

СЕКЦІЯ 2

ЗАГАЛЬНА ПСИХОЛОГІЯ. ІСТОРІЯ ПСИХОЛОГІЇ

A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE FORMATION OF REFLEXIVE PROBLEMATICS IN PSYCHOLOGY

ІСТОРИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ СТАНОВЛЕННЯ РЕФЛЕКСИВНОЇ ПРОБЛЕМАТИКИ В ПСИХОЛОГІЇ

The article examines the category of reflection as a concept that, with equal obviousness, belongs to both philosophy and psychology and serves as a natural conceptual bridge for synthesizing philosophical and psychological knowledge. It is shown that reflection is simultaneously a form of the existence of knowledge, the principal method of its acquisition, and a means of interaction with specific branches of knowledge. It is noted that the formation of reflection as a scientific category has a complex history; its problematics have undergone qualitative changes and were analyzed within virtually all philosophical and psychological schools concerned with explaining the subjective and objective experience of life. An analytical review of philosophical doctrines reveals a qualitative transformation of the semantic context of reflection from Antiquity – reflection as dialogue, self-knowledge, and the schematization of thinking (Socrates, Plato, Aristotle); through the Middle Ages – ontologization of the bipolarity of consciousness, inner human experience (Descartes, Locke, Leibniz); classical German philosophy – reflection as a gnoseological form of the self-unfolding of Spirit (Kant, Fichte, Hegel); to the twentieth century – reflexive-existential comprehension of one's being-in-the-world (Husserl's phenomenology, Sartre's existentialism); and to the present day (cultural-philosophical approach – reflection as an antinomic form of thinking and a means of grasping the contradictions of culture; methodological approach – self-reflexivity of scientific knowledge as a turning back upon its own mechanisms and norms of conscious control over the process of its growth and functioning). From the standpoint of professional methodological work, the article categorizes the concept of "reflection" and analyzes the gnoseological and phenomenological foundations for the development of reflection as a scientific category. Attention is paid to psychological studies of reflection: from A. Busemann's first definitions (1930s) to contemporary Ukrainian developments (O.V. Savchenko, O.I. Sannikov, M.I. Naidionov, R.V. Pavelskiv, N.F. Shevchenko, A.V. Furman et al.), where reflection is analyzed as a fundamental capacity of the person to relate consciously to their own consciousness and thinking, to the conditions and modes of life activity; as a key mechanism of reflexive thought-action, self-knowledge, self-regulation, moral development, and decision-making. It is generalized that the multidirectionality and multilayeredness of research on reflexive problematics lead both to the division of reflexive research into separate approaches and to the institutionalization of reflexive psychology, transforming it into an interdisciplinary reflexive movement that significantly influences the formation of conceptual approaches across various domains of the social and human sciences.

Key words: reflection, personality, self-awareness, cognition, types of reflection, methodological reflection, gnoseology, phenomenology, existentialism, antinomic nature, development of scientific knowledge.

У статті розглянуто категорію рефлексії як поняття, що з однаковою очевидністю належить і філософії, і психології та є природним концептуальним мостом синтезу філософського і психологічного знання. Показано, що рефлексія є одночасно формою існування знання, основним методом його одержання, а також засобом взаємодії з конкретними галузями знань. Зазначено, що становлення рефлексії як наукової категорії має складну історію, її проблематика у своєму розвитку зазнала певних якісних змін та аналізувалася в руслі практично всіх філософських та психологічних напрямків під час пояснення суб'єктивного та об'єктивного проживання життя. Аналітичний розгляд філософських вчень дозволяє побачити якісне перетворення смислового контексту рефлексії від Античності – рефлексія як діалог, самопізнання та схематизація мислення (Сократ, Платон, Аристотель), Середньовіччя – онтологізація біполярності свідомості, внутрішній досвід людини (Декарт, Локк, Лейбніц), класична німецька філософія – гносеологічна форма рефлексії як саморозгортання Духу (Кант, Фіхте, Гегель) до XX століття – рефлексивно-екзистенційна форма осмислення людиною свого буття у світі (феноменологія Гуссерля, екзистенціалізм Сартра) та сучасності (культурфілософський підхід – рефлексія як антиномічна форма мислення і засіб осягнення суперечностей культури, методологічний підхід – саморефлексивність наукового знання як самозвернення до механізмів і норм свідомого контролю над процесом його зростання і функціонування). З позиції професійного методологування здійснено категоризацію поняття «рефлексія», проаналізовано гносеологічні та феноменологічні засади розвитку досліджень рефлексії як наукової категорії. Увага приділена психологічним дослідженням рефлексії: від перших визначень А. Буземана (1930-і рр.) до вітчизняних розробок (О.В. Савченко, О.І. Санніков, М.І. Найдіонов, Р.В. Павелків, Н.Ф. Шевченко, А.В. Фурман та ін.), де рефлексія аналізується як фундаментальна здатність особистості усвідомлено ставитися до власної свідомості, мислення, умов і способів здійснення життєдіяльності, як ключовий механізм рефлексивного мислевчинення, самопізнання, саморегуляції, морального розвитку та ухвалення рішень. Узагальнено, що різноспрямованість і багатопластовість досліджень рефлексивної проблематики призводять як до поділу рефлексивних досліджень на окремі підходи, так і до інституціоналізації рефлексивної психології, перетворення її на міждисциплінарний рефлексивний рух, який чинить істотний вплив на формування концептуальних підходів різних сфер соціокультурного знання.

