

**PARADIGMS OF GAMES AND PLAYFULNESS
THROUGH THE PRISM OF SERGEY KRAVCHENKO'S
SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION**

UDC 316.7

Ljubiša Mitrović

Faculty of Philosophy, Niš, Republic of Serbia

E-mail: ljubisa@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Abstract. *The paper first discusses the various philosophical and sociological concepts of the phenomenon of game since ancient history to the modern age. It focuses especially on contemporary domestic and foreign sociologists' research related to the concept of game and the homo ludens. The central object of the author's analysis in this paper is the interpretation of the paradigm of playfulness as posited by the Russian sociologist Sergey Kravchenko, as well as place this paradigm occupies and the theoretical and methodological role it plays in contemporary sociology.*

Key words: *game, playfulness, homo ludens, Sergey Kravchenko, contemporary society.*

"...man only plays where he is man
in the full acceptance of the term,
and *he is wholly manonly where he plays...*".

F. Schiller

ON THE THEORY OF GAME AND PLAYFULNESS IN PHILOSOPHY,
CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY AND CULTUROLOGY

Games are one of 'the basic phenomena of human existence' (Eugen Fink) and an integral part of social life. There are researchers, anthropologists, psychologists and sociologists who even claim that games represent a key to the understanding of the human personality development, his social character, the basis of cultural dynamics and the di-

rection in which a civilization moves (Roger Caillois). The representatives of the structural transaction analysis of games in psychology think that playing, to paraphrase, represents a set of complementary, hidden transactions approximating a very definite, predictable outcome¹ so that it has cultural significance; it reveals a complex network of communication among people and social groups as actors and a hidden nature of their, very often traumatic, relations and types of personalities involved in the interaction processes while emphasizing the slogan, 'tell me what game you are playing and I will tell you who you are.' Social psychologists, in their turn, explore the role of the game in the processes of personality socialization and its non-compulsory learning of social roles, maturation and preparation for entrance into the adult world.

Games and *playfulness* are socio-cultural phenomena. Game is one of the essential characteristics of man. As such, it is the subject of numerous sciences, namely, natural, social and humanist. The game theory is a branch of applied mathematics that deals with the analysis of particular situations in which there is an interaction of the parties – actors – participants that can have similar, opposing or mixed interests. In the game, that is, competition, according to pre-defined rules, the actors try to down their opponents by predicting their decisions and movements. The victory in the game assumes and requires from the actor to choose an optimal strategy, that is, the capability for strategic analysis of goals and movements of each actor which leads to the expected results. The field of game theory came into being with the 1944 book *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* by John von Neumann and Oscar Morgenstern.²

In the domain of the social sciences, most notably economics, sociology and sociology of culture, the theory of game and playfulness is developed in the form of strategic analysis within the theory of rational choice and culturological theory.

The theory of rational choice has its roots in the Weberian sociological tradition and methodological individualism. By following, in their strategic analysis, the logic of interest games and rational actions of the actors, the sociologists who use this theoretical and methodological approach of the rational choice, are indeed starting from the assumption that the actors in individual and group interactions are, first of all, interested in optimal behavior for the sake of maximizing benefits and minimizing costs and damage while choosing alternatives in their actions and decision-making. This theory has its origins in the philosophy of utilitarianism (J. Bentham) and pragmatism (J. Dewey). Its representative in the contemporary sociology is John S. Coleman as the author of the well-known studies entitled *The Mathematics of Collective Action*, *The Rational Reconstruction of Society* and *A Rational Choice Perspective on Economic Sociology* (2004).

The game theory is a component of the rational choice theory but it is also related to other sociological and culturological conceptions or paradigms such as the theory of mime and imitation in addition to phenomenological, dramaturgical and interaction theories.

