

Cultural Form of Manifestation of Value Models in the Interaction of Personal Values and Social Structures

Hanna Chmil^{1,*}, Nadiia Korabliova², Iryna Zubavina³, Vasily Kupriichuk⁴ and Inna Kuznietsova¹

¹*Institute for Cultural Research of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine*

²*V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Kharkiv, Ukraine*

³*National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine*

⁴*National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine*

Abstract: Value models in society are often positioned as key factors in the formation of interpersonal interaction. In this regard, the process of forming a value model should be considered based on the pattern of social interaction. In cultural studies, as in other socio-humanities, such an internal branch of knowledge as cultural axiology was also formed. In general, cultural axiology is correlated with the implementation of the value approach as a general scientific approach. However, in cultural studies, this approach has its own specifics. The use of a value-based approach in cultural studies allows highlighting the inner side of the relationship between an individual and society. The scientific novelty of the study is determined by the structural content of the formation of values and their correlation with the practical values of the development of the social system. The authors show that the main importance is achieved through the interaction between the paradigm of social development and the expectations of the population in the process of spreading state or public ideology. The paper defines that the main goal remains to determine the possibility of adapting the social value model and the global cultural paradigm. The practical significance of the study is determined by the need to adapt post-structural social development and mitigate the transformation of the paradigm of social development in crisis socio-political periods.

Keywords: Culture, paradigm, structure, approach, society.

INTRODUCTION

The value approach in cultural studies should be specified by three preliminary remarks, because there are a significant number of theoretical developments, which differ depending on to which internal group within cultural studies a particular researcher belongs. And since different approaches, classifications and typologies of values, their main provisions date back to the classical period of existence of this science, it is necessary to first determine the structure of cultural knowledge, and in accordance with it to carry out a comparative analysis of values in different perspectives of this science. Therefore, the first preliminary remark to the presentation of material on value issues in cultural studies is the necessity to define stages and meta-paradigms in the development of cultural studies, as each of them has its own ideas about value and value space as such (Franklin, Mainelli and Pay 2014).

According to the meta-paradigmatic model of theoretical cultural studies, it is possible to divide cultural theories into two large groups along the lines of "classics – non-classics". In other words, their

identification of the five main meta-paradigms in theoretical cultural studies is possible through their attitude to classical theoretical cultural studies, acceptance or denial of its main provisions (Pongsakornrungrungsilp and Schroeder 2011). There are five meta-paradigms, of which the first group includes classical, neoclassical and postclassical meta-paradigms, and the second – non-classical and post-classical paradigms. Each of them had its own idea of values, their essence and varieties, which will be discussed below (William 2014). Add to this the division of cultural knowledge into "first", "second" and "third" cultural studies. In the authors' view, the "first" and "second" culturologies are two groups of G meta-paradigms, while proposing a "new turn in cultural studies" due to the more appropriate modernity of the "third" cultural studies, or everyday cultural studies (Hopp, Santana and Barker 2018).

The second preliminary remark concerns the levels of cultural analysis of values. Today (that is, in the era of globalisation) there are four levels of cultural analysis of the phenomena and processes of social life: the micro-level (with the main unit of analysis – the personality), the meso-level (aimed at studying a social group / community), class-type education), mega-level (the unit of analysis is humanity, which is in a situation of unfolding globalisation processes). According to this

*Address correspondence to this author at the Institute for Cultural Research of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine; Tel: + 380 44 235 7196; E-mail: chmil-hanna2@uohk.com.cn

hierarchy of levels, values at the meso-level of cultural analysis were studied (Haynes 2017). In this regard, the authors do not agree with the proposal for a three-dimensional division of values, proceeding from the three spheres of human life, which includes the sphere of personality, the sphere of the group and the social sphere, since, firstly, the authors consider the spheres of culture, politics, economics and the like the main, and secondly, this list of spheres is represented by spheres of different meanings. They propose to use the principle of differentiation of values based on the dualism "individualism-collectivism". This dimension is one of the main ones for constructing the essential characteristics of a society, and is also one of the dimensions of cultural differences between the national cultures of the world. In the value dimension, collectivist values combine values that correspond to the way of life in a team, community; individualistic – include values that characterise the interests of a particular individual, the essence of the human "I". But since statements of this kind are rather related to the classification or typology of values and their functions, this will be discussed below.