Ключові слова: рефлексія, особистість, самосвідомість, пізнання, види рефлексії, методологічна рефлексія, гносеологія, феноменологія, екзистенціалізм, антиномічність, розвиток наукового знання.

UDC 159.922.8

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/hbts.78.1.2>

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії CC BY 4.0

Buherko J.M.

PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor at the Department of Psychology and Social Work
West Ukrainian National University
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9138-5350

Statement of the problem. The global socio-economic reform of Ukrainian society at the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries raises the problem of seeking new worldview orientations and of developing and substantiating maximally generalized programs of human life activity. Anthropological knowledge that reveals human nature – and thereby helps resolve human problems – is increasingly demanded by society and by the individual. Among such knowledge, reflection holds an important place: it helps a person turn their gaze upon themselves, to know themselves and the world anew by making both the object of individual thinking, and to integrate the knowledge obtained into the structure of one's personality, thereby removing the alienation that has arisen toward the world and toward oneself.

Research into reflexive problematics is a strategically important avenue for outlining the general prospects for the development of modern science – specifically those connected with the shift from a dominant causal approach to a dominant teleological approach, with the interdisciplinary integration of heterogeneous knowledge, with the development of fundamentally new technologies to support individual and group subjects of activity, and with the shift in education from a dominance of scientific knowledge to a focus on the development of reflexive processes and abilities.

Reflection as a scientific category has a quite complex history; its problematics have undergone qualitative changes and were analyzed within virtually all philosophical schools concerned with explaining the subjective and objective experience of life. It is simultaneously a form of the existence of philosophical knowledge, the principal method of its acquisition, and a means of interaction with specific branches of knowledge. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to trace the development of conceptions of reflection as a special scientific category within the frameworks of philosophical and psychological doctrines.

Presentation of the main material. Appeals to the highest phenomenological levels of human existence, the use of the idea of the reflexivity of knowledge, and the grasp of the ambivalence of social reality prompt the person to realize their capacity for reflecting. However, this is often accompanied by a separation of the external world from the personal plane of being. The error of philosophy, according to V.A. Romenets, lies precisely in such a separation, as a result of which “external reality, existing by itself, remains an empty abstraction, while the personal world enclosed within itself is a dead, frozen phenomenon” [1, p. 15]. Orientation toward the psychic is realized in a reflexive manner. Reflection is a special object; it cannot be contemplated and described simply as a capacity of the psyche, a mechanism of thinking, or a type of activity. In the view of G.P. Shchedrovitsky, it is one of the most complex – indeed, in some measure even mystical – processes and, at the same time, an important moment in the mechanisms of the development of activity.

Encyclopedias define reflection as a form of theoretical activity of a socially developed person directed toward comprehending all of their own actions and

their laws; as an activity of self-knowledge that reveals the specificity of the human spiritual world; as the comprehension of something through study and comparison; and, in a narrow sense, as a new turn of the spirit, after a cognitive act is accomplished, toward the I and its microcosm, whereby the appropriation of cognition becomes possible; or as a “turning back, a principle of human thinking – critical analysis of the content and methods of cognition” [2, p. 300]. In a broad sense, the term is used to denote acts of self-consciousness, self-knowledge, and self-analysis; the presence in the person of mechanisms and norms of conscious control over the growth and functioning of their knowledge. Reflection is a distinctive human trait precisely because it extracts the person from the immediate conditions of life activity. It is one of the mechanisms of personal self-determination and a condition of being as *causa sui*.

