

Ayta Sakun

Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor,

Head of the Department of Philosophy, Political Science and Ukrainian Studies

Kyiv National University of Technology and Design

orcid.org/0000-0003-2340-3366

Tatiana Kadlubovych

Candidate of Political Sciences, Associate Professor,

Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Political Science and Ukrainian Studies

Kyiv National University of Technology and Design

orcid.org/0000-0003-2021-2070

Daryna Chernyak

Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor,

Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Political Science and Ukrainian Studies

Kyiv National University of Technology and Design

Kyiv, Ukraine

orcid.org/0000-0002-1515-6070

ANTICIPATION OF THE LIFE PERSPECTIVE OF YOUTH IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NOTIONAL DIMENSION OF MODERNITY

Abstract. *The article analyzes the semantic dimension of modernity in the processes of sociality. It is shown how the change of meanings occurred as the main condition for the transformation of modernity, revealed the main directions of criticism of the Modernist project, analyzed the discourse of “modernity” from the point of view of the synergistic approach. The analysis of the problem of life prospects of the individual is carried out. It is established that the important role in the realization of desires and defining the life path of the individual is played by anticipation, that is the creation of a mental model of the future life scenario. The contents of such concepts as “life path”, “life strategy”, “life perspective” are revealed. A life perspective emerges as a holistic picture of the future, a potential opportunity for development, which is formed in the interconnection of expected and planned events in the unity of value-meaningful, motivational and organizational and activity aspects. In the course of the research, students' perceptions of life prospects and the values that determine the activity of youth in today's “knowledge society” were analyzed. It is established that the social world, which exists in the form of information civilization and has high rates of change, offers modern people many opportunities and variability of choosing their own life scenario, and therefore the anticipation of life strategy can take different directions.*

Introduction

The study of science, politics, education, culture and other spheres of human social life actualizes the problem of “modernity”, which arises in two aspects. First of all, modernity is commensurate with freedom of judgment, independent choice, autonomy with respect to established traditions, the dominant influence of social and political institutions. Dynamism, mobility, rationality, activity as attributive traits of modernity, ultimately arise from this freedom. At the same time, modernity presents itself with a set of rigid standards, the failure of which leads to loss of social and cultural status.

Today, philosophy is entirely focused on the modernity, where science with its innovative technologies is leading. As a result, we can state that way of thinking that “does not allow things to be”, and seeks to transform things or “conquer to our goals” [16, p.6].

Undoubtedly, the decisive role in the formation of a new way of thinking belongs to social studies, which determines the main directions of becoming of modernity. According to this, attention should be paid to the development of scientific social sciences and structures of social reproduction of postindustrial societies, which are impossible without quality science as the basis of prosperity and progress. The development of scientific structures and their incorporation into the industrial, economic and legal spheres leads to the deindividualization of social life, since connections and standards that make up the abstract-social qualities of people are beginning to dominate in these spheres and, according to this, “sacrifice” their individuality. There are clear differences between the formal, social and private individual lives of people.

One should consider that the practical need to solve contemporary problems indicates that the unity of social and humanitarian, ie social and philosophical knowledge is determined not so much by the standards of knowledge, but by the common problems that people face in their common and individual life, the interconnection of global issues and the tasks of self-realization of individuals, including the definition of life prospects. The main tendency of today is recognition of modernity as a “knowledge society”, emphasis on the role of knowledge as a major cultural asset, intellectual stock, potential for action in obligatory correlation with information.

The relevance of the study is due to the need to show the dependence of modernity on the realization of life prospects of individuals, their self-realization. Systematic and synergistic approaches, survey method, document analysis method were used while writing this paper.

1. Significant dimension of modernity in processes of sociality

Large subsystems of society such as production, law, education, science, politics, culture are focused on the use and multiplication of formal and social aspects of individuals’ being. Their private-individual lives find themselves on the "other side" of rigid social structures, but remain in the "field" of social science (philosophy) due to ideas that are not subject to the standards of abstract science and formal sociality, as well as beyond the scientific reflection of life, traditional culture and religiosity. [16, p.6-7].

A decisive influence on the problem of modernity is exercised by a scientific approach that conceptualizes the social and philosophical sciences in general. Growing from a certain social and practical basis, they express and explain its structure: subjects and methods of discipline "follow" the logic of reproducible social connections, capture the dominant types of activity, then complementing, ultimately delineating their delimitation and interconnections. While comparing and contrasting the disciplines of the scientific explanation of reality, practical differences between the forms of social connections and types of activities of people are expressed, which characterize the present (modern) state of life of man and society. Identification of the subject matter of the scientific nature of the disciplines, social and philosophical nature by which modernity is determined, is not only a consequence of the conscious methodological work of thinkers and scientists, but also the result of the reproduction of a certain structure of sociality (“logic of things”). Philosophy, in search of a universal instrument of knowledge of the world and man, abstracts from its internal features, appealing to the universal power of mind (spirit). Psychology, fixing the subject of his special research, begins with the elements of the human psyche, abstracted from the substantive-meaningful aspects of its activity. As a result, human subjectivity is considered in terms of spontaneity, not conditioned by the facts of modern social interactions. Social philosophy and politics in this situation seeks to identify objective “mechanisms” of social interactions, thereby “considering the influence of individuals on social structures, forms of self-realization and self-affirmation of individuals in society as minor” [16, p.7].

It should be noted that the scientific approach involves the creation of relevant theories. Thus, the classical modernization of theory over time begins to encounter circumstances that it is unable to explain and predict, and therefore to convert into facts within its theoretical framework. It is built using “ideal types” (M. Weber), or theoretical constructs. Classical modernization theory uses the terms of common language, but gives them a conceptual meaning. Traditional and modern societies appear in it as “ideal types”. When working with such constructs, which represent the most essential characteristics of the societies under consideration, it is impossible to ontologize “ideal types”, and to take them for reality. They act as methodological regulations aimed at understanding the societal distinctions of the essential parameters, referring to the logic of transition, the drama of which is evident precisely through the opposite traits of traditional and contemporary societies, rather than through ethical considerations. The post-evolutionist and post-progressive theories that emerge today respond to the experience of the unsuccessful application of a previous scientific approach, emphasizing changes in the vision of development – its non-linearity, unpredictability, probabilistic nature due to the emergence of a “globalization – a new megatrend” [34]. It further complicates the process of modernity as a process of development.

