UDC 000 : 304 : 070

OVERCOMING THE CHALLENGES OF POST-TRUTH IN MODERN SOCIO-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

KOVALOVA Tetiana, PhD (Social Communications), e-mail: t.kovalova@journ.sumdu.edu.ua[1];
YEVTUSHENKO Olena, PhD (Social Communications), e-mail: olena.yevtushenko@netcracker.com[2];
[1] Sumy State University, 2, Rimsky-Korsakov St., Sumy, 40007, Ukraine,
[2] NetCracker Technology Corporation, 58, Yaroslavska St., Kyiv, 04071, Ukraine.

The article identifies the features of the post-truth phenomenon in the Ukrainian information space, in particular, the specifics of presenting information are substantiated. The relevance of the study is that today society often shows its inability to think critically, select, analyze and verify information, distinguish facts from lies and manipulation, that lead to the victory of post-truth in Ukraine. The purpose of our study is to investigate trends and outline problematic aspects of the functioning of the post-truth phenomenon in the Ukrainian information space. It has been found that with the rapid development of multimedia technologies, information overload, arises a situation that determines our perception and thinking – the post-truth. It is determined that today the factuality gives way to interpretations, interpretations, prejudices. The authors argue that ehe most productive post-truth response strategy is to restore trust in public institutions and to involve as many information consumers as possible in counteracting fakes, misinformation based on ethics.
Key words: post-truth, fact-checking, critical thinking, journalism education.

ПОДОЛАННЯ ВИКЛИКІВ ПОСТПРАВДИ В СУЧАСНІЙ СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНІЙ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

У статті визначено особливості явища постправди в українському інформаційному просторі, зокрема обґрунтовано специфіку подання інформації. Актуальність дослідження полягає у тому, що сьогодні суспільство часто виявляє свою нездатність до критичного мислення, відбору, аналізу й перевірки інформації, відрізнення фактів від брехні та маніпуляцій, які ознаменували перемогу постправди в Україні. Мета нашого дослідження – визначити тенденції та окреслити проблемні аспекти функціонування феномену постправди в українському інформаційному просторі. З'ясовано, що за умов стрімкого розвитку мультимедійних технологій, інформаційного перевантаження виникає така ситуація, що обумовлює наше сприйняття й мислення – постправда. Визначено, що сьогодні фактуальність поступається місцем тлумаченням, інтерпретаціям, упередженням. Авторами стверджується, що найпродуктивнішою стратегією реагування на постправду видається відновлення довіри до суспільних інституцій та якомога ширше залучення у тому числі й пересічних споживачів інформації до протидії фейкам, дезінформації на основі етики.
Ключові слова: постправда, фактчекінг, критичне мислення, журналістська освіта.

Introduction. Today the Ukrainian system of university training for journalists faced a serious challenge: not only ordinary citizens, but also journalists are not ready to confront total post-truth in the political sphere in modern socio-cultural communication. Accordingly, educators should now look for new ways of training students, who will not repeat the mistakes of current media professionals in a few years.

Each of us, consciously or subconsciously, looks for the truth both in the objective reality and each of its manifestations. However, current rapid development of multimedia technologies and information overload lead to the emergence of another situation that determines our perception and thinking – the post-truth. It is exactly post-truth that dictates the specific features of political, social and moral processes around the world. Everyone today is guided by a mosaic image of the world in which «there are no stable

islands of truth that give us absolute confidence that our views correspond to reality, where the notions of real and virtual, just and unfair, war and peace have become blurred and often indistinguishable» [3, p. 82].

For example, during the last presidential campaign in 2019 Ukraine found itself in a situation where no logical arguments of scientists or experts could influence the emotional impulse of those who heard what they wanted to hear in the words of politicians. Ukraine has become a country of the total victory of post-truth. The already undermined information field was undermined even further during the election campaign. Alternative facts, rumors, false interpretations and outright fakes have became an integral component of the electoral battle. Apparently, the voters turned out to be vulnerable due to the low level of media literacy in the country, low political culture and culture of media content consumption. Not only ordinary citizens, but also journalists sometimes found themselves unable to think critically, to select, analyze and verify information, to tell the facts from the lies and manipulations of politicians that marked the victory of post-truth in Ukraine.