Many philosophers and psychologists develop the idea that a person has two possibilities: either to coincide completely with their life activity (i.e., to be determined by it) or to stand in relation to it. The ability to step beyond immediate connections is realized by the mechanism of reflection and is a crucial condition for the person's grasp of their own way of life. Understanding reflection as the active investigation by the person of their own cognition can be clearly traced in the history of philosophical thought.

Intensive research on reflection as a special scientific problem across different subject domains and paradigmatic contexts began only in the 1960s–1970s. The principal stages in the development of views on reflection have been traced by scholars who naturally turn to the views of Socrates, Plato, Democritus, Locke, Leibniz, Kant, Fichte, and Hegel.

An analytical review of philosophical doctrines reveals a qualitative transformation of the semantic context of reflection as the capacity of the human being to grasp the essence of their own being, proceeding through: (1) reflexive explication of the foundations for multi-aspect discussion of philosophical problems (Ancient Greece); (2) reflexive foundations for the ontologization of the bipolar sources in human consciousness (medieval philosophy); (3) an understanding of reflection as an immanent component of the general picture of the functioning of Spirit (classical German philosophy); and (4) a reflexive-existential form of the person's comprehension of their being-in-the-world (the Early Modern period).

It is traditionally held that the problem of reflection was first posed by Socrates in his principles “I know that I know nothing” and “Know thyself”. This is accurate only insofar as Socrates explicitly formulated it. As for reflexive activity itself – connected with posing and resolving worldview problems – it arose much earlier, with the formation of the first philosophical and scientific notions of the world. The analysis of Heraclitus' and Parmenides' views attests to this: in them, reflection functions to pose problems, to provide critical evaluation of their solutions, and to make explicit the methodological difficulties that arise along the way [3].

In Ancient Greece, the development of reflection occurs within dialogue specially organized by Socrates for multi-aspect discussion of the definition of philosophical concepts in the course of disputes between him and his students or noted interlocutors. Accounts of the modes of thinking of that time constitute a reflexive explication of philosophical problems. Aristotle introduces the first reflexive schema: "In doing so, mind, by virtue of its participation in the object of thought, thinks itself by touching and thinking; thus the intellect and what it thinks are the same" [4, p. 58]. This schema of reflection ("thinking that thinks itself") was needed to close and complete Aristotle's *Organon* of knowledge and sciences – to ground the foundations upon which his proofs rested. In effect, this was one moment in the structure of reflexive activity related to organizing a special visualization of meanings – work determined, in turn, by the context of reflection.

In medieval philosophy, despite its scholasticism, the function of reflection develops in the form of commentary upon already existing concepts and in the form of polemics – toward their alternative interpretations. Characteristic of this period is the identification of a second component of reflection: the reflexive position. In *Parallel Lives*, Plutarch juxtaposes positive and negative, offers reflexive comparison and contrast of consequences along their temporal vectors – a move that, two millennia later, Hegel would formulate in the Christianization of dialectic as "thesis–antithesis–synthesis." Subsequently, philosophers increasingly manifested the ontologization of bipolar being (the City of God vs. the Earthly City; the upper world vs. the lower; ethical norms of good and evil, righteousness and sin, etc.). The tension and struggle of these opposing principles in the believer's consciousness are carried out on the inner plane through reflection on bipolar foundations within a monistic Christian worldview (Saint Augustine's *Confessions*) [5].

A vivid fixation of reflexive work within discursive dialogue is provided by the description of the long-running dispute between Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter Abelard (*Historia calamitatum*). Here, reflection takes the form of formal-logical argumentation of theses that are refuted in multi-day disputations. When the disputants occupy different positions, hold different visions, can object, present counterexamples, or fundamentally different ways of solving a problem, their activity demonstrates a unique process characterized by "being-outside" – which makes possible the formation of a reflexive position.