The seeds of the game theory we find in the works of the philosophers starting from Heraclitus, Plato, Blaise Pascale to Marx, Schiller, Heidegger, Bloch, Marcuse, C. Axel and E. Morain. Even ancient Heraclitus formulated, in his philosophical fragments, the cosmic metaphor about game as a world symbol saying that "time is a child moving counters in

¹ More about it in Eric Berne, *Games People Play*, Nolit, Beograd, 1985, p. 40

² See item "Game" in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 3, Politika, Beograd, 2005, p. 118

a game; the royal power is a child's". Plato, in his *Republic*, wrote about the importance of game in the process of education and development of human personality. Blaise Pascal in his *Thoughts* wrote about man as a 'thinking reed' stressing that our nature consists of movements: without entertainment there's no joy, with entertainment there is no sorrow! Karl Marx in his *Early Works* or economic-philosophical manuscripts writes, among other things, about the difference between labor and game, about alienation and disalienation of man, about the empire of necessity and the empire of freedom. Man is, according to Marx, a creature of universal potentials or a potentially complete being. Labor is an expression of the necessity of human survival and development as well as an assumption of his freedom. Human creativity is dialectically related to freedom. While man is capable of producing according to the standards of every species and of applying to each object its inherent standard; he is also capable of producing in accordance with the laws of beauty. Freed from external necessity, man gives, through the play of his inner powers, the highest achievements of his creativity. In that sense, Marx, in his vision of postcapitalist perspective of social development, stresses the possibility of understanding labor as a joy of playfulness and creative self-affirmation instead of being necessity and slavery thus transcending the future of man from the other side of the class civilization. The poet Schiller, in his studies on aesthetics, stresses that man is never complete except in games. F. Nietzsche wrote about the phenomenon of game as eternal returning of the same and in his study *The Birth of Tragedy* as Dionysian exaltation of human nature. M. Heidegger in his study on *Thinking and Singing* wrote about playfulness as the essence of the being. An all-inclusive study of the phenomenon of game was written by the Dutch culturologist Johan Huizinga who gave it the title *Homo Ludens* and had it published in 1938: it comprises a thorough study of man.

In the West literature this issue was dealt with after the Second World War by Eugen Fink in his study *The Basic Phenomena of Human Existence* (1955), Roger Caillois in his study *Games and Men* (1958) and Herbert Marcuse in his study *Eros and Civilization* (1962) in which he discussed the relationship between labor and Eros as well as the possibility of establishing a non-repressive civilization in the further perspective of mankind development. Then, to this we should add Eric Fromm and his studies *Man for Himself* and *The Art of Loving*, Ernst Bloch's studies *Tübinger Einleitung in die Philosophie* and *The Principle of Hope*, Hans-Georg Gadamer's study *Truth and Method*, G. Debord's *Society of Spectacles* (1967), Vance Packard's *Industry of Consciousness*, Edgar Morain and his culturological studies *The Spirit of Times* as well as the post-modernists such as Lyotard, Derrida and Baudrillard and their studies about simulacrum and simulation in the contemporary postmodern society.

Among the contemporary Russian authors dealing with the phenomenon of games and playfulness under the conditions of the contemporary society we should especially stress Sergey Kravchenko and his study *Playfulness of Society* and Sergey Kara-Murze's *Manipulation of Consciousness* which gives a brilliant critique of the consciousness manipulation in the contemporary society with special reference to the Russian society in transition.

Of the philosophers, sociologists and sociologists of culture on former Yugoslavia's territory those dealing with the phenomenon of game include, first of all, the classical Hellenist scholar Miloš Đurić and his studies on classical philosophy, literature and arts, and Danko Grlić and his studies on *Game as an Aesthetic problem* (1975) and *Aesthetics* (1978). Likewise, the phenomenon of game is dealt with by the sociologist Božidar Tadić in