It is clear that the classical understanding of modernization is extremely rational, it requires mutual harmonization of all the parameters that change in the transition from traditional to modern society. In particular, the basis of modern discourse distinguishes two approaches: the concept of “freedom” must be replaced by the concept of “good”; the concept of “individual rights” must be superseded by the concept of “group rights”. The first aspect stems from the fact that one who cannot turn freedom into a good is willing to admit that he is not worthy of freedom, nevertheless he wants to have good things and insists on it. The second thesis is that those who claim for good are usually certain groups – ethnic, national, religious, linguistic. These groups differ greatly in their collective perceptions and culture from the middle class, that has entered into a social contract, has a similar understanding of morality and lifestyle, accounting for the majority of countries. The main social good include the classes of things necessary for the implementation of any rational life plan. These include both fundamental rights and freedoms, as well as profit, prosperity, the opportunity to realize oneself, social preconditions for self-respect of people. [34, p.15]. The polyphonic complexity of the social process determines the level of modernity, which is characterized not only by the “spontaneous logic” of the division of labor. From the standpoint of such logic, the opposite aspects of social reproduction emerge, which are ontologized, transformed into special objects, which are then considered in their totality, as social reality (“people's lives”), originating from the scientific analysis of the present. An example of such an analysis of the present is the attempt of V. Dilthey to justify the specifics of social science as opposed to naturalistic directed cognition. Orientation to the description of social and historical phenomena and events in their specificity, integrity, individuality are based on modern methodological procedures that determine the new priorities of life. Through them, the principle of “mutually exclusive complementarity” is substantiated [16], which has identified a new humanitarian science that finds its concentrated expression in social and humanitarian knowledge, primarily in philosophy.

It should be considered that the practical need to solve contemporary problems indicates that the unity of social and humanitarian, that is, social and philosophical knowledge is determined not so much by the standards of cognition, but by the common problems facing people in their common and individual life, the interconnectedness of issues and the tasks of self-realization of individuals. It thus outlines the new philosophical integration of the social sciences and humanities, together with its rethinking of their everyday foundations, their history and perspectives, their connection with the practice of society, their commensurability with science and sociality in the context of the present.

It should be noted that the term “modernity” is used to capture the actual reality. In scientific discourses, “modernity” is manifested through “the ambivalent meaning of modernity and even more so through its conceptual critique in postmodern discourse” [25], as S. Proleev points out. The set of connotations that accompany the term “modernity” and its derivatives make its use without clear definitions of its application. But when such concretisation is applied, the problem arises: “one or another sense of “modernity” determines the corresponding theoretical optics; after all, it provides the choice in favor of a diagnosis of the existing state of affairs and the development of humanity” [25].

A certain semantic orientation with respect to the reality that becomes the object of analysis is necessarily included in the preconditions of the analysis itself, forming its semantic horizon. However, one must refrain from conceptually defined verdicts about the present so as not to be in a situation where the result precedes the process of obtaining it. A relatively neutral position should be taken to help focus on the social characteristics that it (the situation) contains. On this basis, it is necessary to point to the change of meanings as the main condition for the transformation of the present. In particular, it is a matter of essential criticism of the Modern (Enlightenment) project and its refutation, which was carried out in three main directions. The theoretical substantiation of the former is carried out by T. Adorno and M. Gorkheimer, who have shown self-denial and self-destruction, which the Enlightenment contains. [2]. The principle of domination over nature, continued and entrenched by the dominance of man over himself, leads to environmental and social crises. If the ecological crisis is connected with the uncontrolled industrialization, which undermines the foundations of self-reproduction of man as a living being, then the social is perceived “in the domination of totalitarian regimes with their inherent use of social technologies of domination and total mobilization” [25, p.161].

In relation to the second, it emphasizes the internal crisis of legitimacy of social practices, and first of all – the production of knowledge, in the conditions of scientific and technological revolution and the social changes caused by it. This critique clearly manifested itself in the postmodern discourse made by the famous French philosopher J.-F. Lyotard [19]. From his point of view, modernity actually contains a rewriting of cultural codes, resulting in a loss of “trust in meta-stories” [19, p.10], and the role of social actors (subjects) with a shared sense of self-determination ceases to exist. And the third direction of criticism of the modernist (Enlightenment) project is directed against the latter's claim to universality. In contrast, it promotes the principle of the cultural and civilizational diversity of humanity, whose social existence and life cannot be reduced to certain unified structures. The latter involves taking into account contextual (local) experience, identifying in it a particular model that can be applied everywhere; showing that the highest achievements of a particular culture or group symbolically or in fact appear to be the achievements of mankind; it is argued that in experience with one context one can see something to understand the other experience. In this connection, P. Berger wrote: “... discipline that seeks to understand the modernity in essence must be inevitably corporate... one must look at Japan to understand the West, at socialism, to understand capitalism, at India, to understand Brazil, etc. [38, p.17]. Although on the basis of post-modern discourse, it is extremely difficult to achieve universality.

These critical discourses, focused on the problematic and meaningful "field" of human existence in the context of the “Modernist project”, point to the limitations of the previous social and humanitarian knowledge installations and its integration on the principle of “mutually exclusive interdependence”. The dependence of these attitudes on the practice of reproducing society as a “large structure”, within and against which the lives of social individuals are realized, is becoming

increasingly apparent. The unproductive social and methodological concepts that actually identify “sociality” with “structurality” appear to be obvious, leading to the neglect of the present. Therefore, in the interpretation of social systems of the modernity, the problem of their formation and change comes to the fore – both in the aspect of shaping the quality of life of an individual society, and in the aspect of the systematic design of the bonds of the human community. The need to show the dependence of the present on the self-realization of individuals is becoming more and more urgent, which in turn is caused by the development of science and technological progress. As a result, understanding the interconnected individual life of people becomes the “core” of understanding the changing modernity.

