

EWA BIELSKA

University of Silesia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6335-3650>

EPISTEMIC AUTHORITY AND THE POST-TRUTH PHENOMENON – ANALYSIS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RISK AND CULTURAL TRAUMA THEORIES *

Introduction: The study examines authority within the ‘post-truth’ era and today’s climate of permanent risk. The focus is on the epistemic perspective of identifying authority as a source or entity that reproduces content to which the recipient attributes reliability and credibility. The study used the method of analyzing source texts as well as the content of social diagnoses.

Research Aim: The study applies cultural and national trauma theories to examine how public discourse categorizes risky events and justifies specific risk management strategies.

Evidence-based Facts: Referring to Neal’s theory of national trauma, it was assumed that widespread exposure to risk factors and crises intensifies the need to identify authorities. In turn, referring to Alexander’s theory of cultural trauma, the importance of representatives of carrier groups in creating a discourse that describes and explains an event and defines the collective identity of its participants was pointed out. High dynamics of discourse creation in late modern society, ease of giving it public status, and deficit in recipients’ competences related to critical evaluation of information sources and reliability of content, foster dissemination of post-truth content. This phenomenon is reinforced in a situation of weakened public trust in key institutions.

Summary: From the perspective of cultural trauma theory, it is crucial to assign epistemic authority to representatives of various carrier groups. Transmitted discourses compete for social recognition and for granting authority to those who create them.

Keywords: authority, risk, cultural trauma, post-truth, disinformation

* Suggested citation: Bielska, E. (2026). Epistemic Authority and the Post-Truth Phenomenon – Analysis in the Context of the Risk and Cultural Trauma Theories. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 45(3), 7–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2026.45.3.7-20>

INTRODUCTION

The category of authority is interdisciplinary in nature and is the subject of interest in education, sociology, political science, psychology, and anthropology. Studies conducted within individual disciplines indicate the multifaceted and diverse understanding of this concept (through references to power, social esteem, socially valued personal characteristics, as well as trust, reliability, and credibility), while also emphasizing its contextual nature and conditioning by cultural, social, and political factors. Authority is also systemically embedded and may therefore be analyzed in stratificational, relational, and normative contexts. The analyses presented in this paper focus on the status of authority in the context of the post-truth phenomenon understood as the effect of processes that occur in the following contexts: (1) the information society, characterized by overproduction of discourses, potential status simulation and easy access to means of transmission; (2) the erosion of social trust in institutions and in representatives of expert roles; (3) a society marked by significant dynamics of change and by phenomena that involve risk and crisis; (4) a deficit in competences related to critical assessment of discourse sources (identity and intentions of the sender). In addition, the problem was referred to the context of a risk society, collective experiences of crisis, and social and cultural trauma.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND AIM

The research problem we analyze here focuses on the perspectives of applying risk theories as well as national and cultural trauma theories in studies on epistemic authority. It also considers the phenomenon of post-truth. The goal is to identify elements of epistemic authority and trauma theories applicable to the study of group discourses. Specifically, this study examines how these groups describe risky events and their preferred management strategies.

METHODOLOGY

The study analyzed source texts on the interdisciplinary understanding of authority – specifically cultural trauma (Alexander, 2004) and national trauma (Neal, 2017). It also analyzed social diagnoses to identify risk factors for collective and individual well-being across various populations.

EVIDENCE-BASED FACTS

The Socio-Cultural Nature of Authority

The concept of authority is characterized by vagueness and ambiguity (Tuziak, 2010). In the social sciences, it is understood as an attribute of power. Therefore, its indicators include decision-making and the right to issue orders and instructions to subordinate entities. Authority is also understood by reference to pragmatic criteria, namely efficiency and effectiveness of action. From this perspective, trust in the task-related reliability and credibility of an individual or institution becomes crucial. From the psycho-social perspective, authority is identified with trust, respect, recognition of moral values, effectiveness of action, as well as such traits as diligence, seriousness, personal dignity, friendliness, and kindness.

