

THE INFLUENCE OF A PERSONAL SAMPLE OF THE
CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL ERA ON THE FORMATION OF
THE VALUE ORIENTATIONS OF THE PERSONALITY IN
MODERN CONDITIONS

*Vitaliya Gotynyan-Zhuravlova*¹, *Oleksandr Lonchak*^{2,3}, *Lyubov Zadorozhna*^{1,4},
Inna Balashenko^{1,5}, *Nataliia Shatailo*^{1,6}

Abstract. Our world is not something fixed, unchanging. There are not only physical changes, climate changes, but also social ones. Most often, social changes are reflected in cultural monuments. Social revolutions create new images of heroes, which journalists, writers, artists, screenwriters, film directors “pick up”, complement, and somewhat embellish.

The importance of this or that cultural and social phenomenon or this or that cultural event is determined according to the personal, human measurement of these phenomena and events. We determine the significance of the changes taking place in society or the state as a whole for ourselves in accordance with those changes that have happened to us personally. Being a deeply social being, a person cannot help but feel the changes taking place in society. She accepts (or does not accept—she lives in conflict) values, morals, rules of behavior that are specific to this era and culture, within which she was formed as a person. That is why many famous philosophers, starting from the time of Antiquity, consider man to be the standard of cultural values and heritage of mankind.

Since a person himself determines (evaluates) what is important (value) for him, what is good for him today, then the person himself can be considered not only the one who conducts the assessment, but also a kind of model (standard) of his era. It reflects all the greatness and power of its era. A personal sample of a cultural-historical era can be imagined as a new abstract construction consisting of typical essential characteristics of a certain cultural-historical era.

If a person can be a kind of standard of cultural values of the era and is a kind of example of his era, then it is advisable to consider the possibility of using measurement to find out the characteristics, mechanisms of replacing one example with another, because there is an opinion that only what can be measured can be improved. When analyzing the processes of applying a personal sample, its formation, we turned to the methodology of standard-free measurement.

Keywords: personal sample of the cultural-historical era, culture, value system, standardless measurement

¹ Odessa National University named after I. I. Mechnikov. vitaliya_gotynyan@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0830-3893>

² Communal Institution of Higher Education “Odessa Academy of Continuing Education of the Odessa Regional Council”

³ Odessa Regional State Administration. osvita@osvita.od.ua, <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1924-1391>

⁴ zadira65@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5672-1792>

⁵ inna_ksu@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6008-1891>

⁶ nvodesa@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4247-2391>

Introduction

It is known that culture is a product of human being. Culture is not only a set of material values that are created by man. First of all, we are talking about spiritual values, those that our distant ancestors came to realize through a strict system of prohibitions. In order to survive in this hostile world for our ancestors, they needed to unite in large families. This made it possible to redistribute responsibilities, go hunting together, gather food, and take care of children. But the residence of a large number of people in a small area requires adherence to strict rules of behavior. And the first prohibition concerned the use of weapons against each other. The first requirement of social life in order to survive was “thou shalt not kill.” Do not kill a representative of your own kind. In order to clearly follow this prohibition, the first rule, the first law was created — the law of the coupon: equal retribution for the deed. This meant: do not kill, because you will be killed. So for centuries, through the strict prohibition of murder, awareness of the value of human life came. Then, a system of values that is familiar to us gradually forms, a certain way of relating to nature, society, and oneself is formed, during which a person assimilates a previously created culture, thereby making it a prerequisite for his activity, creates culture himself, creating a new one on the basis of acquired knowledge, skills and values recognized by him.

Our world is not something fixed, unchanging. Not only the seasons change, but also human society. Most often, social changes are reflected in cultural monuments. Social revolutions create new images of heroes, which journalists, writers, artists, screenwriters, film directors “pick up”, complement, and somewhat embellish. The importance of this or that cultural and social phenomenon or this or that cultural event is determined according to the personal, human measurement of these phenomena and events. We determine the significance of the changes taking place in society or the state as a whole for ourselves in accordance with those changes that have happened to us personally, by whether these changes “affected” us. People are deeply social beings; they cannot help but feel the changes that are taking place in society. We accept (or don’t accept—we live in conflict) values, morals, rules of behavior that are specific to this era and culture, within which we were formed as a person. That is why many famous philosophers, starting from the time of Antiquity, consider man to be the standard of cultural values and heritage of mankind. The German philosopher H. Rickert introduces the categories of evaluation and well to combine values with reality. Usually, the evaluation is carried out by the subject himself, and he himself evaluates the well. According to the system of values, assessment is a kind of development of cultural phenomena. Thus, all the “diversity of culture before correlation with values is only an unexamined diversity of the past. In history the only thing remains that is related to the personalization of values” [1]. Since a person himself determines (evaluates) what is important (value) for him, what is good for him today, then the person himself can be considered not only the one who conducts the assessment, but also a kind of model (standard) of his era.