An important principle of this approach is to take into account the practical incentives that go beyond stereotypes that contrast the common and individual, social and personal, economics and psychology, structures and people. From this point of view, the analysis of the crisis situation of the modernity, in particular the “Modernist project” (Enlightenment), reveals two stages: a) the stage of formation, when a structure was formed that combined methodological dualism with integration in the form of “mutually exclusive interdependence”; b) a stage where this structure disintegrates, losing connections with everyday practice, destroying its own conceptions of sociality as the content of the present in its orders and functions. Thus, it is possible and necessary to speak about the completion of a certain stage of evolution of social and humanitarian knowledge related to the dominance of a particular type of structural and extensive sociality. Its advantage in everyday life, in the forms of large structures (spheres, industries, technologies) of society, in theoretical and methodological knowledge of its great theories (“narratives”), reductions, functions, determinations, etc., which have led to a new stage of modernity [16, p.8].

Although the previous stages (Modernist project) have not been completed, and the type of sociality, expressed by them, continues to operate, conserving the “energy” of large structures and narratives, but alongside and together other schemes that are included, “grow” into social and cultural practice, changing style of thinking. This trend is represented in a number of concepts: “human relations” (E. Mayo); “social action”, “communicative action” (J. Habermas); “structures” (E. Giddens); “constructing social reality” (P. Berger, T. Luckmann); “the social world” (A. Schutz); “world systems” (I. Wallerstein). They are joined by various schemes of dialogical and polylogical interactions, ideas about the quality of social life and activities that are embedded in projects and models of modern economics and politics, which convert into a personal and inter-individual plan of understanding the conditionality of modernity with knowledge and science.

All the above concepts, schools, directions are similar in one: they do not finish or rebuild previous traditional and classical concepts, but shift them to the “periphery” because they understand the concept of “modernity” in another dimension. Accepting the expediency of many critical invectives directed against the rational constructs of the Enlightenment (classical rationality) and partly the neoclassical era, it should be noted that the society of today does not appear in the form of a certain integrity, is not an example of social unity and economic unity. It is more a multifaceted social problem than it is a productive alternative to modern conceptualizations of sociality as the “ontological basis of modernity” [25, p.161]. However, despite the lack of universally recognized social models of existence of the global world, it is necessary to identify the general tendency that characterizes modernity as a “knowledge society” and, to the greatest extent, “the delegitimation of objective knowledge as a major cultural asset, and most importantly, its role as a universal means of self-attestation of reality in its relevance” [25, p.162], – emphasizes S. Proleev.

The urgency of such an understanding of modernity is explained by the fact that Modern time (the modern era) begins with the philosophy of F. Bacon, which convinces the power of nature-oriented knowledge, experienced science. But today there is a somewhat different understanding of knowledge, in particular “as a kind of intellectual stock (and stock of other valuable qualities of the individual), as a potential for activity, information, skills, abilities and other valuable qualities of the individual” [40, p.203]. The dominant characteristic of knowledge in its obligatory relation to information is indicated here.

Clear definitional and functional differences between the interconnected notions of “information” and “knowledge” emerged in the works of authors in the second half of the last century, when the concept of “information society” or a knowledge-based society began to emerge and comprehend. In particular, J.-F. Liotard wrote: “In the form of information goods needed to enhance production capacity, knowledge already is and will be the most important, and perhaps the most significant bet in the world power struggle.” [19, p.20]. In this context, “knowledge” and “information commodity” are identified, although they have not been commodities throughout the history of philosophy and science. Their "commodity existence" is a product of a later time.

The search for and explication of the concepts of “knowledge” and “information” in modern discourse shows that every short message can be called an “information atom” that is not fragmented. As a result, it does not contain a cognitive and epistemic form, and also loses its sense and meaning, each of the “information atoms” taken alone in relation to others, does not give rise to any action, operation or decision. “Information atoms” as elementary units of information define “the content received from the outside world in the process of our adaptation to it” as states N. Wiener. [27, p.84]. In order for a particular message to be regarded as a form of knowledge or knowledge in its own sense, it is necessary that certain actions or activities may be performed on the basis of that message. The latter refers to the set of system-interrelated unit actions (operations). Performed in a certain sequence, they form a reasonable (rational) activity. From this point of view, the ability to perform efficient reasonable activities based on this message is a decisive criterion that allows one or other message to be assigned to the knowledge class. On the contrary, “separate “information atoms” do not stimulate any activity, no targeted solutions” [27, p.84].

It can be concluded that the substantive differences between knowledge, forms of knowledge and information atoms are functional. This criterion for the difference between information and knowledge is rather conditional and relative. From the standpoint of another approach, one can assume that even elementary pieces of information provide some knowledge. But the cognitive-epistemic content of this unit is very limited. An important feature of knowledge is that on their basis it is possible to formulate a systematically organized sequence of rules that underlie a particular practice, a specific regulatory system that defines the contours of modernity, its order and rules. Knowledge is the cognitive foundation of social order and rules. It is important to emphasize that, based on this or that knowledge, both adequate and inadequate rules may emerge. The concepts of "information" and "knowledge" are crucial for modernity, the development of which is driven by scientific and technological progress and innovative technologies.

One should consider that information and knowledge, the development of which characterizes modern society, have both common features and significant differences. Forms of knowledge can act as certain matrices or abstract superstructures, and in strictly formalized form, as scientific theories. The knowledge system can be considered as a pragmatic matrix, which allows to formulate adequate rules and methods of activity that meet the requirements and needs of

modernity. Thus, based on the fact that today “human presence is traced in all disciplines, natural and social and humanitarian” [7, p.50], “temporal schools of projection of the development of the world for human physicality” are being constructed. [7, p.50]. Procedural or temporal-ontological human ontologies are conditioned by the fact that man is a social being, but one of his bases is natural and the other is cultural, communicative and creative, already formed in the new socio-cultural reality.