De Tchorzewski (2018) characterizes authority as an (individual or collective) entity endowed with social prestige, respect, trust, seriousness, and social influence. Bocheński (1993) distinguishes two criteria for determining authority: epistemic (related to an individual's knowledge) and deontic (related to power). Epistemic authority is of key importance for this analysis. One of the areas of activity associated with it is expertise based on the criterion of professionalism, which is expressed through knowledge and competence and is a derivative of the completion of an appropriate stage of education and specific socialization that accompanies or follows it. The social role of the expert involves identifying a problem, naming it, presenting its characteristics, and determining a strategy for resolving the situation associated with it (Stefanovic, 2021).

One of the factors that determine the social status of authority is the social legitimation granted to it (Haugaard, 2017). According to Weber's theory (2002), its foundations can be located in three domains: legal, traditional, and charismatic. Haugaard (2017) identifies two epistemic foundations of legitimation: (1) based on locally recognized matrices, functioning in the structure of imaginaries and intuitively perceived meanings, and (2) based on a normatively defined social role described in political theory and on the legal status of power.

Haugaard (2017) emphasizes the relational nature of authority. When authority is understood in this way, studies of the phenomenon consider the characteristics of both categories of participants in a social relationship (the individual who has been granted the status of authority and the individual who recognizes it). Tuziak (2010) stresses that in relational terms, the individual who identifies with an authority recognizes the values expressed by this authority and treats authority with respect and trust. From this perspective, authority is a social fact that plays integrating, controlling, and motivating functions. It is an element of social consciousness and its status is a derivative of social recognition of the highly valued attributes of an individual or institution. In such a situation, the superiority of authority results from the individual's voluntary consent and recognition of the position, and is not the effect of the formal status characteristic of power.

Post-truth – Characteristics of the Term

The term *post-truth* was first used in journalistic discourse (Pawłowski, 2017). Tesich (1992) used it in reference to an analysis of the conditions that underlie repeated cases of tolerance toward false narratives, created and disseminated by state authorities. Currently, the term is used in analyses of discourses created in the political sphere as well as those related to authorities located in other (non-political) areas of public space and in the media. Farkas and Schousboe (2024) as well as Mohammed et al. (2024) point to concepts considered synonymous with this term. They list them as empty buzzwords, fake news, disinformation, gaslighting, anti-intellectualism, and counter-discourse. Wardle and Derakshan (2018) identify three types of false content that differ in terms of intentionality: misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation. Misinformation contains false content, but the person transmitting it is unaware of it and considers it to be true. In the case of disinformation, the content created or reproduced is false and the person who produces or disseminates it is aware of this fact. The aim of such action is to mislead the recipient. Malinformation, in turn, consists of true content, but its reproduction, highlighting certain elements while suppressing others, is part of an intentional strategy aimed at causing harm to the individual or group concerned.

Drawing on the Oxford Dictionary, Glăveanu (2017) states that post-truth is a term that describes a political and social context in which objective characteristics of events shape public opinion to a lesser extent than the emotions and personal beliefs of those transmitting the content. Valladares (2021) defines post-truth as widespread distribution of false content (using the term misinformation), accompanied by denial of the reliability of scientific knowledge. Michelsen and Tallis (2018) argue that tolerance of false content in the public sphere is a result of a long-term process of devaluating truth in political discourse. Furthermore, post-truth is seen as a consequence of the weakening of the norm of responsibility for one's words. These researchers define post-truth as erosion of the social perception of truth in terms of content whose truthfulness/falsehood is technically verifiable. The researchers also highlight the risks that the spread of post-truth poses to the condition of civil society.

According to Glăveanu (2017), the rise of post-truth stems from a declining belief in objective reality. In this environment, the internet transforms alternative narratives from mere opinions into content that claims to describe reality objectively. Koronska (2023) points to the concept of post-truth spaces, namely websites, social media, messaging applications, and online channels that do not control reliability of published (created or reproduced) content, or that intentionally misinform the recipient. The author and her research team indicate the use of methods for recognizing online spaces where post-truth content is distributed. The identification method includes verification of the status of the content author,

verification of the status of open-source intelligence (OSINT), and analysis of the location of the content source (uniform resource locator).