The main methods used by post-truth include: appealing to emotions; deliberately concealing objective facts; presenting only a share of information; information overload; maintaining a continuous stream of news; combining truth and lies; emergence of information at the right time; provoking a violent reaction of the audience with the help of a «sensational» message [9, p. 358]. According to Hyvönen [18], some of the most salient examples of post-truth are the emergence of fake news and the «rise in sentimental rather than reasoned responses to political questions, as opposed to reasoned analysis» (p.121). Other scientists talk about post-truth in connection with fake news [34; 6; 28]. Harsin [15] mentions post-truth as a general term of several specific «types of communication, statements or narratives, all of which are sub-classes of deceptive communication» and includes misinformation, fake news, rumor bombs, and lying to as examples. It is important that all these manifestations are not accidental but strategic communication, i.e. post-truth always presupposes purposeful distortion of facts.

The purpose of our study is to investigate trends and outline problematic aspects of the functioning of the post-truth phenomenon in the Ukrainian information space.

Methodology. Method of analysis of scientific literature was used to determine the level of theoretical study post-truth phenomenon in the information space. Attention was focused on how critical thinking can help to overcome the post-truth phenomenon. This approach allowed us to summarize the effectiveness of the journalism education responses to the challenges of the post-truth and to understand whether universities in Ukraine are able to provide the media system with quality professional staff.

Results and discussion. Our perception of reality does not arise by itself, but is produced and constructed by those who have power [16, p. 105]. In the world of post-truth, where politicians give free interpretations and substitute notions, we find ourselves in a dangerous situation: «Democracy itself, as well as the political capacity to efficiently address and solve social problems, including the global challenges facing the world, is threatened by political debate in which facts matter less than emotions and opinions» [16, p. 103]. Despite the fact that such situations have accompanied the entire history of mankind, today this phenomenon has reached a particularly large scale. This was primarily due to the crisis of traditional journalism and classic news media (particularly newspapers), and the proliferation of blogging and civic journalism instead, for which social media have become a convenient platform. We have found ourselves in a paradoxical situation: the truth is not hidden; its public demand simply decreases. Journalists have to give answers, establish new rules on how to report on post-truth political discourse [29], but because of the relative novelty of the concept in the professional media environment, the response options are only just starting to be taken into account.

While in the previous epoch trust was supposed to be based on a fact, today the factuality gives way to explanations, interpretations and prejudice. Statements «which are untouched by rational argument, which are held and accepted regardless of (even against) the evidence available» [17, p. 275] can be considered post-truth. Post-truth functions in the public space and appeals to emotions, while ignoring rational thinking based on facts. This is a kind of marginal state, when the rational is mixed with the irrational, which leads to the destruction of interpersonal relations, primitivization, simplification of concepts and views. Post-truth is a shaky bridge between the lies and the truth, and is often associated with populism.

Post-truth manifests itself as mistrust in established institutions, including government, academia, and scientific consensus [2, p. 3], and this is exactly what its principal threat lies in. Since one of the features of a healthy democracy is «the citizens' ability to express dissent, protest and even rage when deceived» [30, p.110], post truth threatens the very essence of democracy and is «detrimental to the health of a democratic society» [19, p. 18] which is based on civic participation and rational decision-making.