Finally, the third preliminary remark concerns the provision on the influence of social change on changes in values, which the authors also share. So, for example, the problem of social changes is important for the cultural understanding of values, because they form new value systems. In the context of rapid social changes, the "updated" system of value orientations does not always have time to form, because fundamental values remain unchanged, but their importance may decrease under the influence of giving weight to the declared values-goals, values-means, and "present" values. It is these temporary, situational values that perform the function of ensuring the perception of those transformations that society is striving for. The system of values is highlighted, which is based on the fundamental, situational values and values of the "present", which is another example of creative rethinking of axiological problems in modern cultural science. But the considerations should be supplemented as follows: the situation of the present is not only evidence of the dependence of changes in value systems due to social changes, but also a powerful reverse process of the influence of values on the transformation of society. So, this process of interdependence of values and social change is today interdependent (Martin and Capelli, 2018).

Thus, taking into account the above preliminary remarks, the authors begin to characterise the

interpretations of values first from the groups of theories along the line of the "classic" and its more modern modifications. It is worth starting with the developments of the recognised classic of cultural studies M. Weber, who was one of the first to consider the problems of values in cultural studies and gave them great social significance. He considered values as a historical phenomenon and believed that they are determined by the interest of the era. With the change of the era, they lose their strength and the values corresponding to it; they are being replaced by the values of another era. Thus, M. Weber considered historicity as the main feature of values, because they are only an expression of the general attitudes of their time. In his opinion, values affect not only the cognition and assessment of phenomena, but also determine the norms of human relationships, the way of social life, and also determine the impact on the nature of the culture of society, act not only as a motive for a human act, but also serve as fundamental norms of any kind of action. According to M. Weber, human life is associated with the need to constantly make a choice, which predetermines the system of values. The source of values is neither emotional consciousness, nor something supra-empirical, transcendental. They are phenomena arbitrarily projected by a person, a consequence of definitions that differ in their properties from those actions with the help of which consciousness comprehends reality and establishes truth.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In M. Weber, there is no sufficiently clear definition of the concept of value. However, the German cultural scientist understood values as generalised goals and means of achieving them, ensuring the integration of society and helping individuals to make a socially approved choice of their behaviour in vital situations. Quite well-known is his division of values into worldly and supreme values (Kutnjak Ivković, Peacock and Cajner Mraović 2020). The scientist defines worldly values as the direction of the interest of the era, and the supreme – as timeless, the implementation of which within the cultural limits has become independent of the implementation in time. The meaning of values, according to M. Weber, is especially important in real scientific activity. He formulates the principle of "freedom from value judgments", according to which scientific work in the field of social science should be free from any evaluative, timeless layers. Putting forward such a requirement, M. Weber was well aware that a scientist,

in principle, cannot but relate positively or negatively to certain social phenomena (Sun and Jiang 2000). However, in his opinion, he still must leave his own assessments and beliefs outside of science, otherwise they will affect the objectivity of scientific knowledge. Accordingly, M. Weber distinguishes between two acts – “correlation with value” and evaluation: if the first turns the individual impression into an objective and generally valid judgment, then the second does not at all lead beyond the bounds of objectivity. In his opinion, “it is true that the worldviews of different people constantly invade the sphere of our sciences, even our scientific argumentation, introducing a fog of uncertainty into them, as a result of this, the credibility of scientific arguments is assessed in different ways (even where it is a question of establishing simple causal connections between facts) depending on how the research results affect the chances of realising one's ideals, that is, the ability to fulfil certain desires increases or decreases” (Alcalde and Walsh-Bowers 1996).