Where there is a standard, there is a thought about the possibility of measurement, because there is a belief that only what can be measured can

be improved. Therefore, if the human being is anything like a standard for determining the significance of cultural values, then it is reasonable to consider the possibility of using measurement for evaluation. Since it is primarily a qualitative assessment of the measured objects, and the measurement objects themselves are not the ones to which standards can be selected (clearly defined, fixed international standards of a given quantity), so we should apply to alternative types of measurement, in particular to standardless measurement.

The methodology of standardless measurement, the features of its application, and its expediency as a separate measurement method were discussed in the works of O. Yefimov[2], В. Боса, Д. Марієв, О. Балалаєва, А. Крохмаль та А. Соловей [3], V. P. Malaichuk, A. V. Mozgovoi [4], O. P. Punchenko [5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. When analyzing the main concepts and ideas about the personal model of the era, regarding the system of values and value orientations, we based on the works of well-known modern Ukrainian and foreign scientists: M. Ossovska[10, 11, 12, 13], D. M. Kyslynska [14, 15, 16], P. Himanen [17], V. S. Loginova [18], R. S. Chip [19, 20, 21], A. Ruchka [22, 23, 24], M. M. Slyusarevskyi [25, 26].

The purpose of this article is to analyze the concept of “personal sample of a certain cultural-historical era” in the context of the possibility of applying standardless measurement in relation to the features of its application.

Theory and methodology

Standardless measurement is a rather broad class of measurements that take place without the use of standards as well-defined international standards of measured quantities. Is not a mandatory condition the numerical outline of the measurement result. At least four types of standardless measurement are distinguished in modern literature [27]. Most often, instead of standards, quasi-standards are used, i.e. objects that are chosen by the researcher as standards for this specific certain study and are not international approved samples of a given quantity. Usually, quasi-standards are used where it is impossible to select a standard for the measured quantity. In the process of measurement, two objects are compared—the measured object and a quasi-standard, which can be conventionally denoted as $R(m_1, m_2)$ [2]. Another type of standardless measurement consists in comparing a comparable feature belonging to the measured object with a feature chosen by the researcher as a quasi-standard of the measured quantity. This type of standardless measurement is denoted as $R[(m^*)P_1, P_2]$ [27]. It is often necessary to match a characteristic with a measurement object, while determining whether this characteristic belongs to the measurement object or not. This type of standardless measurement is denoted as $R(P, m)$ [27]. Sometimes the object of research is considered as a composition, a certain combination of properties that characterize and, in fact, create the object of research, determine its essential features and properties. This type of standardless measurement is denoted as $R(P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots)$ [27].

So, let's try to consider a personal model of a certain cultural and historical era as a certain quasi-standard and try to apply the standardless measurement procedure.

A personal example of a certain cultural and historical era, according to I. Krasynska, is a certain abstract construction, which is formed from the most

common typical characteristics of this cultural and historical era, which are accepted by society and defined as norms in the process of education. The name “personal sample” was introduced and actively used by the Polish researcher M. Ossovska [11, 12,13,14]. This sample includes “socially possible and at the same time desirable, i.e. consciously approved by a person, values to which the individual is directed... and it is a way of existence of the system of value orientations of the individual in society” [14].

If the personal pattern as a system of values is adequate and corresponds to reality, then, according to I. Krasynska, it can be declared that this personal pattern “reflects the main properties of the system of values, in particular, dynamism and adaptability, i.e. the ability to change over time and adapt to new external conditions. At the same time, it seems appropriate to consider the transformations that the system of personal values undergoes within one cultural-historical era as the modernization of a personal model, and to associate the transition to another era with the birth of a new personal model” [28, p. 446]. Therefore, in the formation and description of the personal model itself, there is a standardless measurement based on a combination of essential features, from which a certain personal model $R(P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots)$ is formed. Such a combination of properties $R(P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots)$ usually becomes a system of values characteristic of a certain culture in a certain era. They form, create and simultaneously measure the personal model of a certain cultural and historical era.