This situation contributes to the inclusion the synergistic approach in the understanding of the discourse of “modernity”. Synergetics are especially clearly manifested at the boundary of the transition between “bodies”, when social is born from the living, or from the action a practice emerges and from it – a cultural tradition. These transitions are dissipative structures in the flows of matter, energy, information, that is, they are described by the phenomena of self-organization of being. In today's “multi-temporal scales” activity-procedural ontology can help harmonize dialogue, communication of complex cultures and individuals. In addition, “the body of the culture of temporal ontologies becomes an analogue of the body of the psycho-mental in the ontology of states, and through it a person realizes his being, develops as a personality.” [7, p.51].

The characterization of “modernity” in the context of the role and significance of the factor “knowledge” raises the problem of the ratio of “risk” and “knowledge” in human activity. When considering knowledge as a prerequisite for social action, one must realize that risk is an inherent characteristic of social action. Knowledge and risk are interrelated aspects of the decision-making process within society. Specificity of risk-related decisions is the need to make choices among the options available in the uncertainty of the consequences, that is, in the context of incomplete knowledge. However, knowledge cannot, in principle, be complete; in pragmatic terms, it can be seen as complete in relation to the particular circumstances in which a decision is made. Making, implementing, and deploying consequences in space and in time affects a large number of social actors. In other words, risk today must be seen as a specific form of social communication, linked to the desire to “calculate” the progress of the present into an unknown future. [14, p.54].

From this point of view, modernity is emerging in a new dimension. As N. Luman emphasizes, risk is characterized by a set of “stages of contingency realization”, that is, uneven spatio-temporal distribution of random factors that influence the process of “decision making, advantages and disadvantages of a particular action, probability or improbability of the reality of losses as a result of a decision” [39, c.49]. This provides the basis for interpreting risk as a social construct whose value varies and is closely linked to specific social contexts and goals. Such an interpretation of risk emphasizes its communicative nature. The intertwining of the natural and social, objective and subjective, past, present and future in dealing with the risk of communication processes is characterized by increasing complexity. Within communication risks, synergistic nonlinear interactions occur, and local events in the context of globalization and accelerated development of information and communication technologies are increasingly causing global risk communication. Finally, the perception of risk by social actors as the most important element of communication ensures the inversion of one risk into another, and is also an important prerequisite for increased risk reproduction [14, c.54]. All this characterizes the present as a complex state, as a process, as a new reality.

The prerequisites for the emergence of a new reality are interconnected with the growth of scientific knowledge and the expansion of scientific and technical and technological activities as the most important factor in determining the parameters of modernity. Science and knowledge, in fact,

determined the direction of human development and at the same time acted as one of the most important factors contributing to the increase of uncertainty of the future. In the context of social transformations, which can be interpreted simultaneously and as the formation of a “knowledge society”, science receives a number of new qualities and functions. In particular, representatives of the Starnberg Group, German sociologists G. Bohme, P. Weingart, and V. Kron developed the concept of “finalization of science”. Its essence lies in the fact that the goals of scientific research are increasingly determined not by intrinsically scientific, but by external social and political goals, which causes the emergence of “hybrid communities”. They are "organizational structures in which scientists, policy makers, administrators, and industry representatives and other interest groups are directly involved to identify a problem, research strategy, and find solutions. This includes the process of translating political goals into technical goals and research strategies that combine different discursive universes.” [14, c.54-55]. Thus, the emergence of new institutional structures testifies to the diffusion of science, society policy as a characteristic of modernity.

An important characteristic of qualitative transformations of the present is the change in the relations between science and society. The result of these qualitative changes can be called “post-normal” science, bearing in mind the fundamental differences between T. Kun's “normal” science and the periods of scientific revolutions that he described. In addition, the end of the period of “normality” can also be said in the sense of exhaustion of traditional, “one-channel” relations between experts and politicians, when an integral part of the production of scientific knowledge becomes an account of its socio-political aspects. Under these conditions, previously stable demarcation lines between science, society and politics are gradually being erased, and there is a restructuring of the relationship between them, which has important consequences. The production of scientific knowledge is understood not so much as a search for the fundamental laws of nature, but rather as a process conditioned by the context of the application of knowledge, perceptions of social needs and potential consumers. According to V. Stepin, “the connection of scientific goals with non-scientific, social goals and values is explicated” [32, p.712]. The production of scientific knowledge becomes a reflexive process, a necessary element of which is the account of its social implications.

The reflexiveness of modern social life is the fact that social practices are constantly being researched and reformed in the context of the information on the same practices, which is changing as a result of their very foundations. Knowledge of how to "continue" development is an essential part of the agreements that are used and reproduced by human activity. In all cultures, social practices are changing daily as a result of their ever-changing discoveries. But “only in the age of modernity the revision of agreements becomes radical enough to cover (in principle) all aspects of human life, including technological intervention in the state of the material world” [8, p.158], – points out E. Giddens.

All these features of modernity are singled out as its main characteristic of knowledge, on the basis of which the idea of the "knowledge society" is conceptualized. But science itself, as a source of rationalization of socially significant decisions, simultaneously allows to understand the scope of uncertainty and, thus, expert knowledge. The value of expert knowledge begins to devalue. Any scientifically justified policy decisions can be challenged with the help of scientific analysis again. Therefore, the “knowledge society” has a serious potential for destabilization. However, the full potential of the idea of a “knowledge society” cannot be talked about until knowledge and information cease to be the most important factors in contemporary social change and economic

development.

The world of knowledge is not a world of social static and security. From the point of view of N. Ster, “modern societies are entities that are distinguished primarily by the fact that they produce their structures themselves, determine their future – and therefore have the capacity for self-destruction” [37, p.33]. These societies are “not unstable because they are “liberal democracies” but because they are “knowledge-based societies” [32, p.681]. Thus, modernity is determined by the knowledge that causes the problem of social transformations. However, this does not “remove” the problem of knowledge itself and knowledge based on it, beyond which neither science nor the development of society and man can be implemented.

2. Anticipation of the life perspective of modern youth

“The fate of each person is determined, first and foremost, by their own ability, to think and to reasonably treat everything that is happening in the world that surrounds them,” wrote E. Bern. [5, p.149]. In psychology, this understanding is denoted by the concepts of “life scenario”, “life path of the individual”, “life perspective”, “life strategy”, “lifestyle”, “concept of life”, “subjective picture of life path”, “personal life program”. Sociology uses the concepts of “life plans, programs, orientations”, “life perspective”. They are all used to denote a peculiar image of the future, created by the subject itself, which requires acting in a certain way, activates the need for recognition of the social environment and self-affirmation, and includes life plans, life program, life goals.

