



Editorial

UDK 159.9.016.1:37.091.8-057.87:159

METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES OF RESEARCH ON PROBLEMS OF SOCIALIZATION OF PERSONALITY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN WAR

Slyusarevskiy Mykola

DOI 10.37096/SHDISJ-23-1.2-0001

Abstract

Relevance. Despite being traditional and important for psychological and sociological sciences, the problem of socialization remains vulnerable to criticism due to the apologetic nature of its theoretical and methodological foundations. Within the limits of traditional approaches, the success or failure of the process and results of socialization are considered, in fact, in the interests of the officially recognized state ideology with a corresponding set of ideals and values. This may be acceptable for countries with established democratic regimes, but it generates many insidious questions in the conditions of confrontation between societies with different civilizational reference points. This is the situation we have today in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war.

Methodology is based on the discursive approach, which does not deprive the researcher of the right to evaluate socialization from his or her ideological position, but excludes the extrapolation of these evaluations to the psychological (procedural) content of socialization. According to this approach, the discourses in which socialization takes place, rather than its psychological content itself, can be evaluated from a moral or ideological perspective. This allows for a more realistic evaluation of the socialization experience of different societies, different countries and peoples, for comparison, etc. People's participation in the reproduction and development of discourse can be traced by the results of monitoring all-Ukrainian representative surveys conducted by the Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine since the early 1990s.

Results. During this time, the territorial-state discourse has gradually formed as a leading one in Ukrainian society. Its value imperative is the attitude of state independence. About 80% of citizens believe that although there are many obstacles in the way of our statehood, Ukraine should still be independent.

Keywords: *Socialization, discursive approach, territorial-state discourse, monitoring all-Ukrainian survey.*

Relevance

Dear ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues. I have the honor to sincerely and



cordially congratulate you on behalf of the Directorate and staff of the Institute of Social and Political Psychology on the beginning of the next international scientific and practical conference "Socialization and resocialization of personality in the conditions of modern society". I would also add: in the society at war. In this regard, I would like to express my deep satisfaction with the fact that despite this situation, such academic events of the academic plan are taking place, which are undoubtedly of public relevance.

The topic of this international conference, which regularly, for the eighth time, brings together qualified specialists of Ukraine and European countries, is relevant primarily in the practical aspect. In the aspect of determining the trajectory of psychological assistance to the society, the social structure and social relations of which are currently under threat and are being significantly affected by the war events. But the topic of the conference is also relevant in terms of theoretical and methodological reflection on the scientific and psychological problems of personality socialization. I would even venture to say that in a certain sense, of course, the issues in this theoretical and methodological aspect are even more important now than in the purely practical aspect. I will allow myself to express some considerations in this regard in more detail.

Despite being traditional for social and psychological as well as sociological sciences, despite the fact that in many textbooks the problem of socialization occupies a central place, it, as you know, has been and still is vulnerable to criticism due to the apologetic nature of its theoretical and methodological foundations, according to which success or failure or, relatively speaking, the correctness or incorrectness of the process and results of socialization are considered, in fact, in the interests of an officially recognized state ideology with a corresponding set of ideals, values, etc. This may be acceptable for countries with established democratic regimes, but it generates a lot of insidious questions in transitional societies, in transforming societies, and even more so in situations of sharp confrontation between different social groups or confrontations between countries with different political regimes, value systems, with different civilization reference points. This is the situation we have today in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war.

In this context, the question arises: how to evaluate, for example, the socialization of Russian thugs loyal to Putin who are committing atrocities in the cities and villages of Ukraine? Has it been successful or unsuccessful, normal or abnormal, as they say, desocialization? Or let's ask the opposite question: how to evaluate the socialization of those Russians who, from Putin's point of view, take an anti-social position, those who publicly oppose the war, or those who flee from mobilization using the same criteria of normality/abnormality? Such questions cannot be satisfactorily answered within the framework of existing definitions of socialization, which view it as the process of a person's entry into society, assimilation of his or her socio-cultural experience, norms, values, etc.

