From the standpoint of the resource approach, forensic support is a set of forensic technical means, tactical techniques and methodological recommendations, as well as forensic knowledge and skills of subjects authorized to disclose, investigate and litigate criminal cases.

5. The practical component of the forensic support of the trial of criminal cases is the activity of the court in the formation and subsequent application of the complex, measures developed by the national forensics and tested by the judicial practice aimed at reducing the influence of the information uncertainty factor of the initial stage of the trial, forecasting and preventing a sudden change in the judicial situation, creating favorable conditions for organized, timely commencement and successful conduct of the court session and adoption of a lawful and reasonable decision [2].

References:

1. Myroshnychenko, Y. (2023). Main provisions of the concept of forensic support of court proceedings. *Nove Ukraïns'ke Pravo*, *4*, 185–190. https://doi.org/10.51989/nul.2023.4.24

2. Myroshnychenko, Y. (2023). Forensic support of court proceedings: ontological, methodological and praxeological aspects. *Naukovij Vìsnik Užgorods'kogo Nacìonal'nogo Unìversitetu*, *2*(79), 262–267. https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2023.79.2.40

DOI https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-432-0-33

THE ROLE OF THE PARADIGM IN THE METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCHING THE PROBLEMS OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURAL LAW

Murzanovska A. V.
PhD, Docent,
Docent of the Criminal Procedure Department,
National University "Odesa Law Academy"
Odessa, Ukraine

One of the most crucial problems of the contemporary stage of the development of the philosophical level of methodology is the problem of distinguishing, along with the empirical and theoretical levels, the

metatheoretical level of scientific knowledge. In modern philosophy such constructions are found in the methodological concepts of T. Kuhn, I. Lakatos and other philosophers. These are primarily the following concepts: "paradigm", "style of thinking", "picture of the world", "archetype of scientific thinking", "reflection" [more details: 1, p. 64–94, 135]. Paradigms have an exceptionally important active regulatory role in the methodology.

A paradigm, according to T. Kuhn [2], who introduced this term into circulation, means a disciplinary matrix, that is, what "unites the members of the scientific community, and, conversely, the scientific community consists of people who recognize the paradigm." T. Kuhn explains the term "disciplinary matrix" as follows: "...it is "disciplinary" because it takes into account the usual affiliation of research scientists to a certain discipline; "matrix" – because it is composed of ordered elements of various kinds, and each of them requires further specification. All or most of the orders from that group of orders, which I call in the primary text a paradigm, a part of a paradigm, or which have a paradigmatic character, are components of the disciplinary matrix... they will form a single whole and function as a single whole" [Ibid]. It includes "symbolic generalisations, values that have an interdisciplinary status, generally accepted in a certain scientific community, rules for solving problems, samples, models for solving problems" [Ibid]. Thus, the content of the paradigm includes a set of worldview positions, theoretical standards, value criteria, as well as research principles and methods.

Nowadays, the term "paradigm" (from Greek – example, model) is used in different meanings: as a set of beliefs, including philosophical, as well as values, methodological and other means, which unites a given scientific community, forming a special " way of seeing"; as an example of an approach to solving scientific problems.

There are quite diverse views on understanding the essence of the paradigm. For instance, the main types of legal understanding are called paradigms; basic approaches to the knowledge of legal phenomena; as paradigms sometimes perceive worldview- methodological attitudes, such as: scientism and anti-scientism, holism and particularism. However, in most cases, the mentioned options for rejecting the paradigm are not entirely correct, because the paradigms are gradually changing each other.

The concept of paradigm also has different definitions. Therefore, a paradigm is defined as: a set of philosophical, general theoretical foundations of science; a system of concepts and ideas that are

characteristic of a certain period of development of science, culture, civilization; a certain model, a model for solving certain scientific problems.

In general, we can agree that a paradigm is an integral characteristic of a particular science in a certain era. It includes: symbolic generalisations (formalised components of the theory); picture of the world (model representations, images of objects of science); generally accepted in the society of scientists methodological requirements and value orientations; examples of descriptions, explanations, and basic examples of solutions common in the scientific community. Scientists whose scientific activity is built on the basis of the same paradigms rely on the same rules and standards of scientific practice These general settings are called "prescriptive rules" or "methodological directives". Ensuring the obvious coherence of the efforts of scientists, they are prerequisites for normal science, that is, for the genesis and continuity in the tradition of one or another direction of research; specific scientific problems [1, p. 136]. A paradigm reflects the dominant ideas and beliefs of a certain scientific community regarding the subject of this science. A paradigm shift means the assimilation of a new model of thinking, which begins to be used as the main one.