Creating the perspective of one's own life, dreams, planning, building a life strategy is the prerogative of the youth, since youth, according to the definition of psychologists, is a period in the life of a person, characterized by the “dominant of the future in the general structure of the subjective picture of the personal life path” [30, p.226].

The problem of life perspective of the individual was considered in various aspects: as a problem of life path (B. Ananiev, Ch. Buhler, S. Rubinstein), as a strategy of life (K. Abulkhanova-Slavska, Y. Reznik, E. Smirnov), as a construction of life perspective (K. Levin, J. Nutten) as a time perspective (E. Golovakha, O. Kronik) [24, p.22], as a “life scenario” (E. Berne), etc. A. Adler uses the concept of “lifestyle” and views it as an integrated style of adaptation to and interaction with life [22]. D. Leontiev understands life strategy as the ability of a person to create himself, his individual history, the ability to rethink his own essence [18]. In the works of L. Sohan [30, p.228] the strategy of human life is reflected by the concept of “life program of the individual”, which contains the main goals and results with which a person associates his own future. It is a strategy of activity and achievement.

Human life is first and foremost a story, but “... stories do not happen in real life, but rather they are constructed by people in their heads,” writes J. Bruner [6, p. 10]. “Stories about yourself and your life become a kind of semantic dominant, marking and organizing the path of life, directing self-constitution.” [33]. The idea of one's own life-changing world changes at every stage of society, because it is part of the worldview, world outlook. Defining the concept of the life path of the individual, B. Ananyev wrote: “the life path of a person is the history of the formation and development of personality in a certain society ...” [3, p.67]. A person has many opportunities and ways to choose his own life scenario in a democratic society, where the social world exists in the form of an information civilization and has a high rate of change.

Everyone has the right to choose their individual lifestyles, behaviors, the right to fulfill their own desires and preferences [30, p.40]. For this purpose a person is engaged in self-education and self-creation of one's own personality, programming one's life, anticipating and planning.

Therefore, in the construction of a life strategy, the concept of life, the leading role is played by anticipation, that is, the creation of a “thinking model (in the form of ideas) of those or other results that are expected” [20, p.40-41]. This phenomenon of anticipatory reflection provides a person with an opportunity to look into the future. Such an ability is possessed by a person who is able to independently develop his own life strategy, that is, to realize and determine the purpose of life, to choose the means to achieve it. L. Sohan believes that such a person is “characterized by a special arrangement of his own personality”, endowed with “the ability to life-building, the highest form of creative expression of man” [30, p.42]. Moreover, the life strategy reflects the “structure of life goals of the individual”, which is the “analogue of ... the vital system” of the person, his “consciousness, purpose, interests, desires and aspirations” [30, p.69]. T. Cottle emphasizes the role of anticipation in organizing human activity.

Considering the concept of the personal life path, K. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya distinguishes the concepts of “life strategy” and “life perspective”. The strategy of life is an integral characteristic of the personality, which arises “as the concept of life, as its meaning, the perfect plan” [1, p.5], “the ability of the individual to combine his own personality with the conditions of life, its reproduction and development” [1, p.129]. “It is a strategy of finding, justifying and realizing the individual by correlating the requirements of life with personal activity, values and self-affirmation” [1, p.128]. According to K. Albukhanova-Slavskaya [1, p.129], each personality has its own way of life, a way of its structuring, organization, evaluation and awareness.

Other authors define life strategy as “a dynamic system of perspective and long-term orientation of the person in the future life” [4], which includes social, cultural and personal orientations, which respectively determine the social position of the person, his cultural (generally accepted) and individual values. The main features of life strategies are the time length, reality, the ratio of positive and negative expectations, the structured future, the identification of certain “points” of perspectives of one's life [4].

L. Sohan thinks that creating a life strategy, concept of life, value orientations are a need of the individual [30, p.222]. The life strategy of the individual changes depending on the social situations in which it finds itself, because there is a rethinking of those values that are the motivators of her activities.

The concept of “life strategy” is a kind of planning a person's life according to their own values, it is a search for oneself [1, p.36].

The concept of “life perspective” is interpreted by K. Albukhanova-Slavskaya as a set of “psychological”, “personal” and “life”. Psychological perspective is a cognitive ability that provides a person with the opportunity to predict the future, to predict and shape his image, to imagine himself in it. Personal perspective is not only the cognitive ability to predict the future, but also a holistic readiness for it, the setting for the future, which is an indicator of the maturity of the individual, the potential for its development. The life perspective is the potential, the possibilities of the individual, the “life position”, “which determines the future of the individual” [1, p.77]. K. Levin considered life's perspective as an individual's view of his psychological future and past [17, p.198-199].

“Life perspective is a holistic picture of the future, formed in a complex contradictory relationship of expected and planned events, considered in the unity of value-meaning and organizational-activity aspects, where the activity of personality, conscious and realistic attitude to making plans for future are essential” [13, p.318]. “Life perspective” is a concept that emphasizes

the motivational aspect of life, when the picture of the future is drawn “in the complex contradictory relationship of programmed and expected events, with which a person associates the social value and individual meaning of his life” [31, p.210]. A life perspective is a potential opportunity for personal development.

Life perspective planning is one of the components of self-determination that involves the motives of the individual and his or her values. If the motive is an “affectively” charged “anticipational target state (the idea of the desired result of action: to do something better, to influence someone, etc.), which is actualized under the influence of various stimuli ..., the interest in the target condition, which is repeated periodically ...” [21, p.15], it can be assumed that the creation of a life-long perspective is a theoretical anticipational process of “reconciliation of events and expectations”, “expectations and real” [21, p.197]. J. Kelly believes that a person “looks at the world through transparent stencils or templates” [15, p.7], without which it would be very difficult to navigate in the world. These patterns are called by the scientist as constructs which, in his opinion, help to “build a line of behavior” and to present “a specific meaning of one's life”. “Each person formulates in his own way the constructs by which he tries to anticipate and control the course of events in his life,” says J. Kelly. [15]. In other words, the construct is a representation of a world of high degree of abstraction created by man. Personal constructs are used to predict events, understand the system of phenomena and help to understand the anticipating nature of human behavior, its use of hypotheses in thinking.