Authority in the Context of the Risk Society, Crisis, and Cultural Trauma

Since the 1980s, it has become common in the social sciences to describe the world in terms of risk and the ambivalence, contingency, and unpredictability of events characteristic of this phenomenon (Beck, 2002; Nygren et al., 2020). Risk is understood as a potential event, which results in harm to human well-being or values considered important (Lyng, 2008). Colman (2009) notes that in risk situations, individuals are unable to predict the outcomes of their own actions; they can only estimate the probability of the occurrence of the particular categories of outcome. It can be assumed that under conditions of collective experiences of risk and the uncertainty characteristic of them, there is an increased need to identify authorities that are a source of discourse conducive to gaining a sense of control. Tuziak (2010), for instance, emphasizes that the social need for authority increases when people experience events that are perceived and experienced as groundbreaking and potentially leading to social crises.

Among those groundbreaking events Neal (2005) includes the phenomena that he terms national trauma. According to Neal, trauma is a reaction to an event that disrupts social order, dividing social history into that which took place before and after the event. Events with such effects create a context in which there is an increased need for access to narratives that explain the causes and consequences of exposure to a risk factor, strategies for coping with it, constructing strategies for action after exposure, and determining the status of perpetrators and those harmed by the event. However, the content of the event may vary in terms of reliability, and its inconsistency with the factual reality may be either intentional disinformation or unintentional reproduction or creation by entities that are not professionals in the field of knowledge in question.

According to Alexander (2024), cultural trauma is the context that creates the need to create, transmit, and reproduce discourses that explain events. For Alexander, this is an event through which a social group acquires a sense of participation in horrendous events, leaving indelible consequences for the consciousness of its members, permanently marking their collective memory and fundamentally and irreversibly transforming their collective identity. In describing the process of constructing cultural trauma, Alexander points to the importance of carrier groups, whose representatives create and disseminate content concerning the nature and structure of the event, the status of the victims, the figure and status of the perpetrators, and the expected social consequences (compensation for the victims, commemorative practices). Representatives of carrier groups may include professionals involved in politics, economics, and education, as well as socially engaged, charismatic individuals and groups who are not professionals in areas related to

the specific nature of the event. Individual discourses can also function as tools of competition for social influence.

Beck (2005) points to the erosion of legitimation attributed to the structures of the nation state and democracy characteristic of modernity in the society of second modernity (characterized by the intensification of globalization processes and the amorphous nature of power) as well as the erosion of trust in manufacturing corporations, treated as entities characteristic of ostentatious consumer society. According to Beck, legitimation is instead acquired by counter-power movements (both local and global). They introduce into the discursive space interpretations alternative to those transmitted by state entities and corporations concerning actions (e.g., referring to their declared compliance with the rules of democracy and human rights) and products (referring to data allowing for the assessment of their effectiveness and the associated safety/risk). As Beck points out, these entities base their actions on three strategies: dramatization of risk, democratization, and cosmopolitanization. These strategies are essential in recognizing discrepancies between declarations of state institutions or corporations regarding the safety or effectiveness of their practices or the characteristics of their products. However, at the same time, these entities are also susceptible to the use of post-truth strategies in their activities.

In turn, Rorty (2009) emphasizes the social and contingent nature of discourses and legitimation accorded to them. They are accompanied by an ironic attitude, expressed in doubts about meanings, awareness of their relative nature, and the temporariness of current beliefs based on meanings. The attitude of irony assumes equivalence of the status of beliefs recognized within one's own group and in other social structures. Rorty (2009) points to common sense as the opposite of irony.

