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4103/INTV.INTV_59_18 (in English)

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

Foerster, H., & Pörksen, B. (2002). *Understanding Systems: Conversations on Epistemology and Ethics* (K. Leube, Trans.). Carl-Auer Verlag GmbH. (in English)

Gergen, K. J. (1997). Social Psychology as Social Construction: The Emerging Vision. In C. McGarty & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The Message of Social Psychology: Perspectives on Mind in Society* (pp. 113-128). Blackwell Publishing. (in English)

Glasersfeld, E. (1984). An Introduction to Radical Constructivism. In P. Watzlawick (Ed.), *The Invented Reality: How Do We Know What We Believe We Know? (Contributions to Constructivism)* (pp. 17-40). W. W. Norton & Company. (in English)

Heidegger, M. (2008). *Being and Time*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics. (in English)

Hintikka, J. (1989). *The Logic of Epistemology and the Epistemology of Logic. Selected Essays*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (in English)

Khmil, V. V., & Popovych, I. S. (2019). Philosophical and Psychological Dimensions of Social Expectations of Personality. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research,* (16), 55-65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.187540 (in English)

Lafrentz, D. (n.d.). *Truth is the Invention of a Liar – Centenary of the birth of Heinz von Foerster* (T. Nevill, Trans.). The Feldenkrais Method. Retrieved from https://www.feldenkraisnow.org/truthistheinvent.html (in English)

Levi-Strauss, C. (2008). *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books. (in English)

Little, W., & McGivern, R. (2013). *Introduction to Sociology – 1st Canadian Edition*. Rice University. (in English)

Lotman, J., & Clark, W. (2005). On the semiosphere. *Sign Systems Studies, 33*(1), 205-229. DOI: https://doi.org/10.12697/SSS.2005.33.1.09 (in English)

Mlodinow, L. (2013). *Subliminal: How Your Unconscious Mind Rules Your Behavior*. Vintage. (in English)

Osgood, C. E. (1979). *Focus on Meaning: Explorations in Semantic Space*. Mouton Publishers. (in English)

Pribram, K. H. (1971). *Languages of the Brain: Experimental Paradoxes and Principles in Neuropsychology.* Brandon House. (in English)

Schopenhauer, A. (1891). *On the Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason and on the Will in Nature* (K. Hillebrand, Trans.). London: George Bell and Sons. (in English)

Watzlawick, P. (Ed.). (1980). *The Invented Reality: How Do We Know What We Believe We Know? (Contributions to Constructivism).* W. W. Norton & Company. (in English)

Wheeler, J. A. (1990). Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. In W. H. Zurek (Ed.), *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information* (pp. 3-28). Redwood City, California: Addison-Wesley. (in English)

Wilber, K. (1999). *The Collected Works of Ken Wilber: The Atman Project, Up from Eden* (Vol. 2). Boston: Shambhala. (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

Arnopoulos P. Toward a model procedure for social forecasting. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 1979. Vol. 13, Iss. 1. P. 31–42. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-1625(79)90004-0

Berger P. L., Luckmann T. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin Books, 1966. 249 p.

Bergquist W. Psychology and the Social Construction of Reality. *The Professional School of Psychology.* URL: https://psychology.edu/programs/the-edge-of-knowledge-psps-research-center/psychology-and-the-social-construction-of-reality/

Bohm D. *Causality and Chance in Modern Physics*. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984. 64 p.

Börner K., Rouse W. B., Trunfio P., Stanley H. E. Forecasting innovations in science, technology, and education. *PNAS*. 2018. Vol. 115, No. 50. P. 12573–12581. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1818750115

Capra F. *The Tao of Physics: An Exploration of the Parallels Between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism*. Shambhala, 2010. 368 p.

Castaneda C. *Journey to Ixtlan: The Lessons of Don Juan*. Washington Square Press, 2012. 205 p.

Danylova T. V. Overcoming the Cultural Differences: Parable as a Means of Intercultural Dialogue. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2013. No. 3. P. 42–51. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr2013/14318

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

Danylova T. V. Eastern Spiritual Traditions through the Lens of Modern Scientific Worldview. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2014. No. 5. P. 95–102. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr2014/25202

Danylova T. V. Eastern Mysticism and Timothy Leary: Human Beyond the Conventional Reality. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2017. No. 11. P. 135–142. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i11.105498

Derrida J. *Of Grammatology*. USA : JHU Press, 1998. 360 p.

Фаритов В. Т. Философские аспекты творчества М. Бахтина: онтология трансгрессии. *Вопросы философии.* 2016. № 12. С. 140–150.

Flaherty M., Sikorski E., Klos L., Vus V. Peacebuilding and Mental Health: Moving beyond Individual Pathology to Community Responsibility. *Mental Health: Global Challenges Journal*. 2019. Vol. 1, Iss. 1. P. 27–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32437/mhgcj.v1i1.13

Flaherty M., Sikorski E., Klos L., Vus V., Hayduk N. Peacework and mental health: from individual pathology to community responsibility. *Intervention.* 2020. Vol. 18, Iss. 1. P. 28–36. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4103/INTV.INTV_59_18

Foerster H., Pörksen B. *Understanding Systems: Conversations on Epistemology and Ethics* / trans. by K. Leube. Carl-Auer Verlag GmbH, 2002. 161 p.

Gergen K. J. Social Psychology as Social Construction: The Emerging Vision. *The Message of Social Psychology: Perspectives on Mind in Society* / ed. by C. McGarty, S. A. Haslam. Blackwell Publishing, 1997. P. 113–128.

Glasersfeld E. An Introduction to Radical Constructivism. *The Invented Reality: How Do We Know What We Believe We Know? (Contributions to Constructivism)* / ed. by P. Watzlawick. W. W. Norton & Company, 1984. P. 17–40.