The main and specific circle of problems linked today with reflection arose in the Early Modern period, largely due to the polemic between Locke and Leibniz and Kant's reflections stimulated by their dispute. The works of Kant, Fichte, and Hegel exemplify reflexive work of thought that integrates critique, justification, alternative steps, the formulation of principles and rules, and the schematization of results [6; 7]. In Kant, reflection acquires the gnoseological (and simultaneously methodological) form in which it is now commonly represented. Notably, whereas in Kant reflection is imbricated in the very foundations of cognition, Fichte

develops the preconditions for explicating reflection as a special mode of cognition, and later Hegel distinguishes its procedures of thinking. After Hegel, reflection became – and remains – one of the most important notions grounding philosophical analysis of knowledge.

For Hegel, the social nature of cognition appears in the mystical form of the self-knowledge of the World Spirit through the forms of spiritual culture – art, religion, philosophy. "Only the concrete Spirit," wrote the philosopher, "manifests itself in all the affairs and aspirations of a people; it realizes itself because it deals only with that which it itself brings forth. But the higher achievement for Spirit is to know itself – to advance not only to self-contemplation but to thought about itself" [6, p. 142]. The Spirit's self-knowledge, accomplished through human consciousness, is not reducible to reflection alone; it encompasses cognition in its totality. Reflection is regarded by Hegel as the basis and form of the self-unfolding of Spirit at the level of Reason. Hence, the move to an abstract-universal level of description of being led Hegel to understand reflection as a basic category in the formation of the human being, while consciousness appears only as a stage of its development. In Hegel's conception, the structure and mechanism of activity can always be consciously reproduced within the activity itself. For reflection there is nothing hidden – nothing it cannot clarify or make explicit – and reflection is immanently determined within the general picture of the functioning and development of Spirit [cf. 7].

Thus, the formation of reflection as a scientific category has a complex history; its problematics underwent qualitative changes and were analyzed within virtually all philosophical schools concerned with explaining the subjective and objective experience of life. Philosophy generalized the experience of reflexive activity present in scientific cognition and in the social practice of each epoch. At the same time, in producing conceptions of reflection, philosophy reveals its own reflexive function. However, the current philosophical and psychological conceptions of reflection are not always adequate either to scientific reflection or to reflection's own purpose. It is therefore expedient – proceeding from the principles of organizing professional methodological work – to analyze the gnoseological and phenomenological foundations for the development of research on reflection as a scientific category (see Table).

In the nineteenth century, reflection assumes an existential form of the individual's comprehension of being in boundary situations – including the study of altered states of consciousness. From the spiritual-moral problematic (in Dostoyevsky), existential reflection moves toward a dialogical ontologization of the interaction of the conscious and the unconscious, the rational and the irrational in the human psyche (notably in E. von Hartmann). Thanks to reflection, the psychic becomes accessible to the person in its own essence. Thus, the fluid, shifting life of the I, the stream of consciousness, is not only superficially observed but also explicated in contemplation in accordance with its essential components at all levels [8].

Categorization of the Concept "Reflection" in Philosophical Doctrines

Historical stages	Representatives	Initial premises of philosophical comprehension of reflection	Gnoseological characteristics of reflection	Methodological lines of developing reflexive problematics	Stages of unfolding the reflexive cycle
Antiquity	Socrates	The object of knowledge is spiritual activity in its cognitive function	Reflection as self-knowledge of the activity of one's own soul	Formation of a reflexive position with respect to the world	1. Pre-reflexive stage. 2. Reflexive schematization
	Plato	Cognition is knowledge of the ideal world – that is, knowledge of ideas that a person receives anew in each situation	Reflection as immersion into the inner essence of the object of subjectivity	Development of the conceptual apparatus of reflexive thinking and modes of its unfolding	
	Aristotle	The process of obtaining knowledge according to a ready schema; the unity of the object of knowledge and knowledge itself; the identity of thought and what it thinks	Reflection as an attribute of divine intellect, which produces its object, is reflected in it, and on this basis knows its own essence	Construction of the ancient organon of knowledge as the primary basis of a methodological system	
Middle Ages	Descartes	The doctrine of innate ideas; the principle of the groundedness and certainty of knowledge	Reflection as a procedure of methodological doubt and the only path to certain knowledge	Ontological posing of reflection as a mode of cognizing the organization of the world of objects	3. Objectivation and naturalization of reflection
	Locke	Two kinds of experience—external (sensory) and internal (reflective)	Reflection as observation as inner experience, in which the mind analyzes its own activity, thereby generating ideas of this activity	Construction of a reflexive schema for representing inner activity	
	Leibniz	Functional awareness of knowledge about the inner activity of the soul	Reflection as the monads' capacity for apperception—i.e., for conscious representation of their own content	Formation of the context of reflection as a problem of the relation of knowledge to an idea located beyond the person	
Classical German philosophy	Kant	A priori empirical knowledge bears the marks of universality and necessity	Reflection as an inalienable mark of the power of judgment, manifesting as logical and transcendental reflection	The concept of reflection acquires its modern gnoseological and methodological form	4. De-objectification of reflection
	Fichte	Filiation (derivation) of ideas: a person obtains knowledge by transforming and unfolding knowledge already possessed	Reflection as a subject-activity mechanism of the historical development of knowledge	Reflection acquires an epistemological tint (reflection as "science of knowledge," "informed knowledge")	
	Hegel	Knowledge together with reflection as the driving force of the development of Spirit	Reflection as a form of the self-unfolding of Spirit; three types of reflection – positing, comparative, determinative	Reflection as a means of revealing the categorical structure of science	