Methodology

In my opinion, it is possible to get rid of apologetic ideas about socialization by defining it as the process of a person's entry into a particular social or socio-cultural discourse. The current post-modern, information-rich world is characterized by a

multiplicity of discourses that know neither geographical nor political boundaries. Therefore, a person in the information age can choose in principle any discourse, including one that contradicts the official ideology and the values prevalent in a certain society at a certain stage of its history. A remarkable Russian poet Boris Chichibabin, for example, did it. Throughout his life, this poet, persecuted by the Soviet regime, was deeply immersed in the Russian socio-cultural environment, in the Russian society, and when Russia at the turn of the 90s began to choose old imperial symbols, Chichibabin wrote a powerful, I would say, alternative poem that marked a categorical break with this Russian discourse marked by a bloodthirsty double-headed eagle.

It must be stressed that the discursive approach does not deprive the researcher of the right to evaluate socialization from his or her ideological or moral position, but excludes the extrapolation of these evaluations to the psychological content of socialization. This psychological – and most likely processual – content is invariant to any discursive practices of socialization. Therefore, by and large, the discourses in which socialization takes place, and not its psychological content, can be analyzed from a moral or ideological perspective within the discursive approach. This allows for a more realistic, and perhaps even more sober, evaluation of the socialization experience of different societies, different countries and peoples, for comparison, etc.

The advantage of the discursive approach is that it allows considering in a unified theoretical and methodological context both traditional forms of socialization and the newest ones that are now planned to be discussed at the conference – media socialization, information socialization, cybersocialization, etc. All these forms can be considered in the same context as the traditional ones, since, as philosophers believe, participants of discourses can be not only people, but also computer networks and other carriers of artificial intelligence.

But discourses not only exist, coexist and oppose each other, but are also constantly being reproduced and developed. Therefore, the definition of socialization as a process of not only entering of a person into a certain discourse, but also participation in its reproduction and development will be more complete. This definition also differs from the traditional ones, in which the activity of a socialized person is connected only with the realization of social ties. In fact, a person not only realizes his or her activity in social relations, but also reproduces the discourse in which he or she is socialized and participates in its development.

People's participation in the reproduction and development of the discourse can be traced by the results of monitoring all-Ukrainian representative surveys conducted by our institute since the early 1990s.

Results

The results of these studies show that the most important discourse in the worldview sense, which can be called the territorial-state discourse, was gradually formed in Ukrainian society. Monitoring data shows how this discourse became leading, that more and more citizens participated in its reproduction. And also in its creation! This process



may have been slow, but steady. And what is remarkable is that on the eve of the full-scale Russian invasion, it reached its maximum according to many sociological indicators.

Thus, about 80% of citizens believed that although there are many obstacles in the way of our statehood, Ukraine should still be independent. Only 16% shared the opinion that independence did not bring us anything good. Less than 11% said that Ukraine is too diversified and we cannot get along in one state (although in previous years this figure was almost twice as high). The nostalgic dream of restoring the “union of fraternal Soviet peoples” was retained by only 9.5% of respondents.

At the same time, the ominous image of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism inspired by Soviet and Russian propaganda was losing its power. Less than a quarter of respondents saw it as a danger (the lowest figure for the entire observation period). Instead, the territorial-state discourse was becoming increasingly nationally coloured. Thus, the share of respondents who believe that it is the revival of national identity that will enable Ukraine to become a powerful state increased from 32% to more than 56% compared to the late 1990s. And in the seemingly completely denationalized south this figure rose to more than 80%, which was manifested in the first days of the full-scale war in the mass demonstrations of unarmed Kherson citizens under national flags. At the risk of being suspected of mysticism, I cannot refrain from assuming that a collective instinct for national self-preservation manifested in such an accelerated mass involvement of Ukrainians in the mainstream public discourse on the eve of the war, although at a conscious level, most citizens, as we know, did not believe in the reality of a full-scale Russian invasion.

Such processes of socialization in the specified direction continue to this day. This can be easily seen from a variety of data published by various sociological centers concerning the trust of Ukrainians to the authorities, the dynamics of their attitude to the Ukrainian language, etc.