Anticipation of the subjective picture of life path, life perspective is also based on personal values. “The value orientation of the individual affects both the content and structural characteristics of the subjective picture of the life path” [36, p.248-249]. Planning one's future, planning specific events, one proceeds from a certain hierarchy of values that exists in one's mind and selects the ones that are most closely related to one's dominant needs. Therefore, life's self-determination can be regarded as “value-meaningful” [9].

3. Student youth's perception of a life perspective

The path of life is created by the person himself and is connected with the awareness of the purpose and meaning of his whole life. According to L. Sohan, the way of life is a process of self-realization of the individual [30, p.121]. Psychological past, present and future, whose unity is temporal integrity, are the components of life perspective. [35, p.345].

Today's youth create their own life strategies, life prospects, focusing on success and progress, which become clear guidelines and the basis for future relationships.

The aim of the study was to find out what life strategy is chosen by the representatives of the modern young generation, how they build their own life prospects and what life path is ideal for them. The basis for the research was the exercise on psychological training of creativity “Four ages”, proposed by A. Gretsov [12, p.184-185]. Using A. Gretsov's statement that “exercise creates preconditions for awareness and reflection on one's life path” [12, p.184], a questionnaire was developed in which the questions “What is the most important for a person?”, “What makes him “happy?”, “What makes him successful?”, “What unique opportunities does he have?” Each of these questions had to be designed for a “child”, “teenager”, “adult” and “elderly” person.

Thus, students created their own subjective picture of the life path, expressed by constructions of a high degree of abstraction.

138 respondents – students of 1 year of one of the technical institutions of higher education of Ukraine participated in the survey.

Qualitative and quantitative analysis of respondents' answers was used in the processing of the questionnaires. Answers to the question "What is most important for a person?" were obtained that reflect the leading human needs at one or another age, as described in the scientific literature.

Thus, the scientific literature [26, p.144-145] states that the child's leading need is the need for communication, the exchange of emotions between the child and adults, the need for adult care. 58.7% of the answers (81 people) are the answers: "Parents, complete and happy family, relatives". Another 58.7% (81 people) said: "Care, attention, warmth, kindness, love, attention, help." 44 students (31.9%) consider that the most important thing in childhood is "toys, games, fun, play, fun, entertainment", which is also in line with scientific research [26, p.145-147], as "the leading activity in childhood is a game in which the child actively "absorbs the riches of the world". In the course of the game, the child acquires the norms of social life, learns the basic functions of people, the primary self-knowledge occurs. The game creates a "zone of immediate development" (L. Vygotsky), on the basis of which readiness for learning activities is formed" [26, p.145-147]. "Knowledge acquisition and cognition of the world, cognition, development" such were the answers of 20 students (14.5%).

Leading need of the teenager is communication with peers, friendly relations with the environment [26, p.147-149]. Therefore, the answers "friends, friendship, communication, relationships, love, place in the company, society, collective, recognition, understanding" were provided by 47.1% of the respondents that is 65 students. The leading activity at this age is education, 31 respondents answered "education, knowledge, cognition", which is 22.5%. And the answer "personality formation, self-development, self-knowledge, self-realization, development, social development" is found only in 12.3% (in 17 people). As we can see, these percentages are quite low. According to the team of authors, they can be explained by the fact that modern youth do not see problems in finding information, since it can always be found, only access to the Internet is needed. The only problem is that the information you need to be able to find, and this already depends on the developed skill "be able to learn".

The most important thing for an adult is to start a family and acquire skill and professionalism [26, p.149-150]. Such responses are observed in the students' answers. 54.3% of respondents (75 people) answered "family, children" and 22.5% (32 students) answered "job, career". Also important are the answers "money, earnings, wealth" (20.3%, or 28 people), which may also indicate professional personality traits, since the high level of professionalism is the high earnings.

For the elderly, the most important in life, according to the survey participants are "health" (26.8% – 37 students) and "family" (37 students – 26.8%).

The second question "What makes a person happy?" gave us the following results. Children are happy with "toys, games, entertainment, fun, cartoons, etc." (56.5%) and "parents, mom, dad, their love, attention and care, family" (47.1%). Happiness for a teenager is "friends, communication, first feelings (love)" (47,8%). According to the respondents, an adult becomes happy when he or she has a "happy strong family" (35.5%), is well-off financially (19.6%) and has a job (12.3%). For the elderly, happiness is "a big happy family" (33.3%), "children and grandchildren" (18.8%) and "care, attention" (12,3%).

Students' perceptions of success in life reflect answers to the question "What makes a person successful?" According to the respondents, the success for the child is "their own achievements: win the game, play at the kindergarten, etc.", "elementary skills (to walk, draw, speak, read, write)",

“learning success”, “the first good, self-made , affairs», “championship in little things”, “learning, cognition, knowledge, new discoveries, development” (69,6%). The success of a teenager is determined by the following categories: “learning, education, cognition”, “achievement at school, university, in teaching, sports, art” (39,1%). According to the respondents, an adult will be successful when he has “a good (stable, high-paying, favorite) job, career, business” (45.7%), as well as “wealth, high income (salary), money, prosperity, well-being, providing for yourself and your family, financial independence, financial status” (23,9%). The elderly is successful when they have the wisdom and experience of life (13.8%). These answers were most frequently encountered. The success of an elderly person is a long-term prospect, and that's why not everyone thinks about it.

The unique capabilities of the child are “carelessness”, “lack of responsibility and duties”, “doing whatever they want” (34%). “Discovering the world for yourself, learning new, being able to develop” (22.5%) are unique opportunities for a teenager. Life-long anticipation enabled respondents to point out the unique capabilities of an adult. They became “self-determination and independence” (17.4%), “family; their placement and provision, family care” (15.9%), “work, business, career” (13%), as well as “money and security” (7.97%). “Great experience”, “wisdom” and the opportunity to “share, give wise advice, learn” are such unique opportunities for the elderly, said 44.9% of respondents.