Similarly, post-truth has a devastating impact at the individual level. It knocks out the rational ground from under the voters' feet and makes citizens doubt everything, including themselves. To denote this state, Keane [21] uses the concept of gaslighting, which lies in the fact that normal people, influenced by prolonged intensive manipulation, begin to think that they are slowly losing their minds, refusing to believe in the rationality of their own judgment. This effect can be achieved by politicians, for example, by misinterpreting obvious facts or making statements and then denying their own words. Thus, observers (voters, citizens) find themselves so confused that «[n]ot knowing what to believe, they give up, shrug their shoulders and fall by default under the spell of the gaslighter [of a manipulative politician]» 21]. Widespread dissemination of fakes, alternative facts, bullshit, etc. at the micro level can even be considered as a violation of human rights.

Post-truth is a phenomenon typical for all countries. However, not all of them were able to create mechanisms and public institutions to counteract it. Democratic countries are developing a system of checks and balances based primarily on political activism and civil society control. Countries with limited democracy are not only unable to resist post-truth, but mainly create mechanisms aimed at mind control and influencing the mass audience deliberately. In most countries, there is a wide range of discussions on the fight against post-truth and attempts to understand and explain its causes. In particular, in 2019, a leading private university in Ukraine initiated a broad scientific discussion with the participation of experts from Ukraine and other European countries [22].

It should be noted that in the recent years the fact-checking education movement in Ukraine has become extremely widespread not only among journalists, but also among public activists, university professors and bloggers. This happened as a reaction to the information aggression of the Russian Federation that accompanies the military actions in eastern Ukraine. Ukrainian infosphere turned out to be weak and unprotected, several years ago Ukrainian narratives even in the Ukrainian media compared poorly to Russia's powerful voices. In addition, several rating politicians have been the Kremlin's propaganda outlets in Ukraine (not so long ago the pro-Russian party is the second largest faction in the Ukrainian parliament).

Under these conditions, as early as 2014, Ukraine saw the emergence of a group of Ukrainian journalists, who, on a voluntary basis, started a large-scale project to expose and confront Russian propaganda, called StopFake. Over the next few years, several other powerful resources that combine debunking fakes, fact-checking and journalism analysis, or work as purely fact-checking projects, have emerged. Today, the journalists in these projects mainly work as educators as well, teaching both narrowly focused and broad groups how to deal with facts.

At the same time, much (sometimes too much?) is expected from fact-checking in the Ukrainian scientific and professional journalistic environment in terms of its ability to counter the Russian propaganda, alternative facts, which are spread by politicians of all flanks (from the pro-Russian to the pro-European ones) and fakes of different origins. In general, researchers give positive evaluations of the possibilities of fact-checking in terms of educating the voters and broadening their knowledge [24], and note that fact-checking can «have the potential to contribute to the functioning of democratic societies» [1], can hold back the spread of disinformation by politicians for fear of increasing the reputational costs [25]. Fact-checking is also assessed as a «truth-seeking» practice, which successfully operates for democratic control of American politicians [13; 14]. At that, some studies [11] show that negative checks (in which politicians were «caught» in a lie) have more influence on the audience's opinion than positive ones (which confirmed the accuracy of the statement).

However, scientists also have some concerns about fact-checking as an effective method of combating post-truth. Thus, [16] speak of the concept of belief echo, which lies in the fact that even when rumours or scandals have been disproved, they still have a negative impact on the perception of the person who was in their center. In this situation, fact-checking may not only not improve the situation, but also works in the favor of those spreading lies, «contributes to an increase in the salience of the issue» [4], since, during the checking process «[f]act check needs to reiterate the false claim [...]. And even if the fact check is taken at face value, the rumor still damages the reputation of its subjects» [16, p. 60]. Davis [7] also expresses a similar view of the risks of fact-checking, noting that the very fact of a check raises doubts about the facts even if they are true.

In addition, today, when reality is very often «reported reality» [21], i.e. is created by someone, mainly those who have power, for everyone else, fact-checking faces another challenge. The concept of factuality itself is rather ambiguous, a fact can easily stop being such if the system that generated it is destroyed. Accordingly, even methodologically accurate and unbiased fact-checking in one instance always risks being erroneous in another instance.