Values are, first of all, ideals, “collective ideas”, which are the main “engines” of human behaviour and behind which there are real and acting collective forces. Civilisations are formed and based on great value ideals. This representative of classical cultural studies considers values as an element of a functioning social system (Jakes *et al.*, 2015). E. Durkheim attempted to compare the content of the dominant value concepts with the type of social system. For him, the question was how to see the origins of values in such ideals, which is a factor in the stable and normal functioning of the social organism. He noted that the birth of values is a social act, because society is the environment where values are created. Accordingly, each community offers or imposes a system of its values. The world of values with which humanity ultimately connected is, at the same time, the fruit of group and individual creativity. This world is conditioned by the reaction of the human consciousness to the environment or situation in which he finds ourselves (Peaks and Hayes 1999).

E. Durkheim in his works analysed the mutual influence of the value-normative systems of a person and society. In his opinion, the system of values of society is a set of value ideas of individual individuals, and, accordingly, “is objective already due to the fact that it is collective. Durkheim believes that “the scale of values is thus free from the subjective and volatile assessments of individuals. The latter find outwardly a permanent classification to which they have to adapt”

(Browning *et al.* 2017). The through external coercion: “We clearly feel that we are not the masters of our assessments, that we are bound and forced. We are connected by public consciousness”. In addition, Durkheim emphasised the need to build a hierarchy of values. He singled out such values: economic, moral, religious, aesthetic, metaphysical. The values learned from these systems act as individual and collective guidelines for people's actions (Salako 2010).

It should be stated that in the works of M. Weber and E. Durkheim there is no clear definition of the concept of “value”. On the other hand, a clear cultural definition of values is proposed in the works of American and Polish cultural scientists. They understand as value (social) any object that has empirical content available to members of a social group, as well as the meaning due to which it is or can be an object of action (Fernando and Cooley 2016). They also own the definition of values as more or less identified rules of behaviour, with the help of which the group maintains, regulates and disseminates the corresponding types of actions among its members. In the first case, in fact, any object that contributes to the satisfaction of human needs can act as a social value: house, clothing, food, etc. Considering the rules of behaviour (social norms) as social values (Booth and Skelton 2011), these norms are interpreted not as elements of the internal spiritual structure of an individual, but as some phenomena external to an individual, having a mandatory character and a certain empirical meaning and significance. Values are situational. Central to their theory is the concept of “social situation”, which includes both objectively existing social values and subjective attitudes (Skálén, Pace and Cova 2015).

Within the next meta-paradigm, namely the neoclassical one, consider the views of the American culturologist T. Parsons, who is considered a representative of the second generation of the classics of cultural studies. He is the founder of structural functionalism and considers values as the highest principles on the basis of which there is agreement both in small social groups and in society as a whole. Values, mainly of a moral-religious order, provide quality-appropriate moral norms that appeal to them, adding to them universally binding significance (Cauce 2007). Value, according to T. Parsons, is constructed on the basis of generally accepted ideas about the desired. Therefore, social values are generally accepted ideas about the desired type of social system – first of all, about society as seen by its own members.

According to Parsons, social values are the product of culture, or rather cultural tradition. For him, value is a kind of normative standard that determines the desired behaviour of the system relative to its environment without differentiating the functions of units or their particular situations. The value system exists in every social system as the highest level of the structure, values are specified through the restrictions imposed by the function and the situation. In the theory of T. Parsons, values perform the following main functions: serve as a basis for choosing from the available alternatives to the integration of social systems; determine the responsibility of the social actor for the consequences of their activities (Hashim and Tan 2018).

In his concept, T. Parsons absolutises the significance of value-normative regulations, which formed the basis of the “cultural approach” developed by him to the phenomena of social life, the essence of which is to explain the unification of individuals into social groups on the basis of a common system of values, which is expressed in the general certainty of norms, for general purposes of activity, in rituals and in other forms of human expression. According to T. Parsons, the value system simultaneously unites and divides people, contributing to the emergence of social classes, strata, ethnic groups, nations and peoples. It forms any “collective portrait” of these communities, determines their uniqueness, a difference from each other. What is acceptable to some communities may not be acceptable to others (Ellerbusch 2006).