Environmental pollution, health-related issues, migration, and the risk of macro-social armed conflicts are all issues identified in recent decades as elements of experienced risk and social crises. All of them are discussed in public discourse, both through reliable expert content and through post-truth discourses based on disinformation, conspiracy theories, and risk-denial discourses. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2003) uses the term "infodemic" to describe the increased dynamics of information which appears in the public sphere in the event of a disease threat. Such information consists of reliable and false content, which is reproduced and transmitted to subsequent recipients. The result is a sense of confusion among those exposed to the content and behaviors that increase their exposure to risk factors. This situation also creates the risk of undermining the authority of professionals in the fields of healthcare and health policy.

The Status of Authority and the Matter of Collective Concerns (Exemplifications Based on the Results of Social Diagnoses)

From the empirical perspective, it is significant how representatives of particular social categories identify authority in specific social, political, and cultural con-

texts. In 2022, Jagielska (2023) conducted a study on a sample of young adults, mostly from large and medium-sized cities. Respondents defined authority as someone worthy of emulation, a moral role model, a benchmark for values and behavior, a person who impresses and inspires, motivates self-development, is worthy of respect, identifies with values and is guided by them, a person with desirable qualities and achievements, knowledgeable and competent, wise and experienced, trustworthy, charismatic, possessing life wisdom and common sense, a source of security, guided by principles, and supportive. In turn, qualitative research conducted in 2024 by CBOS (2025) on a sample of adult women (aged 20-30 and 40-50) from Katowice, Warsaw, and Ropczyce indicated that respondents identified public figures as role models – sports and film stars, as well as individuals active on social media, podcast hosts, and bloggers (the respondents indicated psychologists, sexologists, and therapists). They associated these figures with motivation, effectiveness in achieving goals, emancipation, and breaking gender role stereotypes. Young women (aged 20-30) indicated the Internet as their primary source of inspiration, specifically figures that present content on Instagram and YouTube.

From the perspective of identifying authorities, trust in representatives of expert professions is essential. A diagnosis conducted by IPSOS (2022) indicated that according to respondents from Poland (the questionnaire item was phrased: “In general, do you think each is trustworthy or untrustworthy in your country?”), the greatest trust was placed in scientists (48% of respondents) and doctors (39%). However, at the same time, these were the lowest values compared to those indicated by respondents from other countries (on average, 59% of respondents declared trust in doctors and 57% in scientists). Trust in teachers was declared by an average of 52% of respondents globally, while in Poland it was 34%. Considering the global context, trust in expert groups (scientists, doctors, and teachers) was relatively low in Poland. In the diagnosis, lower trust in scientists was indicated by respondents from South Africa and Japan, in teachers by respondents from South Korea and Japan, while trust in doctors was lowest among Polish respondents.

Presenting results of surveys conducted in 68 countries on a sample of 71,992 respondents, Cologna et al. (2025) pointed to relatively high levels of trust in science and scientists. The researchers treated trust in representatives of this group as one of the indicators of epistemic authority and operationalized it by referring to four components: perceived competence, kindness, honesty, and openness. 75% of respondents declared that the scientific method was the best means of verifying content as true or false, 78% expressed their belief in high competence of scientists to conduct research, and 56% stated that most scientists cared about human well-being. Egypt and India ranked highest on the scale of declared trust in science and scientists, while Kazakhstan and Albania ranked lowest. Respondents from Poland achieved an average trust score (3.51 on a scale ranging from 1 – very low trust, to 5 – very high trust).

From the perspective of the present analysis, it is important to identify the matter of concern experienced by representatives of Western societies over the last decade. Such research corresponds to studies of perceived risk. An example of such exploration is a survey conducted by researchers from Chapman University. The results of a 2024 study on Americans' fears indicated that at the time of the study respondents were mostly concerned about government corruption (65.2%), serious illness of loved ones (58.4%), cyberterrorism (58.3%), death of a loved one (57.8%), Russia's use of nuclear weapons (55.8%), insufficient financial resources to meet future needs (55.7%), US involvement in a world war (55%), North Korea's use of nuclear weapons (55%), terrorist attacks (52.7%), and attacks using biological weapons (52.5%; see Chapman Survey of American Fears 2024). In turn, results of a survey conducted in 2022 by UCE Research (2023) indicated that the Poles who participated in it declared the greatest fears related to illness of their loved ones (40%), rising cost of food and other consumer goods (33.9%), rising electricity and heating prices (33.9%), deterioration of their own health (33.7%), decline in the quality of life (32.4%), and war in Poland (27.1%).