Heidegger M. *Being and Time*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2008. 608 p.

Hintikka J. *The Logic of Epistemology and the Epistemology of Logic. Selected Essays*. Netherlands : Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989. 245 p.

Khmil V. V., Popovych I. S. Philosophical and Psychological Dimensions of Social Expectations of Personality. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2019. No. 16. P. 55–65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.187540

Lafrentz D. Truth is the Invention of a Liar – Centenary of the birth of Heinz von Foerster / trans. by T. Nevill. *The Feldenkrais Method*. URL: https://www.feldenkraisnow.org/truthistheinvent.html

Levi-Strauss C. *Structural Anthropology*. New York : Basic Books, 2008. 441 p.

Little W., McGivern R. *Introduction to Sociology – 1st Canadian Edition*. Rice University, 2013. 722 p.

Lotman J., Clark W. On the semiosphere. *Sign Systems Studies*. 2005. Vol. 33, No. 1. P. 205–229. DOI: https://doi.org/10.12697/SSS.2005.33.1.09

Mlodinow L. *Subliminal: How Your Unconscious Mind Rules Your Behavior*. Vintage, 2013. 272 p.

Osgood C. E. *Focus on Meaning: Explorations in Semantic Space*. Mouton Publishers, 1979. 236 p.

Pribram K. H. *Languages of the Brain: Experimental Paradoxes and Principles in Neuropsychology*. Brandon House, 1971. 432 p.

Schopenhauer A. *On the Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason and on the Will in Nature* / trans. by K. Hillebrand. London : George Bell and Sons, 1891. 380 + xi p.

The Invented Reality: How Do We Know What We Believe We Know? (Contributions to Constructivism) / ed. by P. Watzlawick. W. W. Norton & Company, 1980. 352 p.

Wheeler J. A. Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information* / ed. by W. H. Zurek. Redwood City, California : Addison-Wesley, 1990. P. 3–28.

Wilber K. *The Collected Works of Ken Wilber*. Vol. 2: The Atman Project, Up from Eden. Boston : Shambhala, 1999. 720 p.

Т. В. ДАНИЛОВА[1*,2*]

[1*]Вища школа соціальних досліджень, Інститут філософії та соціології Польської академії наук (Варшава, Польща),
[2*]Інститут соціальної та політичної психології Національної академії педагогічних наук України (Київ, Україна),
ел. пошта danilova_tv@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-0297-9473

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2022, Вип. 22
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2022, NO. 22

Соціальне прогнозування та невловима реальність: наш світ як соціальний конструкт

Мета. У статті зроблено спробу дослідити конструктивістський підхід до соціального світу та його імплікації в контексті соціального прогнозування. **Теоретичний базис.** Із використанням методології природничих наук більшість передбачень і прогнозів не в змозі охопити всю різноманітність і мінливість майбутнього. Постмодерне тлумачення реальності дало поштовх до розвитку нових підходів до неї. Конструктивістський підхід до соціальної реальності почав конкурувати з есенціалістським підходом, у якому людина "визначена онтологічно". Якщо в рамках есенціалістського підходу індивіди втрачають свою суб'єктність, то в рамках конструктивізму вони постають як ті, хто визначає власний спосіб життя, хто формує та трансформує власне суспільство. Соціальний конструктивізм стверджує, що реальність – це набір ментальних конструктів, що вона, зрештою, є текстом. Радикальний конструктивізм трактує реальність як певну систему значень, підкреслюючи артефактні аспекти цієї реальності. Інтерпретація поведінки соціальних акторів ґрунтується на способах розуміння, прийнятих у цьому суспільстві, і не має онтологічної універсальності. Творці соціального простору також є його творіннями. **Наукова новизна.** У рамках постмодерного підходу до реальності особливої актуальності набуває прогнозування другого порядку, або прогнозування прогнозування. Спостерігачі-прогнозисти повинні бути залучені до прогнозування як частина єдиного процесу. На цьому етапі творець прогнозів має усвідомити себе частиною великої системи, частиною світу, який він/вона спостерігає (і фактично створює). Ситуація кардинально змінюється: той, хто прогнозує, змушений взяти на себе відповідальність за власні спостереження. Це зрештою призводить до "гуманізації" прогнозування. Оперуючи в сучасному світі, сповненому невизначеності, непередбачуваності й турбулентності, сучасні дослідники майбутнього повинні зважати на потужні соціальні конструкти реальності. **Висновки.** Соціальне прогнозування має бути "вбудоване" в більш широкий контекст, що потребує спільних зусиль філософів, футурологів, істориків, психологів, соціологів, політологів, релігієзнавців, антропологів тощо. Для розробки перспективних сценаріїв майбутнього необхідно дати відповідь на запитання "Чому?", що є завданням філософськи орієнтованого дослідження, оскільки без цієї відповіді ми матимемо справу лише з наслідками, і реалізація негативних сценаріїв буде відтворювати себе в нових соціокультурних та історичних умовах. Розуміння "Чому?" надає можливість перебувати в потоці трансформацій. Дослідження глибинних психічних процесів усіх акторів соціальних змін, багатовимірний вплив на трансформацію соціальних конструктів може поступово розширити відповідь на запитання "Чому?", що спричинить позитивні зміни і, відповідно, дозволить створити плідні проєкти майбутнього та сформувати ефективні стратегії поведінки, які відповідатимуть бажаному рівню розвитку суспільства.

Ключові слова: людина; соціальне прогнозування; майбутнє; соціальний світ; соціальна реальність; соціальний конструктивізм; соціальний конструкціонізм

Received: 20.06.2022
Accepted: 08.12.2022

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271332