Fact-checking is also not always effective because of the characteristics of its audience. The point is not only in the fact that politically active citizens are more interested in fact-checking as they seek to obtain diverse information. It is also in the fact that, since many organizations that use different methodologies interpret facts differently, readers who lack narrow specialized knowledge sometimes risk being in a situation of confusion, not knowing which fact-checker to trust and «which version of competing realities to endorse» [23, p. 594]. Readers' previous attitudes can also stand in the way of accepting the results of fact-checking: the most convinced citizens will not be inclined to change their attitude even on the basis of a large number of checks [20, p. 126]. Such journalistic materials will have a greater impact on a neutral and logical audience. The fact that convinced citizens (those who already have a blind faith in a politician) tend to stand up for their position at all costs can be seen in the Rasmussen Reports survey. It has determined that only 29% of voters in the United States believe in media fact-checking of candidates' comments, with 62% believing that news organizations skew the facts to help candidates they support [33]. The study showed that American citizens of all demographic categories believe that the media are biased in selecting comments for fact-checking based on their political preferences.

It is important to note that the post truth as a phenomenon is not only a political or journalistic but also an educational challenge. Far too often it is schools or universities that have to provide citizens with critical thinking skills. Post-truth ia a special challenge for journalism teachers. Today, for a graduate journalist, it is not only the level of professional training that is critical, but also the level of civic participation

and the ability to defend democratic values. In the context of the Ukrainian-Russian information warfare, Ukrainian journalists have very often been and still are unable to distinguish between fakes, spreading openly pro-Russian messages uttered by Ukrainian politicians. Under these conditions, there arises the question of whether universities are ready to train fundamentally new, high-quality professional journalists and students who are ready to defend professional standards and national interests, as well as search for the truth in this era of post-truth.

In the current climate, educators should not only provide knowledge, «[t]here is also a need for second-order elucidation that – over and above transmission and mediation of contents – also provides information about their origin, how they came to be, and that advertises the rationality at work in content selection» [17]. Basically, the point is that any higher education, not only that in journalism, should develop critical thinking among students, and for this purpose it should not only be «job training», but also «a broader critical citizenship agenda for participatory democracy» [27].

The university should be a «practice of freedom» [12, p. 206] that teaches students how to be responsible citizens, bridges the gap between learning and practice, and expands democratic rights and identities. Modern pedagogics should be a means of teaching students to ask questions, including those about the causes of war, inequality, state supervision of citizens [12, p. 211].

At that, Stearns [31]) notes that interdisciplinarity is critical for achieving the main goals of higher education in today's volatile world, as it is the only approach that allows «adequately to introduce students to what's happening in the world around them, the world in which they will shape their lives in future» (p. 16). Since the modern world is becoming more and more complicated and connected, a return to a broad education in the humanities, which is able to provide an understanding of historical patterns, global processes and social contexts, may become an option of protection from post-truth. And in this case, the main question is whether the universities are really capable of meeting all these requirements and justifying the hopes as hubs of rationality in the irrational world of post-truth.

Although studies [10] show that university professors can significantly influence students' perceptions, particularly those of pseudoscientific statements, in order to promote critical thinking, the role of universities in the post-truth era remains unclear – whether they are the cause of the issue of post-truth or whether they help solve it [18, p. 122]. These concerns are especially relevant for Ukraine, because the local education system is still largely post-Soviet, dominated by the didactic approach, which «does not stimulate initiative and scientific creativity. Here prevails the teacher's monologue, rather than a discussion format; the self-sufficient nature of the lectures; forms of assessment that do not stimulate the student's work during the semester» [8, p. 17]. Ukrainian universities are sometimes clearly unable to produce students who can adapt to the world of post-truth. Because of the powerful information confrontation with the Russian Federation, this problem is particularly acute in journalism education, as poor quality training of journalism students can lead to significant consequences, even those for national security and defence capability. Whether it is possible to rely on the fact that students will be able to acquire underdeveloped skills through short-term trainings, seminars, and summer schools is still an ambiguous question (due to the already mentioned need for systemic education in the humanities).