his study *The Mystery of the Game – From Magic Rituals to Political Myths* (1985) as well as the philosopher Milan Uzelac in his study *The Philosophy of Game* (1987). A special contribution to the problematization of game in the contemporary sociology and culturology was given by Ratko Božović in his studies *Metamorphosis of Game, The Predictment of Game, Culturology* (2008) and *Game* (2009). The phenomenon of game was also dealt with by many other philosophers and sociologists such as Dragan Koković in his study *Crackings of Culture* (2005), Nikola Božilović in his study *Rock Culture* (2004) and Srboľjub Dimitrijević in his *Man, Game and the World* (2003). Likewise, a significant contribution to the understanding of the game phenomenon was also given by Ratko R. Božović in his study *The Art of Game* (1991) and Luka Prošić in his essays entitled *Game and Time* (1972). Yet, surely the most important contribution to the sociological and culturological research of the role of game in the contemporary society was given by our distinguished sociologist Đuro Šušnjić, doyen of the critical theory in sociology in his studies, tracts and essays starting from *The Fishermen of Human Souls* (1976) to *Orwelliana* (1999) in which he explored the forms of manipulation of people in the contemporary society of spectacles.

While exploring the contribution of the prominent world sociologists to the philosophical and sociological understanding of the game we would especially like to analyze the creative work of the following authors: Eugen Fink, Johan Huizinga, Roger Caillois and Sergey Kravchenko whose works undoubtedly take an important theoretical and methodological place in the contemporary science.

Eugen Fink, in his phenomenological philosophy, places the game as the world at the centre of his analysis. In his work there is an identity between the game and the world. In the study entitled *Spiel als Weltsymbol (Play as Symbol of the World)* (1960) he emphasizes the fact that game is at the same time a human and a world problem. The world is, in his opinion, a game without players and man is both a game and a toy. Starting from the thesis that the game is 'the foundation of the fundamental phenomena,' this author uses the human game as an 'anthropological key' for a non-anthropological relation. The world is, in his view, space of the game of possibilities while the game is a production which produces itself.

In the study entitled *Basic Phenomena of Human Existence* (1984), E. Fink considers the game as one of the basic phenomena of human existence. Concerning this he writes that man is an almost inscrutably complicated being having too many ends... He adds that it is essential for the man to be a worker, an actor, a lover, a fighter and a mortal being. His life movement takes place in an incessant struggle between the animal and the divine in him.³ E. Fink thinks that the game should be considered as comprising several structural elements, namely, 1) pleasure, 2) meaning of the fame, 3) external sense, 4) community, 5) rules of the game, 6) roles, 7) toy, and 8) world of the game. Though the game is spontaneity of pleasure, it does not take place without rules. These rules can be changed by agreement but, as long as the playing and the game last, there is an assumed respect of certain rules which are constitutive parts of every game.

Though man is so future-oriented that his present moment looks like a transitory phase, the time of the game is the present. The game shows itself as a living impulse, as a

³ E. Fink, *Basic Phenomena of Human Existence*, Nolit, Beograd, 1984, p. 85

tranquil presence against man's insight into the future. In Fink's opinion, the human life is not only a 'stream,' but it is for good 'given' to everyone and thus it asks for affiliations, decisions and acts of self-realization.⁴ Hence, in his opinion, the essence of human existence is neither to be found in the ways of collective realization of life, nor in the community or in the natural forces of the blood and Eros.⁵ Instead, it is to be found in the personality, in the selfhood, in freedom and history, in individual loneliness and spirituality. The real consequence of this is, according to Fink, *existential punctualism*: irreversibility instead of yielding to the general traditional and conventional way of life (customs and habits), public dictatorship; in other words, instead of living at his own risk, he gives himself over to following the herd and dictates of collectivism. Even and when man accepts these dictates of collectivism and public, he, according to Fink, gets suspicious of the dangers and burdens of freedom, that is, he gives up his own freedom and troubles of selection. Thus the process of man's self-dispossession takes place since man is, according to Fink, his own property. His self is his real property and by giving up freedom, he gives himself up. And freedom is, as Fink underlines in the classical sense of this concept, first of all sovereignty of man's volitional decision rather than being self-sufficient.⁶

