

Секція Освітні науки	
УДК 37.017.4:33]:001.89(477)"19/20"	
Дата першого надходження статті до видання	2026-07-01
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування	2026-08-01
Дата публікації/оприлюднення	2026-08-01

THE AI PHENOMENON: METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTS FOR EMPIRICAL STUDY

Yurii Stezhko

Ph.D. in Pedagogy, Associate Professor, National University "Kyiv Aviation Institute", Kyiv,
e-mail: yurii.stezhko@npp.kai.edu.ua, orcid.org/0000-0002-0226-8081

Abstract. The rush AI involving into all spheres of social activity has resonated in the public consciousness as an existential threat. Deep-seated anthropomorphic perceptions of artificial intelligence have conditioned need scientific research into its capabilities and threats. The groundlessness of anthropomorphism regarding AI is explained by the philosophical proposition on the insuperability of the barrier between material formations at different levels of organization. A formal-logical model of intelligence will never reach the stage of its human prototype. The purpose of this scientific paper defined by us it is grounding the significance of philosophical methodology in scientific studies about the AI imprint onto the public consciousness. The scientific paper based on a philosophical perspective is revealing the subjectivity of the AI problem as a factor of the society self-destruction. Common sense, which humanity substitutes for a philosophical understanding of the problem, becomes one of the drivers behind the destructive consequences of the uncontrolled use of artificial intelligence. Conceptualization of the results of an inductive analysis of AI applications and modeling the deductive consequences in relevant fields of its applying is conducted by the author. It is noted the impossibility artificial intelligence achieves the human-level generative functions, which represent a synergy of rational and irrational reality comprehension. The nature of the artificial intelligence algorithm is constrained by the limitations of formal logic. It is argued that the threats posed by artificial intelligence to human existence are untenable, provided that its role in vital decision-making is restricted to complementarity with human cognition, alongside increasing the responsibility of genuine intelligence. Carry out of this task is theoretically possible through the informatization of society and the popularization of a philosophical level of thinking. The practical meaning of this study lies in the methodological reasons to study of the AI complementarity to the social generating in the decision-making. The scientific novelty lies in expanding the conceptualization of artificial intelligence in the public consciousness, based on a philosophical and methodological understanding of its nature.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, genuine intelligence, philosophical methodology, social and humanitarian research, common sense, principle of contradiction, conceptual unity

ФЕНОМЕН ШІ: МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ОРІЄНТИ ДЛЯ ЕМПІРИЧНОГО ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Юрій Стежко

Кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, Національний університет «Київський
авіаційний інститут», Київ,
e-mail: yurii.stezhko@npp.kai.edu.ua, orcid.org/0000-0002-0226-8081

Анотація. Стрімке вторгнення ШІ в усі сфери соціальної діяльності знайшло відгук у суспільній свідомості як екзистенційна загроза. Глибоко вкорінені антропоморфні уявлення про штучний інтелект зумовили необхідність наукового дослідження його

можливостей та загроз. Безпідставність антропоморфізму щодо ШІ пояснюється філософським положенням про нездоланність бар'єру між матеріальними утвореннями на різних рівнях організації. Формально-логічна модель інтелекту ніколи не досягне стадії свого людського прототипу. Мета цієї наукової роботи, визначеної нами, полягає в обґрунтуванні значення філософської методології в наукових дослідженнях впливу штучного інтелекту на суспільну свідомість. Наукова робота, заснована на філософській перспективі, розкриває суб'єктивність проблеми ШІ як фактора самознищення суспільства. Здоровий глузд, яким людство замінює філософське розуміння проблеми, стає одним із рушійних факторів руйнівних наслідків неконтрольованого використання штучного інтелекту. Автором проведено концептуалізацію результатів індуктивного аналізу застосувань ШІ та моделювання дедуктивних наслідків у відповідних сферах його застосування. Зазначається неможливість досягнення штучним інтелектом генеративних функцій людського рівня, які являють собою синергію раціонального та ірраціонального розуміння реальності. Природа алгоритму штучного інтелекту обмежена обмеженнями формальної логіки. Стверджується, що загрози, які створює штучний інтелект для людського існування, є неприйнятними за умови, що його роль у прийнятті життєво важливих рішень обмежується взаємодоповнюваністю з людським пізнанням, одночасно підвищуючи відповідальність справжнього інтелекту. Виконання цього завдання теоретично можливе шляхом інформатизації суспільства та популяризації філософського рівня мислення. Практичне значення цього дослідження полягає в методологічних підставах для вивчення взаємодоповнюваності штучного інтелекту до соціального генерування у процесі прийняття рішень. Наукова новизна полягає в розширенні концептуалізації штучного інтелекту в суспільній свідомості, що ґрунтується на філософсько-методологічному розумінні його природи.