In turn, a diagnosis conducted in 2025 as part of the Eurobarometer indicated that 68% of the respondents expressed the opinion that the European Union should play a greater role in protecting Europeans from the consequences of global crises and risks resulting from various threats in the future. When asked to indicate the issues that should be treated as priorities by the European Parliament, respondents most often indicated inflation, rising prices and living costs (41%) compared to 39% in Poland, and defense and security (34%; 42% in Poland), which was the most important issue in the declarations of Poles. Respondents indicated combating poverty and social exclusion (31%) and supporting the economy and job creation (30%), which was the third most frequently mentioned by Polish respondents (25%), with the same number of participants choosing the need to increase support for public healthcare. When indicating the values that should be treated as priorities by the European Parliament, respondents most frequently indicated peace (46%), which ranked first among respondents from all countries except for Sweden, followed by democracy (33%), which Swedish respondents ranked first (European Commission, 2025).

Based on the Eurobarometer data, the affective structure in Europe can be described as marked by pessimism. 52% of respondents expressed the opinion that things in their country were heading in the wrong direction. This view was most prevalent in France (71%), Greece (69%), Cyprus (62%), and Finland (62%). On the other hand, the greatest optimism, expressed by the belief that things in the country were heading in the right direction, was found in Luxembourg (64%), Poland (63%), and Ireland (62%; see European Commission, 2025, pp. 106-108). Only 15% of respondents expressed hope that their standard of living would improve over the next five years, 27% declared their belief that their standard of living would deteri-

orate during this period, and 55% stated that it would remain unchanged. The most pessimistic expectations for the future were expressed by respondents from France (46% declared concern about a deterioration in their standard of living), Belgium (40%), Austria (37%), and Germany (37%; European Commission, 2025).

One of the areas of experienced risk concerns health-related issues. Ashkenazi et al. (2020) identified factors that correlated with parental attitudes toward childhood vaccination. As representatives of medical disciplines, they indicated that one of the risk factors between 2000 and 2020 was the increasing incidence of measles infections, with the majority of cases occurring among unvaccinated children or children under 4 years of age vaccinated with only a single dose. In 2019, WHO experts identified vaccine hesitancy as one of the main threats to public health. Research presented by Ashkenazi et al. (2020) indicated a correlation between the sources of information used by respondents to develop knowledge about health issues and parental attitudes toward vaccinating their own children. The research was conducted in Israel on a sample of 399 people. 77% vaccinated their children with two doses, 32% vaccinated incompletely (one dose), and 15% did not vaccinate their children against measles at all. Respondents indicated that doctors (pediatricians and family doctors – 50%), well-baby centers (30%), the Internet and social media (9% and 3%, respectively), religious leaders (4%), and individuals who had contracted measles (5%) were the most valued sources of knowledge about the specifics of the disease and vaccinations that protect against it.

Respondents who relied mainly on knowledge provided by doctors and medical staff working in public well-baby centers achieved the highest scores on questions assessing accurate knowledge. Lower scores were obtained by those drawing primarily on the Internet and social media, and the lowest by those relying on information obtained from religious leaders. The indicated source of knowledge about measles vaccination was correlated significantly with parental attitudes toward vaccinating their own children. 85% of parents who relied mainly on family doctors or pediatricians and well-baby centers vaccinated their children completely (two doses), one-third of parents who declared that they had no source of knowledge did not vaccinate their children at all or vaccinated them incompletely. A similar situation was observed in 45% of parents who indicated that online content was the primary source of knowledge, and 42% for whom religious authorities were their primary source of information about measles and vaccinations. At the same time, the researchers noted that attitudes toward vaccination constituted an indicator of trust in the healthcare system, its associated institutions, and the social roles embedded within it.