The most productive post-truth response strategy is to restore trust in public institutions [15] and to involve as many information consumers as possible in counteracting fakes, misinformation based on ethics, pro-truth pledge [32]. Speaking specifically about journalism education, we finally have to start not from the end today. Today, we are trying to respond to the post truth challenges by giving the students specific knowledge and tools.

Conclusions and prospects. The urgent issue seems that the students of Ukrainian universities do not have a clear understanding of truth and its distinguishing criteria. The Ukrainian journalist community and educators put hopes on fact-checking in the context of not only post-truth, but also information confrontation with Russia. To protect the society interests, the resources and organisations specialising in fact-checking, both in the format of individual projects and in the editorial staff of news media, are widely used. One of the main directions of Ukrainian fact-checking is to verify false, fake information regardless of its source and form [26, p. 44]. In the country, we have the same situation described by Bhaskaran, Mishra, & Nair [5] for India – an average journalism student can get up-to-date knowledge of verification, counteracting false information mainly by participating in training programs, internships.

In the situation of information warfare, it is important for students (and wider audience) to distinguishing truth / manipulation / false in the rhetoric of national and local politicians. This will reveal whether geographical proximity and involvement in community life are a safety device to prevent misinterpretation of political rhetoric. These results can be used by the educators to adjust the ways we are talking to students today about the politics and challenges of the post-truth era. It is also important to involve experts and industry professionals in discussing and finding ways to improve journalism education After all, the post-truth is a complicated and complex phenomenon and we need system solutions, involving as many stakeholders as possible.

1. Aird, M.J., Ecker, U.K., Swire, B., Berinsky, A.J., & Lewandowsky, S. (2018), «Does truth matter to voters? The effects of correcting political misinformation in an Australian sample», *Royal Society Open Science*, vol. 5(12), available at: https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.180593.

2. Bacon, C.K. (2018), «Appropriated literacies: The paradox of critical literacies, policies, and methodologies in a post-truth era», *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 26(147), available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3377.

3. Barkovskyi, P. (2018), «Postideology of the present: «hybrid ideologies» or «new mythologies» as a factor in the construction of a post-modern social field», *The Ideology and Politics Journal*, vol. 3(11), pp. 78–125.

4. Barrera, O., Guriev, S., Henry, E., & Zhuravskaya, E. (2018), «Facts, alternative facts, and fact checking in times of post-truth politics», *CEPR Discussion Papers*, available at: https://www.parisschoolofeconomics.eu/docs/barrera-rodriguez-oscar-david/ssrn-id3004631.pdf

5. Bhaskaran, H., Mishra, H., & Nair, P. (2017), «Contextualizing fake news in post-truth era: Journalism education in India», *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, vol. 27(1), pp. 41–50, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1326365X17702277

6. Corner, J. (2017), «Fake news, post-truth and media–political change», *Media, Culture and Society*, vol. 39(7), pp. 1100–1107, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443717726743.

7. Davis, E. (2017), *Post-truth: Why We have Reached Peak Bullshit and what We can do About it*, Little, Brown Book Group, 384 p.

8. Dobko, T. (2012), «Intellectual and University: Obscurantism or Culture of Intellect?», *The Ideology and Politics Journal*, vol. (2), pp. 7–22.

9. Dodonova, V. (2019), «Populism and Post-Truth as Components of the Election Process in Ukraine», in Dodonov R. (Ed.), *Kyyivski filosofski studii-2019*, Kyiv, 16–17 May 2019, Kyivskyi universytet imeni Borysa Hrinchenka, Kyiv, pp. 355-360.

10. Dyer, K.D., & Hall, R.E. (2019), «Effect of critical thinking education on epistemically unwarranted beliefs in college students», *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 60(3), pp. 293–314, available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-018-9513-3.