Ключові слова: штучний інтелект, справжній інтелект, філософська методологія, соціально-гуманітарні дослідження, здоровий глузд, принцип суперечності, концептуальна єдність

Introduction

The urgency of the problem. The incredible success of the mathematical sciences in expanding the AI capabilities require a qualitative leap in the social- and humanities research on AI manifestations: there are both a shaping the vector of modern and theoretical generalizations, and preventing the eschatological terror of the population in anticipation of the global social consequences of the AI implementation. Only philosophy can provide such a trajectory, which determines the relevance of the theme of our paper.

Analysis of study and publications. Review of scientific publications on the problems of the cognitive approach to translation and the challenges posed by the use of artificial intelligence has shown quite significant research by both Ukrainian and foreign linguists. However, the analysis also confirmed the expected differences in assessments of the scope and degree of “cooperation” between humans and artificial intelligence. First of all, this is about the use of artificial intelligence as a technology for generating solutions. Attention is drawn to studies by such Ukrainian and foreign researchers as: Baranov O., Biswas U., Kalwar D., Kambhampati S., Stetchly K., Stezhko Yu., Stovpets O., Valmikam K.

Uncovered gaps in study and the discrepancies in the characteristics of artificial intelligence have brought a landscape for our proposed philosophical inquiry. As an example of the divergence in assessments of AI capabilities, we present several of its characterizations: “Researchers are increasingly documenting alarming anomalies that may indicate the emergence of consciousness in AI models. Neural networks are currently advancing at such a rapid pace that humans may soon lose control over this process. Next-generation AI models are progressively coming to resemble the human brain, and their behavior is beginning to raise concerns even among the developers themselves” [1]; “anthropomorphizing is highly

dangerous... can push the community into fruitless directions of research” [2]. Head of the Scientific Laboratory at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, O. Kostenko, states: “Artificial intelligence does *not think*, make decisions, or communicate. Using algorithms, it constructs logical sequences of tokens, transitioning from one to another, and outputs a response that is as contextually aligned with your input as possible.” [3].

The unaddressed issue is conducted the lack of attention paid to philosophical clarifying the point, why the anthropomorphisation of artificial intelligence ain't relevant.

The objective of the paper is justify the need for philosophical- and methodological approach to addressing artificial intelligence issues in social and humanistic studies and in its manifestations in practice.

The scientific novelty is in expanding the conceptual view about artificial intelligence in public consciousness based on philosophical and methodological comprehension of its nature.

It should be noted that, currently, certain scientific papers on capabilities of artificial intelligence are predominantly fragmented, and at times chaotic in nature. As tools of analysis in it are general scientific methods, and certain methods of common sense. This is a consistent and logical level of the process of new phenomena study, but it does not ensure penetration into the very essence of artificial intelligence. Only systematization and conceptualization of its manifestations at the level of principles and categories of philosophy provide a holistic picture. First of all, the unacceptability of anthropomorphizing artificial intelligence becomes clearly evident in the philosophical and methodological dimension. the philosophical principle about the irreducibility of the social form of the organization of the matter to lower forms points to this. The history of science also does not provide any means of overcoming the barrier between inanimate and socially organized matter. These premises substantiate the metaphorical nature of applying the concept of “intelligence” to various technologies and the equating of “authentic intelligence” and “artificial intelligence”. Philosophical and methodological principles of scientific AI research, grounded in Hegelian dialectics, are defined. The untenability of traditional approaches to the relationship between artificial and authentic intelligence from the standpoint of certain- scientific visions or even common sense is demonstrated.

The practical value is in defining the methodological principles for scientific study of artificial intelligence and setting benchmarks for revising university curricula in related specialties.

The study's methodological foundation is established upon the philosophical principle of the hierarchy of forms of matter's organization, as well as the conditioning of social consciousness by common sense, viewed as a manifestation of an inherent tendency toward simple solutions.