Kim et al. (2021) stressed the relationship between sources of knowledge about the COVID-19 pandemic and the level of knowledge about this phenomenon. The knowledge scale ranged from 0 to 21 points. The researchers indicated that the highest scores on the COVID-19 knowledge test were obtained by individuals who reported acquiring information from official government sources, WHO

data, and traditional media, with scores ranging from 12 to 21. High scores were also achieved by individuals who identified medical professionals as their source of knowledge (scores 11-21), while lower scores were obtained by respondents who indicated the so-called new media (podcasts, websites, social media) as their source of knowledge (scores 8-21) and those who relied mainly on family members, friends, and co-workers as their primary source of knowledge (scores 9-21). The increase in COVID-19 knowledge, as expressed by test scores, was positively correlated, regardless of the information source, with declarations of engaging in preventive behaviors. Among respondents who achieved the highest knowledge scores, the declared intensity/frequency/regularity of preventive behaviors were similar, irrespective of the source of information.

The research findings stressed the importance of widely accessible new media in social prevention activities concerning risk factors. It is, therefore, crucial to select content based on competence in identifying information transmitted by reliable sources and the ability to verify content in terms of its credibility and coherence with the existing knowledge about the phenomenon, which is the key area of activity within the domain of social education.

SUMMARY

In the social sciences, authority is understood with reference to three components: (1) positioning within the decision-making structures, (2) reliability and credibility, and (3) morality. From the perspective of this analysis, particular importance is attached to the epistemic component, which relates to the reliability of content transmitted in the public sphere. This approach focuses less on objective reliability – a staple of naturalistic, neopositivist research – and more on the subjective, interpretive, social model of reality. The focus is therefore on identifying to whom representatives of particular social categories attribute the status of authority, who they trust, and whose transmitted content they perceive as reliable. In this understanding, the relational perspective in studies on authority is also significant. Its components include the entity to whom authority is attributed, the entity that designates/identifies this authority, and the social context in which the relationship takes place. Sociological theories of trauma are useful for studying how pivotal events create new collective identities and threaten social cohesion.

CONCLUSIONS

Since the 1980s, sociological research treats risk as a shared phenomenon, often focusing on group-specific fears and perceptions. Surveys indicate that respond-

ents are mainly concerned about global, macro-scale threats related to armed conflicts and economic crises, as well as micro-scale experiences expressed in the loss of essential values, such as one's own health and that of their loved ones, the loss of a loved one, and a deterioration in one's standard of living. In the social sciences, it is assumed that in situations that involve traumatic and crisis phenomena, or confrontation with difficult-to-control risk, the need to identify authoritative figures (those who create discourses which explain the phenomenon, define strategies for coping with it, and determine the status of victims and perpetrators) increases. At the same time, under conditions of widespread and egalitarian access to media that enable not only reception, but also reproduction and generation of content, and within a cultural context that accords equal status to the discourses of professionals and non-professionals, reliable explanations of phenomena occurring in the public sphere coexist with false discourses.

Research conducted in various social contexts indicates a correlation between the reliability of a source's content and the respondents' own accurate knowledge about a given risk factor. This correlation extends to their willingness to engage in preventive actions. It is therefore essential to promote such information sources socially through educational content and preventive campaigns.

Research findings indicate a relatively high level of epistemic authority attributed to representatives of expert professions. However, differences in the levels of trust attributed to them are observed from a global (international) perspective. In Poland, these levels obtained average values. Strengthening social trust in expert professionals who transmit reliable, evidence-based knowledge can be identified as an important social goal.

