CULTURE AS A FACTOR IN THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN A DIGITAL SOCIETY

E. V. Lazinina

Teacher,
Stavropol branch of Krasnodar University
of Ministries of Internal Affairs
of the Russian Federation,
Stavropol, Russia

Summary. The culture of a society gives certain patterns of behavior, forms cultural stereotypes. Over time, culturally conditional behavior is consolidated, demonstrated in this culture and transmitted to subsequent generations. The existence of cultural patterns and their assimilation by new members serves to preserve the stability of the social system. Originating as a result of activities, they act simultaneously as elements of a complex mechanism of regulation and cultural and social life, which is especially relevant, since humanity creates the world, transforming its aspects into pre-existing digital forms of social development.

Keywords: society; values; traditions; consciousness; education; digital culture; social reality.

One of the open questions in scientific knowledge remains the psychological mechanism of human socialization through the assimilation of cultural models of society [2, p. 142–145]. The cultural model is socialization. Cultural patterns already exist in society. There are a number of psychological personal needs. The motivation to learn cultural patterns is to meet these needs. By organizing targeted training, the needs of the individual are met, training is carried out, as is customary in society, as corresponds to the culture of a given society to satisfy personal needs [3, p. 80–85].

However, the psychological essence of human existence is much broader and includes not only motivated behavior and a set of social roles, but also complex socio-psychological constructs, including traditional values and meanings, meanings and new social experience [15, p. 73–78].

All regulators of social typical behavior can unite with the concept of tradition. Recently, the concept of tradition has expanded to include cultural stereotypical forms of behavior, that is, customs [11, p. 29–31]. As a tradition, the peculiarities of a person's attitude to the world – values, interests, beliefs, moral standards – passed down from generation to generation were studied. And as customs – stable forms of behavior. The concept of culture acts as more general in relation to tradition, and tradition as more general in relation to customs [9, p. 123–128].

An important aspect of the consideration of culture as a personality-socializing factor is that culture, seen as an independent variable in relation to the human body, determines, or conditions behavior, means to understand the problem too narrowly, or even inadequately. Personality is a product of culture, but, reaching certain points in its development, it ceases to be a passive object of the social environment and becomes an active subject, having a possible effect on it [14, p. 282–284].

Western worldview predisposes a person to the belief that people, not situations, are the cause of events. There is a psychology of positive thinking Western culture [1, p. 83–86]. Having the right disposition, everyone can cope with almost any problem. The Eastern world view implies a focus on the situation and interdependence. While in the domestic tradition there is an orientation towards the family and collective.

Through socialization, there is a process of educating the individual, transferring to her cultural norms, skills and beliefs, and assimilating ethnic stereotypes. To assess the influence of culture, just face another. Cultural variability can be traced to different criteria. The idea of fundamental differences between cultures has its dominant. Every human society once made the selection of its cultural institutions. From the point of view of other cultures, each culture ignores the fundamental and develops the insignificant. In one society, technology is weak even in vital areas, in another – equally primitive, technological advances are complex and subtly designed for a specific situation [10, p. 37–40].

Western society is characterized by the values of individualism (individualistic-oriented culture). It favours autonomy and personal well-being at the expense of social identity. Western literature is often extolled by an adamant individualist who tries, first of all, to satisfy his own interests. Individualism flourishes with abundance, social mobility, urbanism and intense media exposure [17, p. 82–89].

Cross-cultural studies of collective values indicate the existence of an alternative to individualism focused on strength and independence. Collectivism is more valued in Eastern and Asian cultures. People attribute the highest priority to the goals and well-being of their groups – family, clan, labor. Personality in Western cultures is seen as stable, capable of resisting external influences, more or less integrated integrity, having boundaries and a set of traits, characteristics, abilities, thoughts and feelings. But this view is not relevant to other cultures.

In any society, at the level of individual consciousness, at the basis of motives that force a person to realize norms, there can be fear, shame, a sense of duty, responsibility, honor, preservation of a person, guilt [8, p. 18–22]. Fear, being an innate emotion, arises in a dangerous situation with a lack of information, that is, in a situation of uncertainty.