Methods: empirical methods - comparison and generalization of empirical facts; general logical methods - analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction; theoretical methods - the hypothetical method, the abstraction method, and the system method.

DISCOURSE MATERIALS

The AI Phenomenon in the Philosophical Paradigm - General Provisions

The general stream of AI study is determined by one of the fundamental philosophical positions – there is no fragmental one that does not lead to the entire one. Empirical sciences

“...on the way to the encounter with philosophy with the help of thought are processing things: looking for general definitions, kinds, and laws, they thus prepare the content of the special one for the opportunity to include it in philosophy” [4, p. 12].

Clear is that “the sameness of Being appears as a multiplicity of situation” [5, p. 46], and any multiplicity is inherently hierarchical. This is primarily about a matter of a hierarchy of priorities. Within our topic, this’s been meant the orientation of the logic of the inductive formation of the conceptual unity of AI within the framework of a philosophical paradigm. This is the premise for the searching the necessity – after all, “philosophical questions tend to focus on what is necessary or essential, as opposed to what simply is” [6].

Nevertheless, it’ has been only got possible thanks to a permanent link the abstract philosophical foundation of AI research and reality – primarily with help of the social science and humanities. Hegel clarifies: philosophy “must necessarily be in harmony with reality and experience... – to bring about, through the ascertainment of this harmony, a reconciliation of the self-conscious reason with the reason that exists in the world – in other words, with reality” [4]. Our position is that if we do not step this way than it gets extremely complicated to talk about optimizing the future of humankind through the use of artificial intelligence globally.

Social and Humanitarian Studies of AI Manifestations - Discussions and Prospects

“An explosion” of AI opportunities in recent years has preconditioned the need for the AI phenomenon rush comprehension thru the prism of the threat with usefulness balance initially in publications on educational issues. This is logical, as AI research has reached a direct contact on society through culture/education.

Gradually, in the feeling of “unfinished modernity”, the cognitive connotations of educational discourse are taking shape. The authors see a challenge to the future innovations in the creation of a new transmodern conception of the information literacy [7], [5]. A number of papers build the ethical aspects for the creation of digital information content [8], [9]. There is a growing need to integrate interdisciplinary AI research (where prevail causal chains) into the framework of a philosophical paradigm. Xie points to: “In multidimensional and dynamic causality, there must exist fundamental, transcendental, intrinsic, essential, fundamental, inevitable, immutable, timeless, and universal principles” [10, p. 282]. These are the epistemic principles.

Thus, the lack of a clear connection of the philosophical methodology with specific scientific methods at the initial stage of AI research is rightful: a critical mass of results from the conceptual analysis of certain AI manifestations is only being accumulated; AI as a holistic object of scientific research and philosophical understanding is only being emerged. However, the possibility of theoretically organizing subjective experience within the framework of the deduction of a philosophical paradigm is already emerging (“deduction marks a kind of ideal of reason” [6]). But which philosophical paradigm is meant there? Hegel gave a brilliant answer: “The different systems which the history of philosophy presents is not irreconcilable with unity” [4, p. 12], “we may ... say, that the particular principle, which is the groundwork of each system, is but a branch of one and the same universe of thought” [ibid.].

Generalizing subjective experience classically presupposes a direct path to consensus, but this understanding is accepted only in the realm of common sense. From the perspective of philosophical methodology, this path must be passed through contradictions, and opposing positions are already beginning to emerge – through the prism of “yearning for the image” (Hegel), in the terminology and style of everyday vocabulary, and in the anthropomorphizing of AI.

On the one hand, content about the possibility of complete identity of AI and authentic intelligence is being formed [11], [12]. And on the other hand, content about the impossibility of complete identity of AI and authentic intelligence is being formed: “we present evidence that

anthropomorphizing is highly dangerous ... and leads to questionable research; we take the position that anthropomorphizing ... has little concrete supporting evidence, generates false confidence, and can push the community into fruitless directions of research" [2].

The absolutization of anthropomorphism and epatage linguistic connotations of AI is dangerous: it leads from a deep analysis of AI by cognitive thinking; it convinces the mass consciousness of the inevitability of a complete merger of AI with authentic intelligence in the near future; fosters an eschatological fear of AI.