11. Fridkin, K., Kenney, P.J., & Wintersieck, A. (2015), «Liar, liar, pants on fire: How fact-checking influences citizens' reactions to negative advertising», *Political Communication*, vol. 32(1), pp. 127–151, available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2014.914613.

12. Giroux, H.A. (2018), «What Is the Role of Higher Education in the Age of Fake News?», in Peters, M.A., Rider, S., Hyvönen, M., & Besley, T. (Eds.), Post-Truth, Fake News, Springer, Singapore, pp. 197 215, available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8013-5_17.

13. Graves, L. (2016), *Deciding what's true: The rise of political fact-checking in American journalism*, Columbia University Press, 336 p.

14. Graves, L. (2017), «Anatomy of a fact check: Objective practice and the contested epistemology of fact checking», *Communication, Culture & Critique*, vol. 10(3), pp. 518–537, available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/cccr.12163.

15. Harsin, J. (2018), «Post-truth and Critical Communication Studies», *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication,* available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.757

16. Hendricks, V.F., & Vestergaard, M. (2019), Reality Lost. *Markets of Attention, Misinformation and Manipulation*, Springer, Cham, 144 p.

17. Horsthemke, K. (2017), «"# FactsMustFall"? – education in a post-truth, post-truthful world», *Ethics and Education*, vol. 12(3), pp. 273–288, available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2017.1343620.

18. Hyvönen, M. (2018), «As a Matter of Fact: Journalism and Scholarship in the Post-truth Era», in Peters, M.A., Rider, S., Hyvönen, M., & Besley, T. (Eds.), Post-Truth, Fake News, Springer, Singapore, pp. 121–132, available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8013-5_10.

19. Journell, W. (2017), «Fake news, alternative facts, and Trump: Teaching social studies in a post-truth era», *Social studies journal*, vol. 37.1, pp. 8-21.

20. Journell, W. (2018), «Civic education in a post-truth society», in Clabough J., Lintner T. (Eds.), *No Reluctant Citizens: Teaching Civics in K-12 Classrooms*, Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, pp. 113–130.

21. Keane, J. (2018), «Post-truth politics and why the antidote isn't simply "fact-checking» and truth», The Conversation, available at: https://theconversation.com/post-truth-politics-and-why-the-antidote-isnt-simply-fact-checking-and-truth-87364.

22. Mahisterska prohrama z mediakomunikatsiy UKU (2019), *Conference «Digital Communication in the Age of Post-Truth: Reality and Challenges»*, available at: http://media.ucu.edu.ua/projects/konferentsiya-digital-komunikatsiya-v-epohu-postpravdy-realiyi-ta-vyklyky.

23. Marietta, M., Barker, D.C., & Bowser, T. (2015), «Fact-checking polarized politics: Does the fact-check industry provide consistent guidance on disputed realities?», *The Forum*, vol. 13(4), pp. 577–596, available at: https://doi.org/10.1515/for-2015-0040.

24. Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2015), *Estimating fact-checking's effects: Evidence from a long-term experiment during campaign 2014*, American Press Institute.

25. Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2015), «The effect of fact-checking on elites: A field experiment on US state legislators», *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 59(3), pp. 628–640, available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12162.

26. Ostrovska, N.V., & Yeskova, K.V. (2018), «Features of Ukrainian fact-checking projects format», *Sotsialni komunikatsii: teoriia i praktyka [Social Communications: Theory and Practice]*, no. 7, pp. 43–51.

27. Peters, M.A. (2017), «Education in a post-truth world», *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 49(6), pp. 563–566, available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2016.1264114.

28. Rochlin, N. (2017), «Fake news: belief in post-truth», *Library Hi Tech*, vol. 35(3), pp. 386–392, available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-03-2017-0062.