Sometimes researchers have certain difficulties with defining personal patterns of the era. According to M. Ossovskaya, the “bourgeois” [29] could be a special representative of the industrial era, whose historical prototype became B. Franklin. B. Franklin in his autobiography has already successfully described the typical characteristics of the bourgeois (those that we marked as $R(P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots)$, which were found out as socially and especially optimal. But there is a possibility that another researcher will knock down another prototype with a personal sample of the industrial age. Over time, technology has been improved, the latest technologies have been developed. This led to the fact that people began to feel like a creator and the religious personal model is replaced by a more secular one. This is how the “bourgeois” gradually transforms into a “citizen”.

In terms of a late industrial partnership, and, in fact, a consumer society, a special expression is transformed into a pragmatic-consumer, the fragments of “prudence and industriousness, which demonstrated the strength of the spirit, gave way to satisfying the needs of the body” [28, p. 448]. A hacker became a personal symbol of post-industrial society. Most often, this term is used to indicate a wide range of people who relate to their work not as to duties or a means for achieving the fulfilling level of life, but as a hobby. According to the opinion of the Finnish researcher P. Hemanen, in terms of global informatization, people’s attitude to the process of work, knowledge and organization is changing, and at the same time the goals of life are changing [17]. Looking for a will, he creates his powerful virtual world, creates and immerses himself headlong virtual games, just if he created the rules of the game himself. To the thought I. Krasnitskaya, a hacker is a new model of a value system, and he idea that “has no subjectivity—allows a personality to adapt to conditions that are

constantly changing easily. "Don't apostatize principles, but change together with principles—that's his motto" [28, p. 449]. This is the special sample of the modern individual.

Let's pay attention on the fact that the set of essential features, namely the system of value orientations ($R(P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots)$) of special samples from different eras, such as "bourgeois", "pragmatist-consumer", "hacker" are essentially differentiate from one another, that makes it possible to clearly define and clearly measure the certain personal sample with a given system of values. In addition, the consideration of sociocultural changes and transformations with the help of such a nominal standard as a concept of personal model allows researchers characterize both the process of the value systems changing in the individual, and understand motives and reasons for these changes.

Regarding this personal sample as a definite conventional sample, we can verify the significance of this and other phenomena or an event that were in progress in the same historical era or that are being proceeded at the current Ukrainian society.

So, M. Ossovska defines a personal model as a real or fictional person, for example, a literary character, who should encourage others to imitate their behavior, broadcast moral standards, be a role model for others, especially young people. Each era requires its own heroes, bright modern figures who would be the bearers of moral criteria, the system of values spread in society.

I. Krasynska proposes to expand the interpretation of the personal model, adding to it not only the analysis of the moral, but also the worldview model of a person. Such a model of a person was explained like "a certain reference system of individual values for society, as a new abstract construction, which can be called a personal model of the studied cultural era" [28, p. 446].

In the opinion of the author, such a personal pattern should contain values that, on the one hand, should be optimal, recognized by society, and on the other hand, values that are consciously approved by a person, such that they form his personality. So, a personal model should be a way of existence of a system of value orientations of an individual in society. Thus, the personal sample becomes a quasi-standard used in standardless measurements, which are based on the comparison of two objects: the measured object and the quasi-standard $R(m_1, m_2)$. How does this happen?

A person who belongs to a certain social group is the bearer of values and norms of behavior that are widespread in this group. But under the influence of circumstances during life, a person can move from one social group to another. Someone has a strong desire to climb "up", sometimes at any cost, not disdaining any methods and ways, in order to get to the upper echelons of society. Someone, for any reasons, on the contrary, "goes down." Changes in social groups may not be so strong (for example, moving to another city), but they happen to a person during his life. Such social mobility makes it necessary to change the usual rhythm of life, to change something in the system of values, norms and style of behavior, accept the way of life, the system of values of a new social group. These changes directly affect the individual. Gradually the need to adapt to a new life, perhaps to accept a new system of values, norms and laws of behavior that operate in a new social group, changes him, makes him, as they say, a completely "different person", as a person must to obey the laws and norms adopted in this social group, not to break them.