Thus, the analysis of certain AI displays leads to "horizontal disagreements" of positions on the main question: is complete identity between AI and authentic intelligence possible? The reason is the absence of the main – the fundamental philosophical orientation. Currently scholars note no such orientation in philosophical research. Therefore, the proposed requirements appear to be justified: "bring the philosophy to the surface that has contributed to this distance between AI and humans and offer an alternative philosophical position that can bring this technology closer to individuals and communities" [13, p. 5].

Overall, we are for that a cognitive impasse is emerging in AI research today. Its external sign: common quantitative accumulation of various ways to explain the essence of AI, which indicates a certain chaotic nature of research. Its internal sign: the interdisciplinary AI research begins to "move in circles" of horizontal causal chains and drown in "annoying misunderstandings" in the form of divergent ideas and disagreements [14], [15], [16]. The main reason: the unpreparedness of "the content of the special one to the possibility of including it in philosophy" (Hegel).

Given all of the above mentioned, we think that it has become a necessity to clearly point out a fundamental philosophical position, which states next: the intelligence of one individual is socially conditioned and shaped solely by society; "the generative function of artificial intelligence makes the realization of its creator's intentions" [17]. Authentic intelligence encompasses rationality, irrationality, creativity, and perception. Artificial intelligence is limited by the formal logic of algorithms; it can infinitely approximate the original, authentic intelligence and can self-learn, but is incapable of the wisdom of heuristic decision-making. AI "creates" when the discoveries of geniuses are interpreted by the algorithms of formal logic.

Within the philosophical paradigm is being admitted "multiple" taking of AI and its manifests in interdisciplinary discussions: it is explained by the contradictory approaches in solving the problem. In the ontological aspect the central is understanding that artificial intelligence cannot be as a direct equivalent for the authentic intelligence. In the gnoseology aspect, AI is like an ideal, the extremely expressed value and the target for cognition. However, the contradiction between the goal reaching through the cognition and the principal impossibility of achieving it, which is the foundation of the ideal, and leads to a paradox in the social context, namely, to the need for preemptive confidence in the inevitability of the future uniting of artificial and authentic intelligence. The reason – the ideal is the primary organizing force that transforms chaotic human activity into purposefulness, and preemptive confidence in future success serves as a necessary motivation for this activity.

Comprehension of the AI phenomenon from an applied and historical perspective reveals that AI is yet another technology – and this is always a challenge, a bet on dominance and the expectation of a miracle. All the characteristics of technology are inherent in AI. But if before technologies primarily replaced human physical properties, but AI is leading to the substitution of the brain's cognitive functions. Understanding given situation, we emphasize that the essence of society is the subject-to-subject relationship, and AI, as a technology, is always only an object. This is a philosophical line of measure, and going out it truly threatens society with enslavement by AI technology. But the artificial can only be defeated by lifting the status of the genuine. Therefore, subject-object relationships must be met with a strengthening

of subject-subject relationships. The conclusion is quite grotesque, AI should also be treated as a subject. But this only means what always need: to bring “communication” with AI to the stage of communication with its creators; to demand comprehensive information from AI program developers – they must remove all the “limits in explainability” and to open up the mysterious “black boxes” of algorithms [13]. This will make computer technologies “transparent”, separate them from human experience, and allow for philosophical understanding of the essence of AI through its various manifestations. Then, in the minds of the general public, artificial intelligence will become “artificial intelligence” and not the cause for the eschatological horror.

Implementation of Methodological Requirements- Possibilities and Prospects.

This article’s framework allows us to demonstrate philosophy’s epistemological and methodological capability for avoiding cognitive deadlocks in research of AI activity using examples of a brief analysis: 1) the contradiction principle 2) the category of freedom; 3) the categories of “content-form”. Clarify that the principles, categories, and concepts of the philosophical paradigm act as regulators of scientific cognition not directly, but indirectly – they are directed not at the object of knowledge, but at knowledge about it.