Methodological rules-prescripts regulate scientific activity in a certain way, preventing (if they are correct) that science "goes astray" all the time. Consequently, for the early stages of the development of science, the following circumstance is very important: no natural history can be interpreted if there is, at least in an implicit form, an interweaving of theoretical and methodological prerequisites, principles that enable the selection, evaluation and criticism of facts [1, p. 136].

The social, cultural and intellectual trends observed in modern societies are called the comprehensive name "postmodernism" and are a new social reality, supported by freedoms, tolerance and human solidarity. For others, postmodernism is a "theoretical virus" that paralyzes progressive thinking, politics, and practice. Postmodernism can be interpreted as a "complex of intellectual maps" that serve to describe social practices and thinking at the end of the 20th century. The postmodern project dethrones institutional science in its current form, offering in exchange certain representations of human knowledge. They are devoid of methodological foundations in the traditional sense, which are associated with the term "methodology" and do not create a paradigm in the sense proposed by T. Kuhn [see: 1, p. 136–137].

The following scientific paradigms reflecting the level of modern science, in particular: interpretive and systemic, are of significant interest for the current state of scientific research.

The interpretive paradigm reflects the status of scientific validity of qualitative research. In the broadest sense, its methodology is usually defined as the study of the social world by observing individuals and groups in the natural conditions of their lives with minimal outside influence from an observer. It consists of many ontological and epistemological solutions. Constructions open up new perspectives that explain the expansion of our knowledge. Knowledge has a social character, its understanding takes shape interpretations carried out according to traditions and specific social conditions. Knowledge is as qualitative as it is quantitative. Facts, events, and especially people, are subject to change, and within this paradigm, it is important to describe their immutability and changeability. Universal, hidden elements of our deep knowledge can be discovered at the moment of encounter with the research object, and not during objective, internal observation. Deformations, arising from the analytical breakdown of facts, events and characteristics of people into separate constituent elements, can be balanced by highlighting the existing ties between them and observing them as a whole. It plays a key role in interpretation and assigning meanings play the values recognized by researchers and researched [1, p. 137].

The system paradigm has its own certain characteristics, among which the following are distinguished: scientists who think within the framework of the system paradigm, are engaged in studying the system as a whole and the relationships between this whole and its parts; cannot be reduced to any separate discipline and must be considered as a school of comprehensive, solid social science; requires a close connection in the understanding of the existing organisation of society and the historical process during which it arose; researchers working within the systems paradigm recognize that all systems have shortcomings or dysfunctions that are specific to them for details, [see: 1, p. 137–138].

At the current stage of development, the science of the criminal process [for more details 3]: as rightly emphasised in the literature, has the potential to construct a meta-theory of the criminal process, and in essence – a scientific paradigm. This paradigm should unite all existing theories of the science of the criminal process into a conceptual module of science that will create a meta-theoretical unity that will be based on special ontological and epistemological idealizations and guidelines. Such a paradigm, from the point of view of D. V. Filin, can be the accusatory-claim metatheory, the essence of which is that two theoretical models of criminal proceedings,

when the accusation is formulated in the form logical thesis and begins to "live its own life" regardless of the subject who made this accusation, and the model in which the accusation is formulated in the form of a criminal claim and exists as long as it is supported by the plaintiff is combined into a single meta-theory [4, p. 21]. And here we fully agree that such a meta-theory will make it possible to streamline scientific research, demonstrate the unproductiveness of those that do not take into account the type of criminal process that is their subject, get a multiplier (multiple) effect from research that will use the methodological potential of the accusatory-claim paradigm.

Bibliography:

1. Данильян О. Г., Дзьобань О. П. Методологія наукових досліджень : підручник. Харків : Право, 2019. 368 с. URL: https://library.nlu.edu.ua/POLN_TEXT/SENMK/OMND.pdf

2. Кун Структура наукових революцій. PORT-ROYAL, 2001. URL: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Kun_Tomas/Struktura_naukovykh_revoliutsii.pdf?PHPSESSID=5d78mgn9emra84530ml0l5oon7

3. Мурзановская А. В. Основні тенденції розвитку науки кримінального процесу в Україні в сучасних умовах. *Legal science and education in Ukraine and EU countries: a paradigm shift* : Collective monograph. Riga, Latvia : “Baltija Publishing”, 2021. 488 p. P. 285–310. URL: http://www.baltijapublishing.lv/omp/index.php/bp/catalog/book/159

4. Кримінальний процес : підручник [О. В. Капліна, О. Г. Шило, В. М. Трофименко та ін.] ; за заг. ред. О. В. Капліної, О. Г. Шило. Харків : Право, 2018. 584 с.