Often, in order to facilitate adaptation to new conditions, an individual chooses a personal model from a new social group as a certain guide of value orientations system and norms of behavior. Teachers emphasize another important value of such personal models. Teenagers often move from one subculture to another, and this leads to a change in the system of values, behavior, and purpose. Often, for the sake of better adaptation in a new social group or a in a new subculture, they choose for themselves such personal models—idols. And therefore, as noted by V. Loginova, “the methodological significance of the concept of ‘personal model’ is that it can be a tool in the classification of ethical, pedagogical, educational and other systems” [30, p. 66].

In essence, a personal model performs the functions of a standard, or rather a quasi-standard of the system of values and value orientations of an individual in this or that social group or in this or that culture. Further analysis of this issue would certainly lead to the creation of an appropriate measurement methodology based on the comparison of the individual with the personal model of the era or with his idol $R(m_1, m_2)$. But, unfortunately, as noted by M. Ossovska, V. Loginova, and I. Krasnytska, the problem of personal models in general did not interest researchers for a long time, specific samples were almost never distinguished, they were approached extremely rarely. Although V. Loginova repeatedly emphasizes the importance of a personal model in personality education. In her opinion, the meaning of the concept of “personal model” is important, because this concept contains “objective parameters independent of official institutions and scientific developments, which allow to segregate subjects of education” [29, p. 66]. So, we are talking about an attempt to create a certain standard for the education process, because the personal model simultaneously contains objective parameters and with its help real subjects of education are distinguished.

In traditional society, according to V. Boyko, a person does not belong to himself, cannot behave freely, he is “only a participant in a masquerade, a dramatic actor, the personification of a certain state” [30, p. 72]. The individual is completely subordinated to the systems of stereotyped behavior, which are non-negotiable and mandatory to apply. The model of human activity, which is based on the idea of the possibility of free concession, free choice, is almost not in demand by traditional society. This model exists, but unfortunately only as a possibility. If social life under the influence of external factors will require immediate changes in order to adapt to new conditions and new challenges, then for a small bunch of individuals there should be an opportunity for creative, non-standard thinking.

The actions and actions of all others usually correspond to generally defined patterns of behavior.

Such process of relating the behavior and actions of a specific individual with generally accepted models (or a model) of behavior is based on standard measurement, which is based on comparing a quality belonging to the measured thing with a quality that is chosen as a conditional quasi-standard. This type of reference-free measurement is denoted as $R[(m^*)P_1, P_2]$.

Indeed, this mechanism is used to compare, abandon the actions of a specific individual with those actions that are considered stereotyped, a standard of certain behavior. The norm of behavior is to give up a place in transport to

an adult or a woman with a child, help someone cross the road or help someone who has fallen to get up. But, unfortunately, the changes that have taken place in our society in recent years affect our value system, almost excluding from it kindness, mutual respect, respect for the elderly, and helping each other. Conventional standards of behavior in society are changing, altering the personal model of our era. Society changes and we change, measuring, evaluating and getting used to these changes.

We often ask ourselves the question: could I act like my favorite hero? We seem to try on the peculiarities of his behavior, features that belong to another—the hero. At the same time also, there is also a measurement of our value system, based on the comparison of a certain quality with the measured object, which is denoted as $R(P, m)$. We ask ourselves the question: do I have this feature or not? Most often, such measurements take place during the period of reassessment of values, norms of behavior, awareness of oneself, one's value system. Sometimes such a reassessment of one's own qualities takes place on the background of changes in society, in periods when new personal models of the cultural-historical era begin to form and appear.

Conclusions

Thus, we found out that the personal model of a certain cultural-historical era is not just a language formation, a conventional sign of a system of values, characteristic of a certain cultural era of a certain historical period, but in fact is a quasi-standard, a model of behavior in the appropriate conditions, under certain circumstances according to the defined system of values. The personal model of the era has a special influence on teenagers, who continue to form their own value system. No “reading of morality”, no prohibitions and restrictions on behavior, manifestations of one's desires affect their ideas in the same way as an example, an idol, chosen by oneself as a standard of behavior. And that is why educators and pedagogues emphasize the importance of the study of personal samples of the cultural and historical era.