From the pedagogical perspective, particularly within the paradigm of social pedagogy, low trust in expert knowledge poses a risk of developing phenomena that are detrimental to the well-being of society (e.g., health-related risks). This perspective emphasizes the educational consequences of processes that occur in various educational environments, including the popularity of populist and radical discourses and practices. Therefore, it is reasonable to disseminate (within educational programs and already at the primary education stage) content aimed at developing competence in critical evaluation of information sources, critical evaluation of content, and development of attitudes of responsible content management in terms of content creation and distribution. Such skills may be regarded as civilizational competences that promote security and well-being at both individual and social levels.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J. C. (2004). Toward a theory of cultural trauma. In J. C. Alexander, R. Eyerman, B. Giesen, N. J. Smelser, & P. Sztompka (Eds.), *Cultural trauma and collective identity* (pp. 1-30). University of California Press.
- Ashkenazi, S., Livni, G., Klein, A., Kremer, N., Havlin, A., & Berkowitz, O. (2020). The relationship between parental source of information and knowledge about measles / measles vaccine and vaccine hesitancy. *Vaccine*, 38(46), 7292–7298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.09.044>
- Beck, U. (2005). *Władza i przeciwwładza w epoce globalnej*. Nowa ekonomia polityki światowej. Scholar.
- Bocheński, J. M. (1993). Co to jest autorytet? In J. Bocheński (Ed.), *Logika i filozofia* (pp. 187-324). Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Chapman University. (2024). *Chapman survey of American fears 2024: Key findings*. https://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/research-centers/babbie-center/_files/2024-csaf-key-findings-final.pdf
- Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej. (2025). *Kobiety w świecie wzorów i modeli życia (Komunikat z badań jakościowych nr 2)*. CBOS. https://www.cbos.pl/PL/publikacje/fokusy/pliki/2025/fk_002_2025.pdf
- Colman, A. M. (2009). *Słownik psychologii*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Cologna, V., Mede, N. G., Berger, S., Besley, J., Cameron, B., Joubert, M., Maibach, E. W., Mihelj, S., Oreskes, N., Schäfer, M. S., van der Linden, S., Abdul Aziz, N. I., Abdulsalam, S., Abu Shamsi, N., Aczel, B., Adinugroho, I., Alabrese, E., Aldoh, A., Alfano, M., & Zwaan, R. A. (2025). Trust in scientists and their role in society across 68 countries. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 9, 713–730. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02090-5>
- de Tchorzewski, A. (2018). Autorytet i jego struktura aksjologiczna. *Studia Paedagogica Ignatiana*, 20(5), 187–212. <https://doi.org/10.12775/SPI.2017.5.008>
- Eyerman, R. (2001). *Cultural trauma, slavery and the formation of African American identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Farkas, J., & Schousboe, S. (2024). Facts, values, and the epistemic authority of journalism: How journalists use and define the terms fake news, junk news, misinformation, and disinformation. *Nordicom Review*, 45(1), 137-157. <https://doi.org/10.2478/nor-2024-0016>
- Glăveanu, V. P. (2017). Psychology in the post-truth era. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 13(3), 375–377. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v13i3.1509>
- Haugaard, M. (2017). What is authority? *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 18(2), 104-132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X17723737>
- Ipsos. (2022). *Global trustworthiness index 2022*. <https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2022-07/Global%20trustworthiness%202022%20Report.pdf>
- Jagielska, K. (2023). Autorytet w rozumieniu przedstawicieli pokolenia Z. *Szkoła – Zawód – Praca*, 26, 183-194. <https://doi.org/10.34767/SZP.2023.02.07>