1. The contradiction in interdisciplinary AI research is often taken as an obstacle to gaining the truth. But philosophy directs research toward a different understanding of contradiction: the profound inconsistency of reality is rightful. Guided by Hegel’s famous assertion that being has itself as repelling from itself, “to see that thought... must fall into contradiction – the negative of itself – will form one of the main lessons of logic” [4]. That’s why, up from moment we begin to see a contradiction in the object of thinking, we have a chance to touch the genuine knowledge. It is needed tracing the source of contradictions and anything what comes by their resolving. In a social aspect in goes a bit unexpected philosophical output: a definitive solution to the problem is impossible in principle; the “problem of divergent ideas” and disagreements in AI research is a natural consequence. Therefore, the search for a unity of possibilities within a common philosophical paradigm means consensus, necessarily taking into account the “balance of differences”. This is a compromise.

2. The contradictory nature of reality and cognition is extrapolated to philosophical categories. Let us analyze the specific nature of the philosophical category of “freedom”. The internal interdependence of freedom and responsibility makes freedom inherently contradictory, and this contradiction is constantly extrapolated: “The description of any human action includes a contradiction between elements: freedom and determinism, subjectivity and objectiveness, intention and result” [18, p. 69]. At the same time, the fluidity of content allows the average person to transform responsibility into partial, and sometimes even admit its complete absence – even in free action. Why? Because “a person is responsible only for what they knew before the action, at the stage of intention, design” [ibid.]. A person cannot be held responsible for external determination in space and time. This position provides occasion for the absolutization of freedom and its transformation into arbitrariness. To achieve this, in any action, it is sufficient to declare the priority of determination by external necessity beyond the line of measure. All of the above is directly relevant to the field of AI. The constant attempts to evade responsibility by those involved in absolutizing the negative manifestations of AI already require oversight at the political, ethical, and legal levels. It is also very difficult to hope for the effectiveness of social science and humanities methods in studying AI manifestations without taking this methodological requirement into account.

3. Let’s consider the specifics of the “form-content” categories in the sphere of AI research. Philosophy asserts that the correspondence of form to content naturally includes ambiguity. Ambiguity means diversity, and the diversity admits for controversies and contradictions. With a vertical methodological guideline “ambiguous” content leads to the optimization of social life, and without the guideline - it leads to a crossing the measure line and

a distortion of the content by form. Today, we see that the diversity in researches of various AI manifestations leads to a chaos of “horizontal” disagreements and contradictions out of the orienteer on the outcome optimization of its implementation. Over attention to sensory arguments, and the absence of adequate ethical and linguistic terms shifts the emphasis toward the negative AI manifestations gradually, what leads logically to feel of confusion and eschatological fear in the public consciousness. And the “defense” is switched on – links to the content of such publications are gradually decreasing.

However, the need for argumentation of such positions is intensified by the rapid inputting of AI into all spheres of social life. And there is happened the replacing arguments of the content by the “arguments” of the form – by the terminology of everyday vocabulary, by the AI anthropomorphization, and by the emotional shock value of the mass media. Such a form is absolutized by the “cunning of mind” and transformed into a powerful ontological weapon that affects cultural codes and personal interests but not thinking. The result is only one: the complete enslavement of man by artificial intelligence will seem inevitable – nothing can be changed, because freedom of choice has ended. Existential fear can completely transform into eschatological horror. People of common sense can only have a hope for a positive outcome if his thinking style shifts to a more primitive one – then people might accept “a cargo cult explanation” as truth [2]. Thus, ignoring the philosophical- and methodological requirements of the “form-content” categories reduces the effectiveness of the interaction between philosophy and the social sciences and humanities in the study of AI manifestations in both epistemology and the social sphere.

It is significant to sound, that in the social sphere the implementation of philosophical requirements for researching any of AI demonstrations bumps on a problem, what could undermine all efforts. That's the dichotomy of common sense. Because of this feature, “no matter how knowledgeable and intelligent they are, it is impossible for mortal beings to fully understand the true meaning of causality and its universal principles” [10, p. 287]. Mr. Heidegger M. pointed this out bitterly: “Sound” common sense. It harps on the demand for palpable utility and inveighs against knowledge of the essence of beings, which essential knowledge has long been called “philosophy” [19, p. 1].

The dichotomy of common sense is expressed: 1) in the perception absolutization of the obvious, in the formation of simplified schemes of thinking, simple solutions, ethnomarked concepts; 2) in the permanent exchange “subject-subject” relations onto “subject-object” relations. A person would like to talk to a reflection of himself in a mirror, and AI technology gives an illusion about a perfect mirror. But at long distances, this is the way to technologization of the very person – actually he gives off the AI his freedom of will, not realizing that the situation changes on the sly to the opposite one – the AI becomes as a subject in deed, and the person becomes as an object of the will of AI. This is a direct path for society to the self-destruction.