The twentieth century is characterized by the rethinking of the paths and directions of development of European culture, the search for new orientations, and a revaluation of values, which fosters the growth of worldview-political, literary-artistic, and scientific-philosophical reflection. In philosophy at the beginning of

the twentieth century, two main directions stand out in understanding and developing the problem of reflection: as a universal method for analyzing phenomena and the contents of consciousness (phenomenology) and as the source and foundation of human self-consciousness (existentialism).

In phenomenology, the specificity of the organization of consciousness is revealed in its subject-object structure: every act of consciousness presupposes the presence of the object itself and the consciousness of the subject, who reflects. To explain the phenomenon of reflection, E. Husserl introduces the term “transcendental reflection,” by which he understands an act of direct apprehension – an intuitive grasp of the object. The results of such reflection cannot be rendered in exact linguistic description and may be presented metaphorically. Transcendental reflection is defined as a special type of experience – as inner perception accomplished without the mediation of the senses and directed toward pure consciousness [9].

Within the existential direction, a thorough treatment of reflection is provided by J.-P. Sartre in *Being and Nothingness*. He examines the phenomenon of reflection in the context of an analysis of consciousness: “Consciousness is by nature non-reflective; therefore, at first it knows neither the world of external objects nor itself. Yet it immediately apprehends itself as distinct from the world ‘in-itself’” [8, p. 211]. Calling consciousness “being-for-itself,” Sartre distinguishes self-consciousness from knowledge of oneself (reflection), which is a special kind of activity that affects its object, changes it, restructures it, and creates it. At the same time, the manifestation of reflection does not reveal the nature of consciousness; moreover, at the stage of reflection there occurs a distortion of the “purity” of consciousness and its degradation – understood as the emergence of polysemic indeterminacy or functional variability.

In contemporary philosophy, there is a gradual shift from considering the specificity of philosophical reflection to employing a cultural-philosophical mode of reflection, explained by features of modern culture – namely, the blurring of boundaries between cultural phenomena, extreme dynamism, and internal contradictions. This has outlined a new – antinomic – approach to reflexive comprehension of the essence of culture, viewing it not only as a real ontological condition but also as a special epistemological situation connected with authentically new reflexive entry of the person into culture. The positive significance of antinomicity as a way of philosophical reflection lies in forming a special perception of cultural universals of human being – grounded in the correlation of the natural and the non-natural, the traditional and the innovative, the social and the personal qualities of cultural creativity. The introduction of antinomy into the philosophy of culture is associated with O. Spengler (the antinomy of culture and civilization), G. Simmel (the problem of the being of culture through the antinomy of culture and life), A. Schweitzer (the antinomic relation of science and ethics), J. Baudrillard, and M. Weber (antinomies of sociocultural being). Substantiation of antinomicity as a cultural-philosophical mode of reflection is found in W. von Humboldt, E. Cassirer, R. Barthes, M. Foucault, and J. Derrida [10]. Today, the most widespread understanding regards antinomic reflection as a form of “real” thinking, characterized by contradictions that constitute the higher sense of reason – an indispen-

sable moment of “cultivated” thought, its driving force, and in the sphere of practical experience, a generator of personal development [10].