There are studies of cultural variability that are carried out within the framework of cross-cultural (comparative) psychology. The focus is on differences in perception, thinking, revealing the specifics of national features. Recently, many new questions have arisen related to active interethnic contacts, intermarriage and migration processes characterizing the modern world [18, p. 241].

Socio-psychological phenomena arise in the interaction of the social environment, personality and group. The social environment is all that surrounds a person in his social life, this is a concrete manifestation, the originality of social relations at a certain stage of their development. The social environment depends on the type of social economic formations, on class and nationality, on the

intra-class differences of certain layers, on household and professional differences [6, p. 27–30]. Culture shapes the individual in society, thus it largely regulates her behavior. How important culture is for the functioning of the individual and society can be judged by the behavior of people who are not engulfed in socialization. Culture plays an increasing role in solving the long-term program goals of the democratic movement: the formation and strengthening of civil society, the disclosure of human creativity. Culture affects all spheres of social and individual life activity and the way of life of society and personality [4, p. 118–124]. Its importance in the formation and development of a person's lifestyle is manifested through the action of personal-subjective factors (attitudes of consciousness, spiritual needs, values) that affect the nature of behavior, the forms and style of communication of people, values, patterns, norms of behavior. The humanistic lifestyle, focused not on adapting to the existing conditions, but on their transformation, assumes a high level of consciousness and culture, increases their role as regulators of people's behavior and their way of thinking [16, p. 39–44].

The social environment is a set of social relations that develop in society dominant social ideas and values. A favorable social environment is one where dominant ideas and values are aimed at the development of a creative, initiative personality. To a large extent, social factors determine human development. But it should be remembered that man is not formed passively under the influence of the environment. The social environment does not fundamentally affect the development of personality qualities. The development of social factors leads to a variety of their impact on personal development. As factors of deliberate impact on the personality the political system and the policy of the state, science, education, training and education, family, culture and traditions of the state [7, p. 139–144]. There is a group of social factors that do not have total action, but give a person the opportunity to develop. These include culture, literature, art, the media. The degree of influence of these factors will be determined by the capabilities and aspirations of the individual in their realization. Among social factors, education is special. It can be considered as a purposeful process for the formation of specific qualities and properties of a person, his abilities, a process based on the laws of modern digital development of society.

Social reality is now seen as a digital age characterized by the phenomena of the digital economy and digital culture [13, p. 396–402]. Digitalization acts as a logical stage in the development of society. Humanity lives in a situation of permanent technological revolution – computer, digital, biotechnogenic. Technology develops faster than a person is able to adapt to them. Life is getting harder, time is getting faster, information is dominating. A person cannot digest such a huge amount of information. The brain takes the data in portions. It cannot process and absorb large amounts of information going through a continuous flow, and therefore there are obvious processes of rejection of the information flow [12, p. 17–20]. In general, it is possible to distinguish five contradictory characteristics of digitalization relative to social reality, such as the submission

of a person to programs and algorithms, the loss of privacy in conditions of total control, the increasing problem of the ethics of human and robot relationships with artificial intelligence, the hybrid reality of everyday life, the danger of digital totalitarianism [5, p. 43–46]. G. Hegel saw the task of philosophy in reconciling consciousness with reality, which is quite difficult to achieve in the conditions of modern digital reality.