Another interesting area of application of personality models is forcibly displaced persons, those who had to leave their homes, jobs, schools, friends, leave their “usual life” and move to another country, with a different culture, a different way of life. For some, this became a “window of opportunity”, others perceived it as a forced necessity. It is the latter category that finds it most difficult to adapt to new living conditions, it is for them that a personality model, an example of those who have already settled in a “new place”, would be extremely useful.

It is interesting and promising to study the changes taking place in society and the changes they cause in the personal sample itself. Or, in general, it turns out to be interesting how and why changes in the personal patterns themselves occur. Any changes need to be evaluated, just like the value system, which was also discussed by H. Rickert, and the most likely way to determine and measure these changes will be the applying of the benchmark-free measurement methodology.

References

- [1] Zagyrnyak M. Yu. 2012. The concept of value in H. Rickert and ego interpretation in the philosophy of S. I. Hessen. <https://doi.org/10.5922/0207-6918-2012-1-4>
- [2] Yefimov D. V. 2021. Vykorystannia dopovненоi realnosti (AR) v osviti. *Visnyk Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu*. Vol. 2(1). P. 219–225. <https://doi.org/10.26661/2522-4360-2021-1-2-34>
- [3] Bosa V., Mariiev D., Balalaieva O., Krokhmal A., Solovei A. 2024. Vprovadzhennia virtualnoi realnosti u vykladannia inozemnoi movy. *Amazonia Investiga*. Vol. 13(73). P. 187–199. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2024.73.01.15>
- [4] Malaichuk V., Mozghovoi O., Petrenko O. 2001. Informatsiino-vymiriuvalni tekhnolohii neruivnogo kontroliu: Navch. posib. 240 p.
- [5] Puchenko N. O. 2013. Metody ta zasoby pidvyshchennia efektyvnosti otsiniuvannia kharakterystyk impulsno-kodovykh modulatoriv shyrokosmuhovyykh sygnaliv: avtoref. dys. kand. tekhn. nauk: 05.12.13; Khmeln. nats. un-t. Khmelnytskyi. 20 p.
- [6] Puchenko O. P. 2008. Bezetalonne vymiriuvannia dukhovnosti. *Aktualni problemy dukhovnosti. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. Vol. 2(18). P. 361–365.
- [7] Puchenko O. P. 2014. Informatsiini resursy suspilstva: sutnist, struktura, formy reprezentatsii ta rol u suspilnomu rozvytku. *Naukove piznannia: metodolohiia ta tekhnolohiia : Filosofii*. Vol. 2. P. 129–136.
- [8] Puchenko O. P. 2014. Metodolohichni novatsii u suchasnomu naukovomu piznanni. *Humanitarnyi visnyk Zaporizkoi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademii*. Vol. 57. P. 27–37.
- [9] Puchenko O. P., Tsyra O. V. 2020. The Influence of Covid-19 on the Spiritual World of Students Formation in the Conditions of Globalization Crisis. *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzhavnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Filosofski nauky*. Vol. (88). P. 123–134.
- [10] Ossowska Maria. 2000. Normy moralne: próba systematyzacji [Moral norms: An attempt at systematization]. 4th edition. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe. ISBN 83-01-13278-7)
- [11] Ossowska M. O człowieku, moralności i nauce: miscellanea On Man, morality, and science: miscellanies, ed. by Maria Ofierska and Maria Smoła. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe. ISBN 83-01-00801-6
- [12] Ossowska M. 1977. O pewnych przemianach etyki walki [On certain changes in the ethics of struggle]. 2nd edition. Warszawa: Niezależna Oficyna Wydawnicza (a Samisdat edition)
- [13] Ossowska M. 2005. Socjologia moralności: zarys zagadnień [The sociology of morality: An outline of its problems]. 4th edition. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe
- [14] Kyslynska D. M. 2016. Osoblyvosti struktury individualnykh zhyttievyykh tsinnosti maibutnykh pravookhorontsiv u riznykh sferakh zhyttia. *Nauka i osvita*. Vol. 7. P. 15–20.
- [15] Kyslynska D. M., Miloradova N. E. 2016. Tsinnosti ta tsinnisni oriientatsii v psykhologichnykh teoriiakh. *Visnyk KhNPU imeni H. S. Skovorody. Psykholohiia*. Vypusk 53. P. 64–73.
- [16] Kyslynska D. M. 2015. Tsinnisni oriientatsii: teoretychnyi ohliad. *Problemy ekstremalnoi ta kryzovoi psykhologii*. Vol. 18. P. 89–97.