At the end of the twentieth century, with the active introduction of methodological approaches to scientific research, interest grew in the reflexivity and self-reflexivity of scientific knowledge – understood as self-referentiality, the presence within knowledge of mechanisms and norms of conscious control over its growth and functioning. Scholars raise questions concerning the analysis of forms of scientific activity – chiefly reflection – its means and aims, as well as the reflexive analysis of cognitive creativity; reflection on the content of science and on interdisciplinary research; reflection on the construction of models of ultra-complex objects; the design and construction of social systems; and the reflection of means of integrating research and its results. The specificity of metatheoretical research as a special form of the reflexivity of knowledge has been traced; mechanisms of types and levels of the self-knowledge of modern science have been revealed; a typology of the reflexivity of scientific knowledge has been proposed. Here, reflexivity (or self-reflexivity) of scientific knowledge is understood as its self-referentiality – the presence in it of mechanisms and norms of conscious control over the process of its growth and functioning [12].

The complexity, multilayeredness, and ramification of contemporary science presuppose stratification of the reflexivity of scientific knowledge into intra-theoretical, metatheoretical, interdisciplinary, general-scientific, and philosophical-methodological reflection. The significance of the latter lies in teaching science self-knowledge and self-consciousness and, instead of dreams, being able to outline the contours of a genuinely grounded strategy of cognitive activity.

Modern scientific cognition presupposes not only the “spillover” of one form of reflection into another – covering a wide subject field – but also the enrichment of its type. Thus, if the intra-theoretical type of reflection actually coincides with the procedure of internal theorizing, then at the metatheoretical level there occurs a kind of “doubling” of knowledge – its splitting into object-level and metatheoretical knowledge; and at the level of philosophical-methodological reflection, cognitive activity “launches” a mechanism of self-reference and of analyzing its own grounds within a context different from – and/or broader than – that set by the activity itself, thereby alienating itself to the degree that, through self-relation, it can comprehend the perspective of “fusion”, the interpenetration of the subjective into the objective, and grasp the limits of their coincidence – that is, the measure of the objectivity of truth. This feature of the higher levels of reflection opens prospects for immersion into the subject matter, for its critical restructuring and rethinking, as well as for obtaining new knowledge about it. In each case, philosophical-methodological reflection arises in response to a request from concrete scientific knowledge; it is directed to its “pain points” (whose analysis can change the state of a theoretical system), differing in generality, fundamentality, and origin. In short, the

achievements of philosophical-methodological reflection for science can be expressed thus: it teaches science self-knowledge and self-consciousness and, instead of dreams, is able to outline the contours of a genuinely grounded strategy of cognitive activity.

Psychological research on reflection has a much shorter (both substantively and chronologically) history than its philosophical investigation. Only in the 1930s did A. Busemann formulate a "psychological" definition of reflection as the transfer of experience from the external world onto oneself. He also first proposed distinguishing a psychology of reflection as an independent field of research. The first systematic presentation of philosophical and psychological conceptions of reflection was produced in 1948 by the Belgian philosopher A. Marc in *Psychologie de la réflexion*.

The establishment of a psychology of reflection in Ukrainian scholarship was prepared by the elaboration of this notion as one of the explanatory principles of the organization and development of the human psyche – and above all its highest form, self-consciousness. In this methodological perspective, the multi-contextuality of reflection proved to be an exceptionally significant concept, prompting its study in different directions: in the investigation of thinking, of personal self-consciousness, and of processes of communication and cooperation. In result, existing approaches to understanding the course and development of reflection can be conditionally divided into two groups: (1) cognition of reflection as a phenomenon within human thinking activity; and (2) study of reflection as a specific formation within the structure of personality. The traditional understanding of reflection as a foundational condition of thinking and creativity received significant development in I.M. Semenov's conceptual model of the reflexive organization of thinking. He developed conceptual-methodological means for studying the role of reflection in the structure of thinking, which provided the theoretical and methodological basis for an original direction – system-psychological study of the reflexive self-regulation of the creative process. Elaboration of the personal aspect of reflection made it possible to overcome both the narrowness of interpretations that reduced it to retrospection (a tendency also evident in some methodological treatments) and the abstract all-embracingness of the term. Understanding reflection as the person's re-comprehension of the flowing movement of their thought-activity made it possible to differentiate the reflexive and personal components of the phenomenon.