Thus, studying the anticipation of life prospects of modern youth has shown that students are committed to fruitful work in order to gain life and professional experience and to be able to share it with their happy family.

According to researchers (in particular, T. Reznik, Y. Reznik [29]), life strategy can take different directions: strategy of life well-being (receptive, “acquiring”), strategy of life success and strategy of life self-realization (creative). The strategy of vital well-being intensifies the efforts of the individual to acquire vital goods, accumulation, material well-being. The strategy of success in life is aimed at achieving success, depending on the idea of the person, based on motives and motivation. Creative orientation involves, first and foremost, self-realization, regardless of external recognition or non-recognition.

After analyzing the students' answers to all the questions concerning adults and the elderly (because these answers indicate a life perspective), the authors concluded that the directions of the respondents' life strategy are distributed as shown in Table. 1

Table. 1. Directing the life strategy

| | Receptive direction | | Motivational direction | | Creative direction | |
|--|---------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| | adults | elderly | adults | elderly | adults | elderly |
| Question 1 “The most important thing in life” | 31 | 12 | 48 | 2 | 20 | 23 |
| Question 2 “What makes a person happy?” | 52 | 1 | 28 | 2 | 7 | 14 |
| Question 3 “What makes a person successful?” | 98 | 7 | 41 | 23 | 29 | 43 |
| Question 4 “Unique Features” | 14 | 5 | 43 | 33 | 73 | 34 |

As shown in Table. 1, a person's views on his own life strategy depend on the question to which they answer. According to the respondents, the most important for the adult is the motivational direction (34.8%), the receptive direction (37.7% and 71% respectively) will bring happiness and success, and the creative direction (52.9%) will bring unique opportunities. The elderly will preferably have a creative direction of life perspective, as the answers to all questions showed. Thus, students' perceptions of life prospects are based on their perceptions of life values, priorities, meaning of life and success. A person realizes his place in it, envisages his life path, the meaning of his activity for himself and all humanity, plans and dreams by studying, cognizing the world, mastering professional competences. The life prospects of contemporary youth are diverse and varied.

Conclusions

The problem of "modernity" can and should be understood not only in the categories of plurality, but, importantly, it develops itself according to the laws of the synergistic nonequilibrium system, demonstrating the multiplicity of evolutionary vectors of development. A person, knowing the world, always understands his place in it and the importance of his activities for himself and all humanity in a new sense. These processes are variable and spontaneous, they include multidirectional, contradictory and mutually exclusive tendencies. The logic of their development does not obey the principles of classical determinism, the methods of dialectics, so it requires a more complex, cognitive approach, requires a new culture of thinking. This situation is due to the factor of globalization as the most important megatrend of the present.

The social world, which exists in the form of information civilization and has a high rate of change, offers modern people many opportunities and variability of choosing their own life scenario.

An important role in the realization of desires and the definition of the path of life is played by anticipation – the creation of a mental model of the future life scenario. Anticipating abilities are a necessary element of regulation of activity, behavior and emotional states of a person, they participate in processes of adaptation of the person to changing environmental conditions and help in building a life perspective.

The life perspective emerges as a holistic picture of the future, a potential opportunity for development that is formed in the interconnection of expected and planned events in the unity of value-meaning, motivation and organizational-activity aspects. Since the anticipation of a life-long perspective is based on personal values, it was appropriate to find out which ones are determinative for modern student youth. Thus, in the course of the research it was found that the basic values that determine the activity and actions of young people and, accordingly, are the desirable life prospects are: a happy, full family, dominated by love, mutual respect, mutual support and care; work that allows you to self-actualize, show professionalism, grow, have good earnings; well-being that will enable them to fulfill their vital needs and be independent; health; wisdom and life experience as an opportunity to transmit knowledge, to realize oneself in children, students and followers.

It has been found that the anticipation of a life strategy can take different directions: a strategy of life well-being (receptive, "acquiring"), a strategy of life success and a strategy of life self-realization (creative).

The crisis and unstable social situation in Ukraine escalates the problem of life-long anticipation, since it is difficult for individuals to project their own life paths, considering the uncertainty of social development prospects.

Anticipation, the construction of a life strategy is part of the emergence of a new reality, and therefore should be based on scientific knowledge as the most important factor in determining the parameters of modernity. Science and knowledge determine the direction of human development and is one of the most important factors contributing to the uncertainty of the future.