The Dutch philosopher and culturologist Johan Huizinga, in his study *Homo Ludens* (1939), defines man as a *being who plays*. Starting from the thesis that game is older than culture since some of its elements can be also found in animals, Huizinga stresses that the human culture has sprung from and developed from the game. Concentrating upon the social aspects of the type of the game, this author stresses its three basic characteristics, namely, 1) game is an act of freedom, that is, it assumes free action that is felt to be beyond ordinary life, 2) game is neither a 'common' nor 'real' life regarding the fact that it means exit into a special sphere of human activity and expression, and 3) game is being 'played' within time and space, so that finality and limitability are likewise its properties regardless of the fact that it, in its place and duration, differs from everyday life.

According to Huizinga, game can be defined as a voluntary action or activity that is taking place within some defined time or space limits. It is done according to voluntarily accepted yet without any exception obligatory rules; it has an end in itself and is accompanied with the feeling of tension and joy as well as the consciousness of its being 'something else', something other than 'common life.'⁷

An all-inclusive theory of the game as a social and cultural phenomenon can be found in Roger Caillois's study *Games and Men* (1958). In this author's opinion, the game can be defined as an activity which is essentially 1) *free* (voluntary), 2) *separate* (limited by precise and previously defined space and time limits), 3) *uncertain* (course and outcome of the game cannot be known in advance so that players or actors have a certain freedom to conceive of their strategies and movements), 4) *unproductive* (game produces neither goods nor riches nor any other kind of new elements), 5) *governed by rules* (means the game is subdued to the new rules that abolish common regulation and, in an instant, introduce new ones) and 6) *make-believe* (the game is accompanied with a specific con-

⁴ Ibid, p. 79

⁵ Ibid, p. 80

⁶ More about it in op. cit.

⁷ More about it in Johan Huizinga *Homo Ludens*, Matica Hrvatska, Zagreb, 1970.

sciousness about some kind of new reality with respect to the ongoing life which is of secondary importance).

On the basis of the predominant common characteristics which are peculiar to a certain kind of game, Roger Caillois has classified all the games into four categories naming them after classical Greek nomenclature, namely, 1) *agon* (competition games), 2) *alea* (game of chance), 3) *mimicry* (pretence games) and 4) *ilinx* (passion games).

Roger Caillois pleads, in his studies, for a sociology of games. He thinks that games are an important element of the social structure and of the cultural dynamics as well as an unavoidable subject of the general sociology and the sociology of culture thus stressing that the fate of a culture is reflected in a game. Or, to paraphrase his words, the cultural benefits of the games highlight the fact that their choice reveals, in its turn, face, style and value of a particular society.⁸ Depending on the type of the game prevailing in a society, this can, as stressed by R. Caillois, affect the decision-making regarding the future of a civilization. In the author's opinion, in the 'primitive' or archaic type of the society (or 'chaotic' type), everything happens in a game (like disguise and passion, pantomime and ecstasy) which provides for intensity and cohesion as well as integration of the collective life while in the modern or civilized society, it is the social contract that makes up the base for compromise, social consensus or taciturn division of responsibility and system regulation and integration while assuming comparison and competition. The former societies are, therefore, those of disguise (*mimicry* and *ilinx*) while the latter ones are competitive ones (*agon* and *alea*).⁹

SERGEY KRAVCHENKO'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE PARADIGM OF THE SOCIETY'S PLAYFULNESS

Sergey Aleksandrovich Kravchenko is doctor of philosophical sciences, Head of the Chair for Sociology of Moscow State University Institute for International Relations. His academic speciality is theoretical sociology. He is today professionally acknowledged in the academic community of sociologists as the founder of a new paradigm – *society's playfulness* which represents a specific type of the reflexive sociology and postmodernist paradigm. Kravchenko is a very productive and affirmed researcher in the domain of theoretical sociology, social ecology, sociology of risk and sustainable development. His writings are of a wide range while his most important studies are *Society's Playfulness – Towards the Foundation of a New Sociological Paradigm* (2002), *Playfulness of the Russian Society* (2002), *Playfulness of Society: Basics of a New Postmodern Paradigm* (2004), *Sociology of Risk* (2004), *Sociology – Paradigms Through the Prism of Sociological Imagination* (2004) and *Non-linear Socio-Cultural Dynamics: Playfulness Approach* (2006).