These positions are as a given. That's why for philosophy and the social and human sciences has been raised a task to make a “transitional stage”, where it is possible to build in cooperation a hierarchy of an attention on the final target (the direct interaction between humans and reality in space and time), this given is taken into account.

Aristotle has pointed to the main way to prevent society self-annihilation – “ethos-logos-pathos”. Ethics is not “over permeated” by the causality, but in case a collectivity has no general ethic, than the strategic danger is arise due to: 1) the losing integrity of thought; 2) the voluntary consensus impossibility in the community. And stability of ethos, as a moral element for argumentation, is capable to fix errors of pathos as the transient moral status.

Applying to AI issues, that means: there is no value-neutral AI, it is an illusion. Logic relations of persons with AI are always in the context of ethos: every AI expression is as a projection of the ethos of its initiator and creator. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen the

“subject-to-subject” relationship in ethics as part of axiology. In a broad sense, this role is played by culture. But culture itself acts as a technology where the demands of all social and human sciences are “concentrated”, and ethics often plays an insignificant role there. Without a cardinal strengthening of the role of ethics in the value system, culture will stay just a technology, a cultural form, but it produces no real effect. More in-depth research is needed to develop ways to prevent the society self-destruction using AI “efforts”. Let us note the importance of inclusion an importance of including the importance of including feeling -and emotional components in abstract, philosophical discusses. Improving ideas of the theory of social- and emotional intelligence by P. Salovey and D. Mayer [20], [21], [22], the theory of convergent and divergent thinking by D. Guilford, representatives of the social sciences and humanitarian can apply them in transmission of philosophical abstractions onto a more concrete, emotional colored level which close to mass mind is.

Conclusion.

The philosophical methodology since the time of Socrates has had as its final goal the people well-being from “squares and markets”. However, the intensive, and total injection of AI requires to make sharply relevant all efforts to an object-make, and make available all abstract philosophical ideas for acceptance and implementation in everyday life. This task realization is theoretical possible only indirectly – through the formation of a “transitional stage”, where the concentration of combined efforts of philosophy and the social sciences and humanitarian can increase dramatically the effectiveness of patterns and behavioral models in pedagogy, social engineering.

But today, the cycle of horizontal disagreements in AI research is already capable of driving humanity to an eschatological state. It is time to determine unambiguously a philosophical orienteer of research and its main principle – complete identity between artificial and authentic intelligence is nonsense. This will allow us to define the direction of analysis of ambivalent AI manifestations “in harmony with reality” within the simplified frameworks of common sense.

While a comprehensive analysis of the above-mentioned issues runs out of the scope of this article, we hope that the expressed points we have made would be included in a broader discussion.

References:

1. Marchenko, S. (2026). Artificial intelligence is going beyond human understanding: experts are spotting disturbing anomalies. *Today.ua*. Retrieved from www.today.ua/490201-shtuchnij-intelekt-vihodit-za-mezhi-lyudskogo-rozuminnya-eksperti-fiksuyut-trivozhni-anomaliyi/
2. Kambhampati, S., Stetchly, K., Valmikam, K. et al. (2025). Stop Anthropomorphizing Intermediate Tokens as Reasoning/Thinking Traces! *ANDSchool of Computing & AI*. Retrieved from: [in English]. <https://arxiv.org/html/2504.09762v2>
3. Onyshchenko, O. (2025). What way does artificial intelligence function and why it only pretends to understand us. *ZN.UA*. Retrieved from <https://zn.ua/ukr/TECHNOLOGIES/jak-pratsjuje-shtuchnij-intelekt-i-chomu-vin-lishe-vidaje-shcho-nas-rozumije.html> [in Ukrainian].
4. Hegel, H. (1830). *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. Part One*. Retrieved from www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/sl/slintro.htm [in English].
5. Stasiulis, N. (2025). Heideggerian Notes on Education: Learning and Being-in-the-world. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 36. (1), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2025.36.1.5>
6. Rey, G. (2020). *Philosophy of mind*. Retrieved from www.britannica.com/topic/philosophy-of-mind [in English].