References

1. Abul'khanova-Slavskaya, K.A. (1991). *Strategiya zhizni*. M. : Mysl'.
2. Adorno, T. (1997). *Dialektika Prosveshcheniya*. M.: SPb.: Yuventa.
3. Anan'ev, V. G. (1980). *Chelovek kak predmet poznaniya, Izbr. psikholog. trudy* (T.1.). M. : Pedagogika.
4. Bekurina, Y.S. (2018). *Zhiznennyye strategii molodezhi kak teoreticheskiy kontsept: nauchnye i filosofskie refleksii*. Retrieved from <http://publishing-vak.ru/file/archive-philosophy-2018-4/4-bekurina.pdf>
5. Bern, Erik. (1996). *Igry, v kotorye igrayut lyudi : Psikhologiya chelovecheskikh vzaimootnosheniy ; Lyudi, kotorye igrayut v igry : Psikhologiya chelovecheskoy sud'by*. [SPb.] : Spets. lit.
6. Bruner, Dzh. (2005). Zhizn' kak narrativ *Postneklassicheskaya psikhologiya*, 1, 9-30.
7. Budanov, V. G. (2012). Postneklassicheskie praktiki i kvantovo-sinergeticheskaya antropologiya. V. G. Budanov, *Postneklassicheskie praktiki: opyt kontseptualizatsii*. (p. 37-62). SPb.: Izdatel'skiy dom «Mir»
8. Giddens, E. (2011). *Posledstviya sovremennosti*. M.: «Praksis».
9. Ginzburg, M. R. (1988). Lichnostnoe samoopredelenie kak psikhologicheskaya problema. *Voprosy psikhologii*, 2, 19-26.
10. Golovakha, E. I. (2001). Zhiznennyye perspektivy i tsennostnyye orientatsii lichnosti. L. V. Kulikova (Sost. i obshch. red.), *Psikhologiya lichnosti v trudakh otechestvennykh psikhologov*. (c. 256-269). SPb.: Piter.
11. Golovakha, E. I. (2008). *Psikhologicheskoe vremya lichnosti*. M. : Smysl.
12. Gretsov, A. G. (2008). *Trening kreativnosti dlya starsheklassnikov i studentov*. SPb.: Piter.
13. Guljas, I. A. (2011). Zhyttjeva perspektyva osobystosti jak predmet teoretyko-metodologichnogo analizu. *Problemy suchasnoi' psyhologii'*, 12, 315-324.
14. Efremenko, D. V. (2010). Konceptiya obshhestva znaniya kak teorija social'nyh transformacij: dostizhenie i problemy. *Voprosy filosofii*, 1, 49-61.
15. Kelli, Dzhordzh A. (2000) *Teorija lichnosti : Psihologija lichnykh konstruktov*. SPb. : Rech'.
16. Kemerov, V. E. (1999). Konceptiya radikal'noj social'nosti. *Voprosy filosofii*, 7, 3-13.
17. Levin, K. (1992). Opredelenie ponjatija «pole v dannyj moment». P. Ja. Gal'perin, L. I. Zhdan (Red.), *Istorija psyhologii (10-e-30-e gg. Period otkrytogo krizisa): Teksty*. (2-e izd.). (c. 190-204). M.: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta.
18. Leont'ev, D. A. (1996). Ot social'nyh cennostej k lichnostnym: sociogenenez i fenomenologija cennostnoj reguljatsii dejatel'nosti. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serija 14: Psihologija*, 4, 35-44.
19. Liotar, Zh.-F. (1998). *Sostojanie postmoderna*. M.: Institut jeksperimental'noj sociologii, SPb.: Aletejja.

20. Lomov, B. F. (1980). *Anticipacija v strukture dejatel'nosti*. M. : Nauka.
21. Makklelland, D. (2007) *Motivacija cheloveka*. SPb.: Piter.
22. Osipova L. B., Jenveri L. A. (2016) *Zhiznennye strategii molodezhi: opyt sociologicheskogo issledovanija*. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/zhiznennye-strategii-molodezhi-opyt-sotsiologicheskogo-issledovaniya>
23. *Osnovnye podhody k issledovaniju zhiznennyh strategij lichnosti* (2010). Retrieved from http://polga.pro/?page_id=173
24. Pyrog, G. V. (2018) *Zv'jazok zhyttjevyh strategij suchasnoi' molodi z psihologichnym vikom: teoretychni aspekty. Suchasni naukovy doslidzhennja v psihologii' ta pedagogici – progres majbutn'ogo : zbirnyk naukovykh robit uchasnykiv mizhnarodnoi' naukovy-praktychnoi' konferencii'*. Odesa : GO «Pivdena fundacija pedagogiky», c. 22-25.
25. Prolejev, S. V. (2011). *Osvitnij proekt modernu ta suchasnyj universytet*. [avt. kol.: V.Andrushhenko (kerivnyk), M.Bojchenko, L.Gorbunova, V.Lutaj ta in.] *Filosofija i metodologija rozvytku vyshhoi' osvity Ukrai'ny v konteksti jevrintegracijnyh procesiv*. (c. 154-178). K.: Pedagogichna dumka.
26. *Psyhologija: Pidruchnyk*. (2008). (6-te vyd., stereotyp). K.: Lybid'.
27. Rakitov, A. I. (2005). *Reguljativnyj mir: znanie i obshhestvo, osnovannoe na znanijah. Voprosy filosofii*, 5, 82-93.
28. Ral'nikova, I. A. (2002) *Zhiznennye perspektivy lichnosti: psihologicheskij kontekst*. Barnaul : Izd-vo Alt. un-ta.
29. Reznik, T. E. (1995). *Zhiznennye strategii lichnosti. Cociologicheskie issledovanija*, 12, 100-105.
30. Sohan', L. V. (1987). *Zhiznennyj put' lichnosti (voprosy teorii i metodologii social'no-psihologicheskogo issledovanija)*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
31. *Sociologija*. (1999). K. : Ukr. encykl.
32. Stepin, V. S. (2003). *Teoreticheskoe znanie*. M.: Progress-Tradicija.
33. Tytarenko, T. (2010). *Zhyttjevyj shljah osobystosti v postmodernists'komu dyskursi. Psyhologija osobystosti*, 1, 11-18.
34. Fedotova, V. G. (2002). *Neklassicheskie modernizacii i al'ternativy modernizacionnoj teorii. Voprosy filosofii*, 12, 3-21.
35. Havula, R. (2015). *Zhyttjeva perspektyva osobystosti v junac'komu vici. Aktual'ni pytannja gumanitarnykh nauk : mizhvuzivs'kyj zbirnyk naukovykh prac' molodyh uchenykh Drogobyc'kogo derzhavnogo pedagogichnogo universytetu imeni Ivana Franka*. Drogobych : Prosvit., 11, 343-348.
36. Shatyns'ka, O. P. (2013). *Vzajemovplyv systemy cinnostej osobystosti ta i'i' zhyttjevogo shljahu. Aktual'ni pytannja gumanitarnykh nauk : mizhvuzivs'kyj zbirnyk naukovykh prac' molodyh uchenykh Drogobyc'kogo derzhavnogo pedagogichnogo universytetu imeni Ivana Franka*. Drogobych : Prosvit., 6, II, 244-250.
37. Shter, N. (2002). *Mir iz znanija. Sociologicheskij zhurnal*, 2, 30-35.
38. Berger, P. (1992). *Sociology: a Disinvitation? Society*, 30, 14-22.
39. Luhman, N. (1991). *Soziologie des Risikos*. B. I. Y. de Gruyter.
40. Nyiri, L. (2002). *Knowledge-based society and its impact on Labour-market values. Society and economy*. Budapest, Vol. 24, 2, 201-210.