Another representative of structural functionalism, R. Merton, after analysing the relationship between culture, structure and anomie, notes that culture requires a certain type of behaviour, which is hindered by the social structure. When cultural values, as the goals of human activity, coincide with institutional means, this indicates the stability of society and the normal functioning of its systems. The very same culture G. Merton defines as “an organised set of normative values that govern the behaviour that is characteristic of members of a particular society or group”. Anomia, however, occurs when “there is a serious discrepancy between the norms and goals of culture and the socially formed abilities of group members to act in accordance with them.” Thus, due to their position in the social structure of society, some people are unable to act according to normative values.

A special place in the value problems and analysis of sociocultural phenomena belongs to P. Sorokin, who

is called a representative of the second generation of classics, and also his teaching is placed in the classical meta-paradigm. His construction of integralist cultural studies as a science is based on the indivisible unity of an individual, society and culture. For him, sociocultural interaction is a unity of three aspects: personality as a subject of interaction; society as a set of persons interacting with each other; culture as a set of meanings, values and norms possessed by persons interacting with each other, and a set of objectifying carriers socialise and reveal these meanings.

None of these three aspects can be understood when viewed separately from each other. According to P. Sorokin, it is the value (the economic value of the land, the value of religion, science, education, music, democracy, life, health, etc.) that serves as the basis and foundation of any culture, is an indispensable aspect of all socio-cultural phenomena. In his opinion, each culture has its own axiological core. He distinguishes three types of cultural super-systems – sensual, ideational and idealistic (Marcelino *et al.* 2013). P. Sorokin believed that culture cannot develop for a long time on the same value foundation. The transition from one type of culture to another is accompanied by crises, breaking of old models and ideals, and the establishment of new ones. His famous work “Social and Cultural Dynamics” (1937-1941) draws attention to the fact that in the historical context, socio-cultural dynamics coincide with the values that were still developed by ancient Greek philosophy: values that are the product of mental activity are Truth; values of aesthetic pleasure – Beauty; values of social adaptation and morality – Good. Finally, the integrating function is fulfilled by the value of benefit. It is precisely any human activity that can be explained on the basis of these universal categories. In the context of social progress, an important role is played by the public consensus on the acceptance of certain values as criteria for progress. It is the public consensus on this issue that acts as a kind of filter that filters out secondary, insignificant or random criteria.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The implementation of cultural approaches to the macrolevel regulation of human behaviour is found in the works of the American cultural scientist and social anthropologist K. Kluckhohn, who defined values as “a conscious or unconscious idea of the desired, characteristic of an individual or a group of individuals, which determines the choice of goals (individual or group) with taking into account possible means and

methods of action". K. Kluckhohn has done great theoretical work to identify key values for comparing different cultures. The scientist identified three groups of cultural values: values concerning the place of a human in nature ("human and nature"); values relating to interpersonal relations ("human and human") and values relating to both the relationship between human and nature and interpersonal relations ("about human and about nature"). K. Kluckhohn believed that all cultures can be characterised by their inherent characteristics in these groups. Based on the analysis of scientific publications and the results of studies of five American cultures, the author made conclusions about what positions each culture occupies for the types of values allocated to it.

The ideas expressed by K. Kluckhohn found their logical continuation in the works of other American researchers. According to researchers, the nature of the values that are given preference forms the culture of a particular society and distinguishes it from other cultures. It is the order of preferences that is the basis for more visible cultural values, beliefs, norms, actions, and even for cultural heroes, rituals, songs. They also suggested that while society may have value preferences, there is a great deal of diversity within one culture, and all cultures will express all possible dimensions of values at certain times and by certain people.