- Kim, S., Capasso, A., Cook, S. H., Ali, S. H., Jones, A. M., Foreman, J., DiClemente, R. J., & Tozan, Y. (2021). Impact of COVID-19-related knowledge on protective behaviors: The moderating role of primary sources of information. *PLoS ONE*, 16(11), Article e0260643. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260643>
- Koronska, K. (2023). *Mapping post-truth spaces concerning the war in Ukraine*. <https://www.veraai.eu/posts/mapping-post-truth-spaces-concerning-the-war-in-ukraine-dmi>
- Lyng, S. (2008). Edgework, risk and uncertainty. In J. O. Zinn (Ed.), *Social Theories of Risk and Uncertainty* (pp. 106-137). Blackwell Publishing.
- Michelsen, N., & Tallis, B. (2018). Post-truth-telling in international relations. *New Perspectives. International Journal of Central & East European Politics and International Relations*, 26(3), 7-15. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2336825X1802600301>
- Neil, A. G. (2017). *National trauma and collective memory. Extraordinary events in the American experience*. Routledge.
- Nygren, K. G., Olofsson, A., & Öhman, S. (2020). *A framework of intersectional risk theory in the age of ambivalence*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pawłowski, Ł. (2017). Przedmowa. In R. Keyes (Ed.), *Czas postprawdy. Nieszczerość i oszustwa w codziennym życiu* (pp. 9-27). Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Rorty, R. (2003). *Przygodność, ironia i solidarność*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Białskiej.
- Schutz, A. (1976). Equality and the meaning structure of the social world. In A. Brodersen, (Ed.), *Collected Papers II. Phaenomenologica*, vol 15 (pp. 226-273). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1340-6_11
- Stevanovic, M. (2021). Deontic authority and the maintenance of lay and expert identities during joint decision making: Balancing resistance and compliance. *Discourse Studies*, 23(5), 670–689.
- Tesich, S. (1992). A government of lies. *The Nation*, 6(13), 12-14.
- Tuziak, B. (2010). Autorytet jako zjawisko społeczne. Wymiar lokalny. *Studia Socjologiczne*, 2(197), 53-88.
- Valladares, L. (2022). Post-truth and education. *Science & Education*, 31, 1311–1337. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-021-00293-0>
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2018). Thinking about ‘information disorder’: formats of misinformation, disinformation, and mal-information. In C. Ireton & J. Posetti (Eds.), *Journalism, ‘fake news’ & disinformation* (pp. 43–54). UNESCO.
- Weber, M. (2002). *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo. Zarys socjologii rozumiejącej*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- World Health Organization (2023). *Infodemic*. https://www.who.int/health-topics/infodemic#tab=tab_1

AUTORYTET EPISTEMICZNY A ZJAWISKO POST-PRAWDY – ANALIZA W KONTEKSCIE TEORII RYZYKA I TRAUMY KULTUROWEJ

Wprowadzenie: Przedmiotem analizy jest status autorytetu w kontekście zjawiska post-prawdy w społeczeństwie permanentnego doświadczenia ryzyka i niepewności. Uwagę zogniskowano na epistemicznej perspektywie identyfikacji autorytetu, jako źródła bądź podmiotu odtwarzającego treści, którym odbiorca przypisuje rzetelność i wiarygodność. W podjętych studiach wykorzystano metodę analizy treści tekstów źródłowych oraz metodę analizy treści wyników diagnoz społecznych.

Cel badań: Celem analizy jest identyfikacja perspektyw wykorzystania teorii traumy narodowej i kulturowej w identyfikowaniu dyskursów opisujących ryzyko oraz optymalne strategie radzenia sobie z nim.

Stan wiedzy: Neal w teorii traumy kulturowej zakłada, że powszechna w społeczeństwie późnej nowoczesności ekspozycja na czynniki ryzyka oraz kryzysy intensyfikuje potrzebę identyfikacji autorytetów. Z kolei Alexander w teorii traumy kulturowej wskazuje na znaczenie przedstawicieli grup wiodących w procesie tworzenia reprezentacji traumy. Duża dynamika tworzenia dyskursów w społeczeństwie późnej nowoczesności oraz deficyt kompetencji odbiorców dotyczący krytycznej oceny źródeł informacji oraz rzetelności treści sprzyjają upowszechnianiu treści o charakterze post-prawdy. Zjawisko to jest wzmacniane w sytuacji osłabienia zaufania społecznego do kluczowych instytucji.

Podsumowanie: W perspektywie teorii traumy kulturowej kluczowe jest przypisywanie statusu autorytetu epistemicznego przedstawicielom różnych grup wiodących. Transmitowane dyskursy stanowią przedmiot rywalizacji o ich społeczne uznanie oraz nadanie statusu autorytetu tworzącym je.

Słowa kluczowe: autorytet, ryzyko, trauma kulturowa, post-prawda, dezinformacja