it, thus contributing to that prophecy becoming a reality and is based on an ancient Greek myth. In society, when people believe in an expectation or prediction, their behavior changes as a result, thus contributing to the fulfillment of that expectation. The key to the Oedipus Effect is that it demonstrates the interaction between prediction and reality, highlighting the self-fulfilling nature of human behavior in social phenomena.

The Oedipus effect has an important revealing power in the impact of media communication on people's economic behavior. Specifically, by reporting, predicting and commenting on certain events, the media is not only an objective presentation of the content of the phenomenon, but also a potential shaping of the public and market behavior, pushing the public's behavior in the direction of the report or prediction, thus verifying and realizing the media's initial prediction in the report.

Media coverage, analysis and commentary on the market often go beyond the function of disseminating information itself and become the main driving force in shaping public perception and behavior. Media coverage of news often carries a strong emotional orientation and predictive language, which conveys information to the public while also profoundly influencing their perceptions and behaviors.

When the media use terms such as “recession” and “rising inflation” to describe the potential risks of a crisis, consumers may reduce their spending and increase their savings due to panic, thus weakening market demand and further aggravating the downward pressure on the market. Similarly, when the media portrays positively the potential for market recovery or sector-specific growth, investors' expectations of market expectations increase, leading to greater investment, and firms increase production, thus driving up market activity. This mechanism of circular validation is typical of the Oedipus effect: initial predictions that are not entirely based on facts are then inadvertently made real by people's reactions to the information.

When the media report on a stock's trend is predicted to rise significantly, investors will often be misled by the information reported by the media, and then will easily focus on buying the stock, which will promote the stock price to get a substantial increase in a short period of time, and ultimately verify the truth of the report's prediction.

When the media reports negative news substantially, investors may divest their existing investments or reduce their market activities due to their own risk aversion, exacerbating the downward pressure on the market. In the process, the media adds a direct influence on market volatility, and its predictions are no longer a passive reflection of the facts, but become a self-fulfilling force that stimulates market sentiment and behavior.

O. A. Vashko
PhD in Philosophy,
Associate Professor,
Belarus State Economic University (Minsk)
e-mail: oksanavashko@mail.ru

THE PHENOMENON OF SCIENTIFIC ARGUMENTATION: VALIDATION OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS

In scientific discourse argumentation is the most important tool, a means of communication and an essential way of the information transmission. Scientific argumentation represents a systematic process aimed at justifying theoretical assertions based on logical deductions and empirical data. Effective scientific argumentation comprises several key components and forms that are critically important for progress in the scientific domain.

The standard structure of scientific argumentation includes the following elements: thesis, evidence, logical arguments and counterarguments, conclusion.

1. Thesis represents the main assertion or hypothesis to be proved, that should be clear, specific and testable.

2. Evidence as a component encompasses empirical data gathered through experiments, observations or systematic reviews. Evidence can include quantitative data (experimental results or statistical samples) and qualitative data (conclusions drawn from interviews or text analysis).

3. Arguments link the thesis with the provided evidence and can include various logical strategies, such as induction (moving from specific cases to general conclusions), deduction (moving from general to specific), and abduction (formulating the best explanation for observed data). Counterarguments as the crucial part of scientific argumentation helps to acknowledge and refute possible objections. Counterarguments must be thorough and convincing.

4. Conclusion as a final section summarizes the findings and ties back to the initial thesis. The conclusion should not only summarize key findings but also emphasize their significance for further research, practical applications, or existing theories.

Scientific argumentation can be classified into several forms:

1. Theoretical argumentation engages with existing theories and their applicability. Works addressing foundational scientific questions, like «The Methodology of Scientific Research Programs» (1978) by I. Lakatos, allow researchers to assess how well a theory explains observed phenomena and how it can be improved. The assessment criteria for validity of theoretical research results (a theory, a concept or some theoretical constructions) must satisfy the following universal criteria: single-subjectedness, completeness, consistency, interpretability, verifiability, validity.

2. Empirical argumentation is based on factual data and observations. An example of scientific work containing extensive evidence is «The Logic of Scientific Discovery» (1959) by K. Popper, that discusses the criterion of falsifiability. The assessment criteria for validity of empirical research results must be objective (as much as possible in a given problem domain), adequate (must assess what a researcher wants to assess), neutral (with respect to studied phenomena). The whole set of the criteria must cover all essential characteristics of a studied phenomenon or process with sufficient completeness.

3. Mathematical argumentation utilizes mathematical and logical methods to formulate conclusions. This is particularly important in physics, as illustrated in B. Russell's «Principia Mathematica» (1910), where logic and mathematics are employed to address philosophical questions and problems.

4. Comparative argumentation involves comparing different theories or explanations to identify their strengths and weaknesses. This approach can be especially useful in social sciences, where various theories often compete to explain the same phenomena.

In conclusion, successful scientific argumentation necessitates clarity, logic and rigor in the application of scientific methods and analyses. This reinforces the trustworthiness of scientific knowledge and ensures its validity. By considering the aspects discussed here, researchers can present their arguments more systematically and effectively, contributing to progress in their fields.

А. И. Верещако,
канд. филос. наук,
БГЭУ (г. Минск)
e-mail: alexei.vereschako@bseu.by

СОЗНАНИЕ И ИСКУССТВЕННЫЙ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТ: ОБЩАЯ ПОСТАНОВКА ПРОБЛЕМЫ

Тема искусственного интеллекта (далее – ИИ) только набирает свою актуальность. Различные сообщения, связанные с ИИ, не уходят из информационной повестки. Теперь только ленивый не высказывается на эту тему. Для философии техники проблематика ИИ не является чем-то новым, т. к. многие мыслители, работающие в этой проблематике, давно сталкивается с фундаментальными, онтологическими вопросами, выходящими за пределы частных отраслей науки и затрагивающими такие категории как воля, разум, свобода и т. д.

Здесь нас интересует связь ИИ с феноменом сознания. Обладает ли ИИ сознанием? Ответ на этот вопрос в первую очередь будет зависеть о того, что именно мы понимаем