⁸ Roger Caillois, *Games and Men*, Nolit, Beograd, 1965, p. 100

⁹ More about it in M. Tripković, 'Game-item,' *Sociological Dictionary*, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Beograd, 2007, p. 184

What makes this author stand out in the Russian and European sociology is the foundation of a postmodern sociological paradigm under the name of the *theory of playfulness*.¹⁰ Further on in the paper we are giving a review of this paradigm.

Playfulness theory is one of the variants of the reflexive postmodern sociology which starts from the thesis that man is a *homo ludens* and that he has an existential need to play. It is the Eros of his existence and happiness. The game appears as an inner driver of man pushing him to compete with himself and others or even the world at large. Under the conditions of the mass consumption society as a society of spectacles (G. Debord), playfulness gets separated from the game. While the game is characteristic for closed social systems, playfulness is, as stressed by Kravchenko, a phenomenon of contemporary, open and pluralist societies having a tendency towards a non-linear socio-cultural dynamics and the formation of a self-organized autonomous *socium* with intrasystem indefiniteness.¹¹

According to Kravchenko, playfulness as a socio-cultural phenomenon is a new phenomenon which is identified and dispersed in the society of the radical-modern and the postmodern. It emerges with the crisis of the traditional and closed systems that are based on the firm control over ruling people. It, as a new form of social integration of peoples, enables a passage of the actors from one social state to another thus increasing their possibilities of self-organization and self-realization. Playfulness is a phenomenon of the contemporary, open, pluralist societies having a tendency towards nonlinear development. The action and consequences of the socio-cultural dynamics can be expressed in algorithm: *chaos-order-chaos*. By playfulness Kravchenko assumes the following: 1) introduction of the principles of game and heuristic elements into pragmatic life strategies which allows an individual, through self-reflection and self-realization, to play, very efficiently, basic social roles, to adopt himself to disbalanced state of innovation, to the life under the conditions of the knowledge system pluralization and to the multifaceted time and space, 2) a new type of reflexive rationality which is being formed and characteristic for the contemporary socio-cultural dynamics, 3) factor of the constitution of support and modification of the social reality of disbalanced type, and 4) social paradigm with theoretical-methodological instruments providing for analyzing order and chaos in the dynamic, contemporary social system.¹²

Game and playfulness represent a voluntary human activity that cannot be done by force (J. Huizinga). Game and playfulness have passion in common, that is, what Huizinga calls tension and which testifies about uncertainty as well as chances. Game and playfulness are certain forms of social contact implying hidden motivation and latent meaning. *Playfulness is, on principle, different from game*. While game is an activity with no practical purpose, no obvious goal except for pleasure and in which playing the game itself is, as written by Goffman, more important than gain, playfulness is opposite to it: it is so pragmatic as can be seen in its striving after gain and benefit. Then, in the game the rules are indisputable and obligatory while playfulness does not know of any strict organizationally fixed rules. In that sense, playfulness makes the rules open; it constantly corrects them, that is, it appears as a factor of socio-cultural transformation of

¹⁰ More about it in S. A. Kravchenko's university textbook entitled *Sociology – Paradigms through the Prism of Sociological Imagination*, EKZAMEN, Moscow, 2007, p. 700-715