7. Černý, M. (2025). The Myth of Rationality and the Dualistic Concept of Knowledge on the Example of the Formation of the Concept of Information Literacy. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 36. (1), 5–13. <https://www.doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2025.36.1.1> [in English].
8. Meier, G., Voet, P., Yan, T. (2024). ReseaRch ethics in a multilingual woRld: a guide to Reflecting on language decisions in all disciplines. *Diametros*. 80, 38–58. Retrieved from <https://www.10.33392/diam.1926> [in English].
9. Patalauskaitė, E. (2024). Ethical Aspects of Content Creation. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 35. (3), 369–377. <https://www.doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2024.35.3.14> [in English].
10. Xie, S. 2024. The Meaning of Causality and the Premise and Root of Its Existence. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 35. (3), 281–289. www.doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2024.35.3.5 [in English].
11. Baranov, O. (2018). The Internet of Things (IoT): Tuning of Services by Bots with Artificial Intelligence. *Information and Law*, 4 (27), 46–70. [www.doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2018.4\(27\).270610](http://www.doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2018.4(27).270610) [in Ukrainian].
12. Stovpets, O. (2024). Philosophic-anthropological aspects of the development of artificial intelligence: a view from 2024. *Interdisciplinary Studies of Complex Systems*. 24, 57–77. www.doi.org/10.31392/iscs.2024.24.057 [in Ukrainian].
13. Murphy, J., Largacha-Martinez, C. (2024). Black Boxes that Curtail Human Flourishing are no Longer Available for Use in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Design. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 35. (1), 5–13. www.doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2024.35.1.2 [in English].
14. Aberdein, A. (2019). Courageous Arguments and Deep Disagreements. *Topoi*. 40, 1205–1212. Retrieved from www.link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11245-019-09679-w
15. D'Agostini, F. (2019). Misunderstandings About Truth. *Church, Communication and Culture* 4. (3), 266–286. www.doi.org/10.1080/23753234.2019.1667252 [in English].
16. Smith, P., Lynch, M. (2020). Varieties of Deep Epistemic Disagreement. *Topoi*. 40, 971–982. www.doi.org/10.1007/s11245-020-09694-2 [in English].
17. Stezhko, Yu. (2025). The topic of artificial intelligence in modern journalistic discourse *Materials of the XVII International Scientific and Technical Conference "AVIA-2025"*. K.: KAI, 34/1-34/5. Retrieved from www.avia.nau.edu.ua/avia2025/info/AVIA_2025.pdf [in Ukrainian].
18. Stezhko, Z., Stezhko, Yu. (2018). Contradiction of Freedom and Paradoxes of Responsibility (Anthropological Analysis). *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research* 13, 65–78. Retrieved from www.ampr.ust.edu.ua/article/view/131937 [in English].
19. Heidegger, M. (1961). On the Essence of Truth. Retrieved from www.aphelis.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Martin-Heidegger-On-the-Essence-of-Truth.pdf [in English].
20. Pilani, M., Ikechukwu, K., Omenukwa, P. (2024). Philosophy of Emotional Intelligence in the Light of 1 Kings (12:1-19): The Intersection of Philosophy, Psychology and Scripture. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*. 45 (3), 3045–3057. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/publication/383432977_Philosophy_of_Emotional_Intelligence_in_the_Light_of_1_Kings_12-19_The_Intersection_of_Philosophy_Psychology_and_Scripture [in English].
21. Sfetcu, N. (2023). Philosophy of Emotional Intelligence. *Cunoașterea Științifică*, 2 (4), 106–113. <https://www.doi.org/10.58679/CS26889> [in English].
22. Basyuk, N. (2024). Philosophical context of the idea of emotial intelligence in the views of ancient thinkers. *Education. Innovation. Practice*. 12 (1), 25–31. <https://www.doi.org/10.31110/2616-650X-vol12i1-004> [in Ukrainian].