Bibliography

1. Бакланов И.С. Социокультурное и коммуникативное наполнение понятия рациональности в современной социальной философии // Вестник Северо-Кавказского федерального университета. - 2011. - №5. - С. 83-86.
2. Бакланова О.А Методологические измерения социальности в современной социально-теоретической рефлексии // Вестник Северо-Осетинского государственного университета имени Коста Левановича Хетагурова. - 2013. - №2. - С. 142-145.
3. Болховской А. Л., Говердовская Е. В., Ивченко А. В. Образование в глобализирующемся мире: философский взгляд // Экономические и гуманитарные исследования регионов. - 2013. - № 5. - С. 80-85.
4. Говердовская Е. В., Добычина Н. В. Взаимные референции между реальным и виртуальным пространством: новая коммуникационная среда // Социально-гуманитарные знания. - 2014. - №7. - С. 118-124.
5. Гончаров В. Н. Концепция «информационного общества»: социально-философский анализ // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. - 2009. - №1. - С. 43-46.
6. Гончаров В. Н. Социальная концепция информационного общества // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. 2011. - №6-2(12). - С. 27-30.
7. Деркачев Г.И., Бакланов И.С. Проблемы и истоки легитимации власти в современной России // Социально-гуманитарные знания. - 2009. - №9. - С. 139-144.
8. Ерохин А. М. Религиозное сознание в контексте общественных отношений // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. - 2015. - №2(81). - С. 18-22.
9. Ерохин А. М. Научно-информационный аспект исследования социокультурного развития общества в области культуры и искусства // Экономические и гуманитарные исследования регионов. - 2015. - №2. - С. 123-128.
10. Камалова О.Н., Джиоева Д.А. Перспективы развития сенсорных технологий и проблема расширения чувственных возможностей человека // Северо-Восточный научный журнал. - 2011. - №1. - С. 37-40.
11. Камалова О. Н. «Созерцание» в философско-культурологических построениях И. Ильина // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. - 2012. - №6. - С. 29-31.
12. Колосова О. Ю. Синергетические аспекты развития современного общества // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. - 2012. - №4. - С. 17-20.
13. Колосова О. Ю. Информация в системе управления: социальный аспект // European Social Science Journal. - 2013. - №12-2(39). - С. 396-402.
14. Лобейко Ю. А. Социальная активность личности в обществе: социально-педагогические аспекты формирования // European Social Science Journal. - 2014. - №7-2 (46). - С. 282-284.
15. Лобейко Ю. А. Социально-психологические проблемы общения в контексте межличностных общественных отношений // Экономические и гуманитарные исследования регионов. - 2015. - № 4. - С. 73-78.
16. Матяш Т.П., Несмеянов Е. Е. Православный тип культуры: идея и реальность // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. - 2015. - № 3 (82). - С. 39-44.

17. Месхи Б.Ч., Несмеянов Е.Е. Теология или лженаука: что на самом деле разрушает отечественное образование // Гуманитарные и социальные науки. - 2014. - № 4. - С. 82-89.
18. Микеева О. А. Анализ методологии и направлений исследований современной социальной реальности // Социально-гуманитарные знания. -2009. - №9. - С. 241.

ЭТНОКУЛЬТУРНАЯ САМОИДЕНТИФИКАЦИЯ КАК ВАЖНЕЙШАЯ СОСТАВЛЯЮЩАЯ ДУХОВНО-НРАВСТВЕННОГО РАЗВИТИЯ ЛИЧНОСТИ

Н. В. Беленов

*Кандидат педагогических наук,
Самарский государственный социально-
педагогический университет,
г. Самара, Россия*

Summary. The article deals with the problem of ethnic self-identification in the Russian Federation and suggests some ways to solve it. A list of useful resources is also provided.
Keywords: self identification; ethnic culture; personality.

Этнокультурная самоидентификация личности – по нашему мнению, является основополагающим условием ее духовно-нравственного развития. Данная точка зрения отражена и в федеральном государственном образовательном стандарте для основного общего образования.

Так, в главе 1 "Общие положения" в пункте 4, среди прочего, отмечается: "Стандарт направлен на обеспечение сохранения и развития культурного разнообразия и языкового наследия многонационального народа Российской Федерации, реализации права на изучение родного языка, возможности получения основного общего образования на родном языке, овладения духовными ценностями и культурой многонационального народа России". И далее, в пункте 6, постулируется ориентация стандарта на такие личностные характеристики выпускника основной школы, чтобы, в частности, он был "...любящим свой край и свое Отечество, знающим русский и родной язык, уважающим свой народ, культуру и духовные традиции".

Наконец, в главе 2, пункт 9, находим: "Личностные результаты освоения основной образовательной программы основного общего образования должны отражать: воспитание российской гражданской идентичности: патриотизма, уважения к Отечеству, прошлое и настоящее многонационального народа России; осознание своей этнической принадлежности, знание истории, языка, культуры своего народа, своего края, основ культурного наследия народов России и человечества".

Как видим, задача поставлена чётко и ориентиры ее решения отмечены верно. Вопрос, таким образом, состоит в механизмах реализации.