Discussion

In conclusion, I would like to single out a number of theoretical challenges that arise in the development of the problem of socialization of personality. Challenges that, at first glance, are of a purely conceptual nature, but which in fact have obvious practical significance in terms of psychologists’ processing of the traumatic experience of the war that is relevant for many Ukrainians. For example, how are socialization and social or social-psychological adaptation, and, accordingly, social-psychological maladaptation and desocialization related to each other? Is maladaptation always desocialization? And, if not, how to diagnose their differences and how to work with it? And also how are the scientific and psychological contents and scopes of the concepts social-psychological adaptation and resocialization, resocialization and social-psychological rehabilitation etc. related to each other? In my opinion, there are no convincing answers to these questions yet. Finding them in the processes of theoretical-methodological comprehension and scientific and practical application is a perspective of further development of the problems of socialization, resocialization and development of a modern person in conditions of war and peace.

Conclusions

Dear colleagues! I hope that the issues I touched on in my speech will be the subject of serious discussion both at this conference and at subsequent academic discussions, because it seems to me that they are relevant and not at all abstract in nature.

I wish the conference successful work, and I wish all the participants resilience, safety and victory over the Russian aggressor. Thank you! Glory to Ukraine!

References

Luk"yanets', V. (2002). Dyskurs. V Filosofs'kyy entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk Discourse. [In Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary] (s. 156-157). Kyiv: Abrys. Slyusarevs'kyy, M. (2022). [In Ukrainian]

Sotsial'no-psykholohichnyy stan ukrayins'koho suspil'stva v umovakh povnomashtabnoho rosiys'koho vtorhnennya: nahal'ni vyklyky i vidpovidy. Naukova dopovid' na zasidanni Prezydiyi NAPN Ukrayiny 21 kvitnya 2022 r. [The socio-psychological state of Ukrainian society in the conditions of a full-scale Russian invasion: urgent challenges and responses. Scientific report at the meeting of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine on April 21, 2022] / Visnyk Natsional'noyi akademiyi pedahohichnykh nauk Ukrayiny. – Tom 4, № 1 (2022). <https://visnyk.naps.gov.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/254> [In Ukrainian]

Instytut sotsial'noyi ta politychnoyi psykholohiyi Natsional'noyi akademiyi pedahohichnykh nauk Ukrayiny. (2022, 23 kvitnya). Stan suspil'noyi svidomosti v Ukrayini naperedodni povnomashtabnoho rosiys'koho vtorhnennya. [The state of public consciousness in Ukraine on the eve of a full-scale Russian invasion] – Rezul'taty vseukrayins'koho reprezentatyvnoho opytuvannya. <https://bit.ly/3vHe7jO> [In Ukrainian]

Slyusarevs'kyy, M. (2020). Yakym ye psykholohichnyy suprovid transformatsiynykh protsesiv vUkrayini i shcho potribno dlya yoho pokrashchennya. [What is the psychological support of transformational processes in Ukraine and what is needed for its improvement] Osvita i suspil'stvo, (1), 5. <https://naps.gov.ua/ua/press/releases/1778/> [In Ukrainian]

AUTHORS INFORMATION

Slyusarevskiy Mykola

Corresponding member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, director of the Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4038-5668>,

slyusarevskyy@ukr.net



Competing interests: Any competing interests were declared by author.

Disclaimer: The author declares that her opinions and views expressed in this manuscript are free of any impact of any organizations.

ABOUT THIS ARTICLE

Cite this article

Slyusarevskiy Mykola METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES OF RESEARCH ON PROBLEMS OF SOCIALIZATION OF PERSONALITY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN WAR 2023
Socialization & Human Development journal 2. DOI 10.37096/SHDISJ-23-1.2-0001

Submitted on 1 Aug 2023 / Revised 14 Oct 2023 / Approved **14 Nov 2023**

Published: **20 Nov 2023**

DOI: 10.37096/SHDISJ-23-1.2-0001

Managing editor - *Yaroslav Ryabchych*.

RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS

Copyright: © 2023 Slyusarevskiy Mykola. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.