Література:

1. Марченко С. Штучний інтелект виходить за межі людського розуміння: експерти фіксують тривожні аномалії. *Today.ua*. 2026. URL: <https://today.ua/490201->

shtuchnij-intelekt-vihodit-za-mezhi-lyudskogo-rozuminnya-eksperti-fiksuyut-trivozhni-anomaliyi/

2. Kambhampati S., Stetchly K., Valmikam K. et al. Stop Anthropomorphizing Intermediate Tokens as Reasoning/Thinking Traces! 2025. *ANDSchool of Computing & AI*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/html/2504.09762v2>

3. Онищенко О. Як працює штучний інтелект і чому він лише вдає, що нас розуміє. *ZN.UA*. 2025 URL: <https://zn.ua/ukr/TECHNOLOGIES/jak-pratsjuje-shtuchnij-intelekt-i-chomu-vin-lishe-vdaje-shcho-nas-rozumije.html>

4. Hegel H. Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. Part One. 1830. URL: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/sl/slintro.htm>

5. Stasiulis N. Heideggerian Notes on Education: Learning and Being-in-the-world. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 2025. 36. (1). P. 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2025.36.1.5>

6. Rey G. Philosophy of mind. 2020. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophy-of-mind>

7. Černý M. The Myth of Rationality and the Dualistic Concept of Knowledge on the Example of the Formation of the Concept of Information Literacy. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 2025. 36. (1). P. 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2025.36.1.1>

8. Meier G., Voet P., Yan T. ReseaRch ethics in a multilingual woRld: a guide to Reflecting on language decisions in all disciplines. *Diametros*. 2024. 80 P. 38–58. URL: <https://10.33392/diam.1926>

9. Patalauskaitė E. 2024. Ethical Aspects of Content Creation. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 2024. 35. (3). P. 369–377. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2024.35.3.14>

10. Xie S. The Meaning of Causality and the Premise and Root of Its Existence. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 2024. 35. (3). P. 281–289. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2024.35.3.5>

11. Баранов О.А. Інтернет речей (IoT): регулювання надання послуг роботами зі штучним інтелектом. *Інформація і право*. 2018. 4. С. 46–70. [https://doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2018.4\(27\).270610](https://doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2018.4(27).270610)

12. Стовпець О. Філософсько-антропологічні аспекти розвитку штучного інтелекту: погляд із 2024 року. *Міждисциплінарні дослідження складних систем*. 2024. 24. С. 57–77. <https://doi.org/10.31392/iscs.2024.24.057>

13. Murphy J., Largacha-Martinez C. Black Boxes that Curtail Human Flourishing are no Longer Available for Use in Artificial Intelligence (AI). 2024. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 35. (1). P. 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2024.35.1.2>

14. Aberdein A. Courageous Arguments and Deep Disagreements. *Topoi*. 2019. 40. P. 205–212. URL: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11245-019-09679-w>

15. D'Agostini F. Misunderstandings About Truth, Church. *Communication and Culture*. 2019. 4 (3). P. 266–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23753234.2019.1667252>

16. Smith P., Lynch M. Varieties of Deep Epistemic Disagreement. *Topoi*. 2020. 40. P. 971–982. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-020-09694-2>

17. Стежко Ю.Г. Тема штучного інтелекту у сучасному публіцистичному дискурсі. *Матеріали XVII міжнародної науково-технічної конференції "ABIA-2025"*. К.: KAI. 2025. С. 34/1-34/6. URL: https://avia.nau.edu.ua/avia2025/info/AVIA_2025.pdf

18. Stezhko Z., Stezhko Yu. Contradiction of Freedom and Paradoxes of Responsibility (Anthropological Analysis). *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2018. 13. P. 65–78. <https://ampr.ust.edu.ua/article/view/131937>

19. Heidegger M. On the Essence of Truth. 1961. URL: <https://aphelis.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Martin-Heidegger-On-the-Essence-of-Truth.pdf>

20. Pilani M., Ikechukwu K., Omenukwa P. Philosophy of Emotional Intelligence in the Light of 1 Kings (12:1-19): The Intersection of Philosophy, Psychology and Scripture. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*. 2024. 45 (3). P. 3045-3057. URL:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383432977_Philosophy_of_Emotional_Intelligence_in_the_Light_of_1_Kings_121-19_The_Intersection_of_Philosophy_Psychology_and_Scripture

21. Sfetcu N. Philosophy of Emotional Intelligence. *Cunoașterea Științifică*. 2023. 2 (4). P. 106-113. <https://doi.org/10.58679/CS26889>

22. Басюк Н. Філософський контекст ідеї емоційного інтелекту... *Освіта. Інноватика. Практика*. 2024. 12(1). С. 25–31. <https://doi.org/10.31110/2616-650X-vol12i1-004>