¹¹ S. A. Kravchenko, *Ibid*, p. 700

¹² *Ibid*, p. 700

ambiance, mechanism of regulation, dynamic regulation of social life in which a very active role is reserved for subjects themselves. In the contemporary postmodern society, playfulness is a specific form of reflexive rationality for which Kravchenko says it is a specific, hybrid type of rationality at the center of which there is ethics of success and chance. Concerning this, Kravchenko writes that, if McDonaldization (G. Ritzer) has become religion of the consumption society, then playfulness can be called the *religion of success*.¹³

In his studies Kravchenko explores the conditions as well as the assumptions of functioning of the contemporary mass consumption postmodern society as a society of spectacles and the role of the phenomenon of playfulness in addition to a new type of individual, namely, *playful individual* whose main trait is that he looks at everything through the prism of success or failure. Playfulness, through different forms of its manifestations, comprises chance games, show business and the like and it is often expressed as a hybrid hymn of irrationality and rationality, that is a form of irrational rationality contributing to the depersonalization of personality and dehumanization of social relations.

Playful individual in the contemporary society is not an actor of his fate; he is, in essence, very much like an alienated man (K. Marx), man with the character of unproductive and unfruitful orientation (Fromm) or paradoxical man (Toshenko). Though this playful individual cherishes an illusion that he does what he wants to do, in fact and in practice he is driven by irrational forces and impulses stemming from the society of spectacle. He gets transformed into a servant made by someone else's hands – idols of simulacra inducing an irrational passion for game. Concerning this, Kravchenko writes that many people begin to feel like puppets having no self of their own; they have no feeling of a self-sufficient selfhood and are ready to lie and delude themselves. It is from this that the social type of "self-organized adventurer" comes into being as someone who is moved by his passion for games and success at any cost. To him everything is permitted: he can bluff or he can speculate with the minds of those surrounding him. He strives to transfer the risk of the game that he has himself created to a playing chorus of people or crowd. For a certain number of playful individuals, adventurism means that everything is permissible.¹⁴ In this context of discussing the phenomenon of playfulness in the contemporary society, Kravchenko, just like G. Debord who has proposed the conception of society modeled after the theater of spectacle, stresses the role of simulacrum and simulation and playful individual thus showing how the socio-cultural dynamics leads towards the transformation of the consumption society into that of spectacle and how simulacra move man further away from the objective reality thus replacing it with the virtual one in which the reality exists in a play and the play is the reality. This mutual alienation is the essence and the base of the societies of spectacle. Playfulness in the contemporary society testifies that there has been no confirmation of M. Weber's prognosis that the formal rationality has to defeat all other types of rationality in the society. Kravchenko shows, in his study, that playfulness as a phenomenon finds its place for its parallel existence side by side with the traditional and the postmodern types of rationality including McDonalization and postFordism. The expansion of playfulness, as an alien-

¹³ More about it in op. cit.

¹⁴ Ibid.

ated form of play, is today opposed by Protestantism in the West and Orthodox in the East, as stressed by Kravchenko.

While exploring the phenomenon of playfulness, as a form of human alienation and imitative modernization in the mass consumption society and the society of spectacle, Kravchenko has applied these key determinants of his paradigm to the exploration of certain phenomena and issues of the modern society, of both the world and the post-socialist Russian transition one. The results of his explorations reveal the theoretical and the methodological value of this paradigm in the analysis of socio-cultural phenomena and thus they make up the basis for founding the sociology of culture, the sociology of games and the sociology of mass media in the contemporary sociology.

TOWARDS THE SOCIOLOGY OF GAMES

The so far presented considerations of the contributions made by philosophers, sociologists and culturologists to the explanation of the place and role of game in the life of man and society have paved the way to a possible foundation of the *sociology of games* as a special applied sociology in the system of the contemporary sociological sciences. An important contribution was given to it by the contemporary Russian sociologist Sergey Kravchenko in his studies.