Note that in the classification of cultural meta-paradigms, the concepts of K. Kluckhohn and his followers are not mentioned, obviously, because they are not representatives of "pure" cultural studies and their works most likely belong to the works of an interdisciplinary sort related to cultural studies. The same can be said about the concept of many other representatives of sciences related to cultural studies, whose theoretical positions and methodological tools, nevertheless, are actively used in their research by modern culturologists. So, for example, at the end of the 20th – beginning of the 21st centuries, the problem of values has acquired particular relevance in cross-cultural studies of management and business spheres. Considers values often as the core of a culture. Culture determines the characteristics of human behaviour and is "collective spiritual programming". Based on the research, which covered 117 thousand employees of the huge multinational company IBM in more than 70 countries around the world, a system of indicators was determined to assess intercultural differences (indices or measurements) that define culture. Among the main indicators are the following: "distance from power",

"isolation (individualism)", "masculinity", and "uncertainty avoidance".

It is important to emphasise that the methodology was created within the framework of one of the scientific paradigms of cultural studies – the paradigm of objectivism, based on the theoretical approach to the study of the values of personality and culture, developed in American cultural anthropology. Scientists working within this paradigm share the theoretical provisions that social reality exists objectively, regardless of individual ideas, social sciences are called upon to understand the social structure, to discover objectively existing social laws and patterns, quantitative natural-scientific methods are more objective and scientific (the paradigm is based primarily on the cultural studies of E. Durkheim). Developing in line with the objectivist paradigm, a cross-cultural approach to comparing the values of different cultures, they tried to determine the structure of the cultural value system and identify the components of this structure. In solving these problems, they relied on the theoretical postulates of American anthropologists, who considered the structure of the value system to be universal for all cultures. The empirical studies carried out showed that more than half (namely, 51%) of the cultural characteristics of workers are due to the geographical location of the country, therefore, national management models are different in certain regions of the world and are similar in countries located close to each other.

Despite the emergence of more modern and improved approaches to the study of values, the methodology proposed by the classification of cultures continues to remain popular in the scientific world and, especially, in the educational environment. The significance of the research is determined, first of all, by the fact that the components of the value structure were discovered not speculatively, but on the basis of an analysis of the results obtained in practice and processed using quantitative methods. The selected cultural universals should be considered objectively existing, reliable, which make it possible to more accurately study the value system of any culture.

The technique has significant heuristic possibilities, in particular, in the study of the values of individualism and collectivism. According to the indicator of individualism-collectivism, all cultures are divided into three groups: Eastern, for which collectivism is characteristic; Western with developed individualism; mixed or intermediate with varying degrees of collectivism and individualism.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The end of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st century is characterised as the era of globalisation, which has affected all countries of the world and caused truly revolutionary changes in the socio-humanitarian sciences, and among them had the greatest impact on cultural studies. Initially, researchers viewed globalisation as a positive process of penetration of the Western model of development, Western lifestyle and Western values, and only later began to pay attention to the contradictory nature of this phenomenon, to the collision of the process of globalisation with the processes of state building. Subsequently, on the basis of international empirical research and the emergence and spread of new phenomena, the term “globalisation”, firstly, began to be used in the plural (“globalisations”), which, secondly, marked a departure from Western models and recognition of the plurality of globalisations and theories in which they are analysed by modern researchers. As a result, using the logic of reasoning, it can be stated that globalisation (or subsequently globalisations), as the most important phenomenon of our time, is today equally successfully studied in all three sociologies – “first”, “second” and “third”, in two modern meta-paradigms – post-classical and post-non-classical.

In general, representatives of the “first” cultural studies of the positivist persuasion from the postclassical meta-paradigm focus on the characteristics of the post-industrial society, which acted as the immediate predecessor, base and basis of globalisation, and later on globalisation processes as predominantly objective and irreversible phenomena. They investigate the spread of globalisation in the spheres of economy, finance, trade, international relations, where the force of globalisation influences is greatest. This meta-paradigm also focuses on the fact that globalisation has changed the modern social structure, has led to the emergence of new rich and new poor on a global scale. The object of increased attention of this group of culturologists is the sphere of culture, where the influence of globalisation is experiencing a tangible rebuff from local cultures, the values of these local cultures and local identities.