It should be noted that in contemporary psychology and related disciplines the concept of reflection is considered in a wide variety of aspects. Definitions differ considerably and, in part, are mutually contradictory. This is due to the polysemy of its content, from which numerous objects emerge as the targets of reflection (knowledge, concepts, representations, feelings, experiences, attitudes, desires, values, meanings, etc.), as well as to the differing methodological approaches of researchers. Nevertheless, a common element is the interpretation of reflection as a fundamental ca-

capacity of the person to relate consciously to their own consciousness and thinking, and to the conditions and modes of their life activity [cf. 12].

A critical analysis of experimental studies of reflection has enabled scholars to distinguish its principal psychological aspects: intellectual, personal, cooperative, and communicative. The largest number of studies concerns the intellectual aspect of reflection as the subject's capacity to identify, analyze, and relate their own actions to the task situation. An indispensable link in the central mechanism of the thinking process is the reflexive-personal components whose function is to ensure the participation of the I in this process (V.K. Zaretsky, I.M. Semenov, S. Yu. Stepanov). Study of the communicative aspect of reflection has shown that the development of this complex phenomenon of self-consciousness occurs in communication, through interaction with others (V.I. Slobodchikov). The ability to coordinate one's actions with others' in collective-cooperative problem solving most effectively demonstrates the practice of generating reflexive processes and reveals the conditions of their emergence and functioning. Research on group creativity within the psychology of reflection led to the introduction of the term "group reflection" (M.I. Naidionov), understood "as a complex multicomponent structure that includes, in particular, the interpersonal sphere (comprising the components of interaction, mutual understanding, and mutual coordination)" [13, p. 33]. At the Institute of Reflexive Research and Specialization (IRIS), M.I. Naidionov's team has carried out substantial practical developments of technologies for creating reflexively organized structures in enterprises on the basis of reflexive management. All this has ensured the institutionalization of interdisciplinary study of reflection, the implementation of its results in social practice, and their scientific transmission in a series of analytical and synthetic publications.

In recent years, in Ukrainian psychological science, reflexive problematics has gained new comprehension in the context of problems of consciousness and self-knowledge: studying reflection as a psychological mechanism of moral development (R.V. Pavelkiv [14]; Ya.M. Buherko [15]); investigating principles for stimulating and balancing reflexive manifestations of personality (O.I. Zimovin, Ye.V. Zaika); analyzing personal reflection as a mechanism of self-development and self-improvement (M.I. Kazanzhy, O.V. Vdovichenko, O.V. Savchenko, N.F. Shevchenko [17]). Research continues on reflection as a fundamental principle of human thinking that intentionally directs the person toward grasping the foundations of their own reflecting, critically analyzing its content and the methods of cognition used. A.V. Furman has carried out a thorough methodological analysis of the mechanism of reflexive thought-action [18]. O.I. Sannikov reveals the relationship between the level of development of reflection and parameters of decision-making, noting that reflection is a subsystem in the regulation of personal decision-making and not only binds other regulatory subsystems into a whole but also ensures their coordinated functioning [19]. The study of reflexive competence – the internal condition

for organizing a person's reflexive experience – and of the system of reflexive resources stands at the center of O.V. Savchenko's research [20]. A significant broadening of the spectrum of psychological research on reflection, together with increasing complex interdisciplinary work on this problem, calls for syntheses of reflexive-psychological investigations – particularly in studying reflexive mechanisms of personal decision-making, which is especially relevant under current conditions of the Russian Federation's military aggression.

Consideration of contemporary directions of development of reflexive problematics indicates a tendency for the category of reflection to acquire not only philosophical-worldview and general-scientific but also special-scientific status. This ensures the intensive development of many human-science disciplines and research areas (acmeology, sociology, political science, image studies, ergonomics, etc.) and of social practices (psychological training, business and organizational-activity games, image-making, engineering, organizational consulting, design, etc.).

Conclusions and future research prospects.