- [17] Himanen P. 2001. The Hacker Ethic and Spirit of the Information Age. Prologue by Torvalds L.; Epilogue by Castels M. Pub. Vintage. 234 p.
- [18] Loginova V. S. 2009. Personal sample: the content of the concept and its place in the pedagogical terminological apparatus. *Academic notes. Psychology series. Pedagogy*. Vol. 3-4(7-8). P. 64–72.
- [19] Chip R. S. 2022. Psykholohichni osoblyvosti rozvytku osobystisnoi identychnosti pidlitkiv. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho natsionalnoho universytetu. Ser. Psykholohiia*. Uzhhorod. Vol. 1. P. 126–130. <https://doi.org/10.32782/psy-visnyk/2022.1.24>
- [20] Chip R. S. 2023. Stanovlennia osobystosti maibutnoho fakhivtsia u protsesi dialohizatsii osvithnoho prostoru. *Aksiopsykholohichni vektory rozvytku suchasnoi osvity : zbirnyk materialiv Mizhnarodnoi nauково-praktychnoi konferentsii (m. Ternopil, 19–20 zhovtnia 2023 r.)*. Ternopil : TNPU im. V. Hnatiuka. P. 95–100.
- [21] Chip R. S. 2012. Tsinnisni oriientsatsii yak mekhanizmy rehuliatcii povedinky osobystosti. *Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii*. Vol. 18. P. 810–818.
- [22] Chip R. S. 2019. Vplyv pidlitkivoi subkultury na stanovlennia gendernoi identychnosti u period doroslshannia osobystosti. *Aktualni problemy reformuvannia systemy vykhovannia ta osvity v Ukraini : zb. tez nauk. robit uchasn. mizhnar. nauk.-prakt. konf., m. Lviv, 26–27 kvitnia 2019 r.* Lviv. P. 34–37.
- [23] Ruchka A. 2010. Tsinnisna mentalnist vikovykh hrup sotsiumu. *Sotsiologichni doslidzhennia kultury : kontseptsii ta praktyky: zb.nauk.prats / nauk. red. Shcherbyna V. M., vidpov.red. Naumova M. Iu.* Kyiv : In-t kulturolohii NAMU. P. 117–127.
- [24] Ruchka A. 2010. Tsinnisna mentalnist vikovykh hrup sotsiumu. *Sotsiologichni doslidzhennia kultury : kontseptsii ta praktyky: zb. Nauk. prats.* Kyiv : In-t kulturolohii NAMU. P. 117–127.
- [25] Ruchka A. Tsinnosti ta tsinnisna zmina u suchasnomu suspilstvi. *Prykladna kulturolohii i kulturni praktyky*, P. 172–179.
- [26] Sliusarevskiy M. M. 2013. Metodologichni pryntsyipy rozroblennia i kryterii otsiniuvannia sotsialno-psykholohichnykh teorii. *Naukovi studii iz sotsialnoi ta politychnoi psykholohii*. Vol. 32. P. 3–19.
- [27] Sliusarevskiy M. M. 1999. Teoretychni problemy dohovirnoho upravlinnia chuzhym mainom v Ukraini : avtoref. dys... kand. yuryd. nauk: 12.00.03 / Natsionalna yurydychna akademiia Ukrainy im. Yaroslava Mudroho. Kharkiv. 20 p.
- [28] Gotynyan-Zhuravlova V. V. 2020. Social and philosophical components of standard-free measurement: types, definitions, applications: monograph. Odesa : Publishing House “Helvetika”. 358 p.
- [29] Krasynskaya I. S. 2008. On the system of values (post) of a modern human being. *Scholarly notes of the Tavricheskogo national universiteta named after V. I. Vernadskyi. Series “Philosophy. Sociology”*. Vol. 21(60). No. 1. P. 445–450.
- [30] Bekha V. P. 2010. Autopoiesis of social systems: a monograph / scientific editor. Kyiv : Publishing House of M. P. Dragomanov State University. 748 p.
- [31] Boyko V. A. 2009. Personal dimension of culture and the specifics of tradition reproduction in the modern world. *Herald of NSU. Series: Philosophy*. Vol. 7, Iss. 1. P. 71–76.