The subject matter of the sociology of games is the exploration of game as a socio-cultural phenomenon, as a product as well as a producer of the contemporary society and its culture. The task of the sociology of game is to explore complex networks of interactions among particular kinds of games and types of the global society and its culture. It is to decode both the manifest and the latent function of games, their hidden cultural meaning within the context of the society's structure and dynamics.

By using the sociological and culturological methods and techniques of the empirical research the sociology of games should study the position and role of game in the life of individuals and social groups, and their socio-cultural function in spare time. It should explore both the structure and the dynamics of games in the context of contemporary social changes in different types of global societies and systems with the goal to identify their role in the process of meeting individual and collective social needs, the relation between the society of spectacles and *homo ludens* and playful individual as well as the role of game and playfulness in the processes of alienation and dis-alienation of the modern man.

Starting from a thesis proposed by G. Debord about the relation between the ramified capitalist way of production and the society of spectacles (since, as stressed by the author, the spectacle is capital in its accumulation phase in which it is not a set of images but a social relation among the individuals mediated by images¹⁵) and his statement that in the contemporary mass consumption society - spectacle has expanded to include all reality and to penetrate it¹⁶, the contemporary sociology of games should especially explore the relation between mass media and the phenomenon of game as well as the role of mass media in the system of symbolic violence and people's manipulation. Underlining that

¹⁵ G. Debord, *Society of Spectacle*, Arkizin DDO, Zagreb, 1992, p.36

¹⁶ Ibid

game is not only a product of the contemporary society and its culture but its producer as well, we would like to stress that, by meeting men's needs, game, at the same time, alienates or releases his powers thus integrating him into order of capital-power or, through the philosophy of liberation, it orients him to Promethean overcoming of the existing, to the straightening up or establishing his own power over himself and the world he creates. In a word, game can wake up or put to sleep man's inherent powers in the processes of individual and social interactions. The sociology of games, among other things, has as its task to explore the role of game in alienation and liberation of man's powers in the processes of dehumanization or humanization of social relations and social development in the contemporary world.

REFERENCES

1. Berne, E., *Games People Play*, Nolit, Beograd
2. Božović, R., *Ludosti uma*, Čigoja, Beograd, 2006.
3. Božović, R. R., *Umjetnost igre*, Zbornik Matica Srpska za društvene nauke, br.91, 1990.
4. Božilović, N., *Rok kultura*, SKC, Niš, 2004.
5. Caillois, R., *Games and Men*, Nolit, Beograd
6. Debord, G., *Society of Spectacle*, Arkizid DDO, Zagreb
7. Dimitrijević, S., *Čovek, igra, svet*, Književna zajednica, bora Stanković, Vranje, 2003.
8. Fink, E., *Basic Phenomena of Human Existence*, Nolit, Beograd
9. "Game" in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 3, Politika, Beograd
10. Huizinga, J., *Homo Ludens*, Matica Hrvatska
11. Kravchenko S. A., university textbook entitled *Sociology – Paradigms through the Prism of Sociological Imagination*, EKZAMEN, Moscow
12. Tripković M., 'Game-item,' *Sociological Dictionary*, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Beograd

PARADIGMA IGRE I IGRARIZACIJE KROZ PRIZMU SOCIOLOŠKE IMAGINACIJE SERGEJA KRAVČENKA

Ljubiša Mitrović

U radu autor najpre razmatra različite filozofske i sociološke koncepcije fenomena igre – od antike do modernog doba i savremenosti. U njegovom fokusu su posebno istraživanja savremenih sociologa, stranih i domaćih, o igri i homo ludensu. Centralni predmet autorovih istraživanja u ovom prilogu vezan je za interpretaciju paradigme igrarizacije, ruskog sociologa Sergeja Kravčenka, i njeno mesto i teorijsko-metodološka ulogu u savremenoj sociologiji.

Ključne reči: *igra, igrarizacija, homo ludens, Sergej Kravčenko, savremeno društvo.*