The category of reflection is a vivid example of a concept that, with equal obviousness, belongs to both philosophy and psychology. It is a natural “conceptual bridge” for the synthesis of philosophical and psychological knowledge. The multidirectionality and multilayeredness of research on reflexive problematics lead, on the one hand, to the division of reflexive research into separate approaches – whereby the unity of reflection as a multifaceted phenomenon is lost (even though the concept of reflection was introduced precisely to overcome the partiality of separate psychological knowledges) – and, on the other hand, to the institutionalization of reflexive psychology, transforming it from a scientific movement (as it became in the last third of the twentieth century) into a scientific discipline. This interdisciplinary “reflexive movement” exerts a significant influence on the formation of conceptual approaches in various fields – philosophy, sociology, psychology, pedagogy.

At the same time, a substantial expansion of the methodological field for analyzing reflection – together with an increase in complex, interdisciplinary developments – necessitates syntheses of reflexive-psychological, reflexive-acmeological, and reflexive-pedagogical investigations so as to overcome a situation in the study of reflection in which the motley, weakly structured, and heterogeneous character of the accumulated material leads to a devaluation of the concept's very content. Therefore, further study is needed for a theoretical-methodological substantiation of reflection as an antinomic category and for the introduction of the idea of a closed universe (of spirit, consciousness, personality) in which, by means of reflection, ever new states (forms, concepts, organizations) are revealed – states that constitute the development of the content of this universe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Роменець В.А., Маноха І.П. Історія психології ХХ століття : навч. посіб. Київ : Либідь, 1998. 992 с.

2. Психологічна енциклопедія / Автор-упоряд. О.М. Степанов. Київ : «Академвидав», 2006. 424 с.

3. Korthagen F. A reflection on reflection. In: *Linking practice and theory*. Routledge, 2001. P. 67–84.

4. Charles D. The Undivided Self: Aristotle and the 'Mind-Body Problem'. Oxford University Press, 2021.

5. Kelly M.A. Confessions, Confessions: Reading Augustine and Rousseau after Foucault. 2021. PhD Thesis. The University of Chicago.

6. Stein S., Wretzel J. (ed.). Hegel's encyclopedic system. Routledge, 2022.

7. Heidemann D.H. Hegel's Philosophy of Philosophy. *The Relevance of Hegel's Concept of Philosophy*. London : Bloomsbury, 2022. P. 37–53.

8. Atkins S., Murphy K. Reflection: a review of the literature. *Journal of advanced nursing*. 1993. № 18(8). P. 1188–1192.

9. Cavallaro M., Heffernan G. (Editors). *The existential Husserl*. Springer, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05095-4>

10. Sartre J.-P., Richmond S., Moran R. *Being and nothingness: An essay in phenomenological ontology*. Routledge, 2022.

11. Strydom P. The Antinomic Field of Hermeneutics & Critical Theory: Interpretation/Understanding vs Critique, 2023.

12. Anderson J. Reflection. *ELT Journal*. 2020. № 74(4). P. 480–483.

13. Найдьонов М.І. Формування системи рефлексивного управління в організаціях. Київ : Міленіум, 2008. 484 с.

14. Павелків Р.В. Генеза рефлексії як психологічного механізму морального розвитку особистості. *Інноватика у вихованні*. 2018. № 8. С. 6–16.

15. Buherko J., Kuzmyska D. Reflexive organization of decision-making process in youth. *Психологія і суспільство*. 2024. № 2. С.147–156. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/pis2024.02.147>.

16. Бугерко Я.М. Рефлексивний характер освітньої діяльності як ціннісний фактор професійного становлення сучасного фахівця. *Психологічний часопис*. 2022. Том 8, № 2. С. 39–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31108/1.2022.8.2.4>.

17. Shevchenko N., et al. Ethical consciousness of university students in the context of postmodernism. *Postmodern Openings*. 2022. № 13(4). P. 472–496. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.4/528>.

18. Фурман А.В. Архітектура теорії діяльності: рефлексивно-вчинковий сценарій метаметодологування. *Психологія і суспільство*. 2022. № 1. С. 7–94. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/pis2022.01.007>.

19. Sannikov A.I. O sootnoshenii refleksivnosti i parametrov priniatia resheniia [On the relation of reflexivity and the parameters of decision-making]. *Science and Education. A New Dimension. Pedagogy and Psychology*. II (8). 2014. 16. P. 173–177.

20. Savchenko O.V. The formation level of the components of the reflective experience as a factor of the students' educational success. *Psychological perspectives*. 2016. № 28. P. 269–282.

Стаття надійшла у редакцію: 31.10.2025

Стаття прийнята: 13.11.2025

Опубліковано: 08.12.2025