So, in the theory of post-industrial society, the process of the beginning of global changes is analysed, primarily on the basis of information changes. Changes in society have covered all of its spheres – social structure (techno-economic sphere), political system

and culture. A new (post-industrial) society is defined as a society in whose economy the priority has shifted from the predominant production of goods to the production of services, research, organisation of the education system and improving the quality of life, in which the class of technicians has become the main professional group. New global changes require the approval of new value orientations, and in the final case – the transformation of the value system of modern society. The value priorities of the post-industrial society include knowledge and information. Knowledge, first of all theoretical, is a key element of theory, they shed light on various areas of experience, unite science and technology.

Information is a strategic resource of a post-industrial society, thanks to which society acquires a new meaning. The transition to a knowledge society is important civilisational progress that requires a new worldview, new value guidelines. Among these are maintaining order in all spheres of life, thoughtfulness of actions, adherence to appropriate rules of behaviour. For the researcher, post-industrial society is human-oriented, aimed at consolidating people in order to work for the benefit of all mankind. In a post-industrial society, the value worldview is aimed at protecting the environment, caring for people who need it, which is evidence of overcoming human egoism, models of rational behaviour aimed at competition and obtaining economic benefits. The idea of progress, personal freedom and creativity became the basis of social transformations.

The author of the theory of “three waves”, American cultural scientist A. Toffler, claims that modern society acquires the features of an information society due to the technological revolution, which is associated with the beginning of the computer era. The third wave gives rise to a new civilisation, which is significantly different from its predecessors, since the central element of the Third Wave is not land (agrarian revolution), labour or capital (technological revolution), but knowledge and information. Such transformation processes significantly affect the axiosphere. A. Toffler notes that all developed societies are experiencing a crisis of values. In support of his thoughts, the author gives meaningful arguments. First, values change very quickly compared to previous historical periods. If, for example, in the past an individual grew up in a society in which the system of values remained unchanged throughout his life, then today this is characteristic of isolated and technically backward societies. Secondly, the fragmentation of societies leads to a variety of

values, which is why it is difficult in progressive societies to come to an agreement on one issue or another. If earlier societies had a certain generally accepted set of values, understandable to everyone, then in the future, the futurologist notes, pluralism will push back the unity of views on the outskirts of civilisation. As a result, all social institutions will promote completely different values. A. Toffler's forecast came true: axiological barriers are increasingly becoming the cause of misunderstandings and conflicts, both at the institutional and international levels. The contradictory values, new consumer goods and services, affordable education and entertainment lead to the fact that a person makes his choice in a new way. He consumes lifestyles like his predecessors, who consumed ordinary goods, but were significantly limited in their choice.

The modern information society is characterised by readiness and striving for development, social change; high level of social mobility; a market mechanism for regulating the behaviour of an individual in society; rational development based on scientific knowledge and information; the dominance of criticism, rationalism and individualism in the social worldview; lack of specific prescriptions and prohibitions, erosion of morality and law. A. Toffler assigns an important role in his theory to the issues of education, since knowledge is that inexhaustible resource that can become the main factor in the development of modern human civilisation. Knowledge depends not only on economic growth, the level of well-being of society, but also on the quality of life in general. The future of everyone, notes A. Toffler, almost entirely depends on the education he received. People who must live in a super-industrial society will need new skills and abilities in three key areas: learning, communication, and choice. Thus, knowledge and creativity are the only things that are generally valuable in modern conditions, because the knowledge worker is the main asset of any organisation.

In the information society, more and more researchers emphasise the importance of personality-oriented education with an emphasis on cultural knowledge, the development of creative thinking based on the principles of humanism, democracy, and the priority of universal and personal values. It should be noted that the issue of the quality of higher education is becoming increasingly important today. They understand the quality of education as an integral conventional characteristic of the educational process and its results, expressing the degree of their

compliance with the expectations of the subjects of the educational process (from the individual to society as a whole), and note that the education that best meets the established and prospective requirements of all subjects of the educational process can be considered qualitative. process, takes into account the context of civilizational changes and modern world trends.