29. Romano, A. (2017), «Asserting Journalistic Autonomy in the "Posttruth" Era of "Alternative Facts": Lessons from Reporting on the Orations of a Populist Leader», *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, vol. 27(1), pp. 51–66, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1326365x17704287.

30. Sanotska, N.Ya. (2017), «Outlines of Post-Truth in the Information Society», *Aktualni problemy filosofii ta sotsiolohii* [Current Issues of Philosophy and Sociology], iss. 20, pp. 108–111.

31. Stearns, P.N. (2012), «Globalizing Higher Education: a global challenge», *The Ideology and Politics Journal*, no. 2, pp. 14–18, available at: http://ideopol.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/3_ENG-ED-Final-Stearns.pdf.

32. Tsipursky, G., Votta, F., & Roose, K.M. (2018), «Fighting fake news and post-truth politics with behavioral science: The pro-truth pledge», *Behavior and Social Issues*, vol. 27(1), pp. 47–70, available at: https://doi.org/10.5210/bsi.v27i0.9127.

33. Rasmussen Reports (2016, September 20), «Voters Don't Trust Media Fact-Checking», available at: http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/general_politics/september_2016/voters_don_t_trust_media_fact_checking.

34. Waisbord, S. (2018), «Truth is what happens to news: On journalism, fake news, and post-truth», *Journalism studies*, vol. 19(13), pp. 1866-1878, available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1492881.

УДК 000 : 304 : 070

ПОДОЛАННЯ ВИКЛИКІВ ПОСТПРАВДИ В СУЧАСНІЙ СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНІЙ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Ковальова Тетяна,
канд. наук. із соц. комунік, e-mail: t.kovalova@journ.sumdu.edu.ua[1],
ORCID – https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6551-4139;
Євтушенко Олена,
канд. наук. із соц. комунік, e-mail: olena.yevtushenko@netcracker.com[2];
ORCID – https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7850-1580.
[1] Сумський державний університет, вул. Римського-Корсакова, 2, Суми, 40007, Україна.
[2] NetCracker Technology Corporation, вул. Ярославська, 58, Київ, 04071, Україна.

Вступ. Сьогодні Україна потерпає від агресивних інформаційних впливів та воєнних дій сусідньої країни (РФ), а медіаспільнота, влада та суспільство не завжди може адекватно реагувати на ці загрози. Альтернативні факти, чутки, хибні трактування, відверті фейки стали невід'ємним компонентом цієї боротьби. Суспільство часто виявляє свою нездатність до критичного мислення, відбору, аналізу й перевірки інформації, відрізнення фактів від брехні та маніпуляцій, які ознаменували перемогу постправди в Україні. Мета дослідження – визначити тенденції та окреслити проблемні аспекти функціонування феномену постправди в українському інформаційному просторі.

Методи дослідження. Під час дослідження використані такі методи, як аналіз наукової літератури – для визначення рівня теоретичного вивчення порушеного питання, статистичний – для з'ясування тенденцій розвитку явища постправди в інформаційному просторі. Увага акцентувалася на репрезентації функціонування означеного явища як вагомої ознаки критичного мислення медіа споживача.

Результати та висновки. У результаті дослідження означено прийоми, якими користується постправда, зокрема апелювання до емоцій, умисне замовчування об'єктивних фактів, подача частки інформації, інформаційне перевантаження, комбінування правди й брехні. Визначено, що найбільш яскравими прикладами прояву постправди в українському інформаційному просторі є поява значної кількості фейкових новин. Варто зауважити, що всі ці прояви є не випадковою, а стратегічною комунікацією, тобто постправда завжди передбачає цілеспрямоване викривлення фактів. Звідси найпродуктивнішою стратегією реагування на постправду видається відновлення довіри до суспільних інституцій та якомога ширше залучення як медіафахівців, так і пересічних споживачів інформації до протидії фейкам, дезінформації.

Ключові слова: постправда, фактчекінг, критичне мислення, журналістська освіта.