In the modern globalised world, the dominant development factor is not only information, but also the development of new technologies that can transfer information faster. Information turns from a means into an end that can radically change the "face" of society, its value system. A characteristic feature of modern society is the rapid development of information and communication technologies and, on their basis, global computer networks, which create a new dimension of social and virtual reality – a networked society. Spanish culture scientist M. Castells speaks about modern network-type communications that are created on the basis of the Internet. It is he who introduces the concept of "network society". In his opinion, a feature of modern society is not so much the domination of information, but the transformation of options for its use, when the leading role in society is acquired by global network structures, replacing traditional forms of relationships. Network structure is the complex of interconnected hubs. Specific content of each hub depends on a character of the specific network structure, which is discussed.

The networked society is global in nature due to the construction of network-type communication links at various levels – personal, professional, socio-political. In practice, virtual network structures cover all spheres of human life and are able to radically influence the development of both global and national systems. The creation of a global information (communicative) space leads to an increase in the amount and role of information, which is not knowledge as such, but communication, the operation of translating symbols. As a result, the substitution of objective and subjective reality with virtual reality. This, in turn, due to the organisational and spatial complexity of virtual networks, makes it difficult to study its value systems. M. Castells himself makes attempts to explain the nature of values in a networked society from the standpoint of institutionalism. In particular, for the subjects of the network economy, the ability to work autonomously and at the same time be its active agents is valued. Hence, flexibility, creativity, initiative and sociability are the key to successful adaptation of an individual to the conditions of a networked society.

However, the integration of values is opposed by the processes of disintegration and skepticism, which in the context stimulates a positive attitude towards national sovereignty, cultural identity, decentralisation of power, and protectionism. Under such conditions, the value picture acquires a mosaic character, because there are risks of chaos and the very existence of the idea. On the other hand, the process of social change that has embraced the countries is quite diverse in terms of assessments and results. This, in particular, paved the way for the formulation of the concept of social trauma. It is expedient to note here that the mosaic is inherent in both real-life value systems of the present and those theories and concepts in which this diversity is displayed.

Regarding the "second" cultural studies, or post-nonclassical meta-paradigm, it is in it that the most of the opponents of globalization are found. First of all, they emphasise the ambiguity of the "theory of globalization" itself, which "leads the world to discrimination", "new poverty", which turns people into outcasts, unable to fulfill basic civic responsibilities. Within the framework of their concept of "risk society", they characterise globalisation as a process of depoliticisation and deregulation of society, when completely new historical actors, such as transnational corporations, international and non-governmental organisations, whose interests and actions are very often not can be placed under public control. In a globalised world, a person becomes an unprotected bearer of the traditions of his culture, he has to be guided mainly by universal human values that are recognised by most people, while he needs to remain himself, preserve his personality and adhere to his own value attitudes. In the process of globalisation, the world becomes filled with pseudo-values, due to which it is not easy for a person to select for himself those values that would be truly significant for him.

In addition to plots related to critical assessments of the development of post-industrial society and globalisation, the post-non-classical meta-paradigm (that is, the "second" cultural studies) is characterised by the representation of theories and concepts of analysis of modern (newest, postmodern) society (more broadly, globalised humanity). In this meta-paradigm, first of all, the integrative paradigm and the postmodern paradigm are distinguished. However, the research framework does not allow to give a complete description of the entire variety of these theories. It is important to highlight those aspects that best reveal the place and role of values in the modern world. The

authors have identified those parts of the work of post-non-classical cultural studies that are considered the most significant in the context of the development of the chosen topic.

Social progress at the end of the 20th – beginning of the 21st century distinguished itself by cardinal changes, when the modern society, where production was the basis in society, was replaced by a postmodern society in which consumption becomes the leading "centre". The emergence of the phenomenon of "mass consumption" created the preconditions for the formation of the theory of the consumer society. An important point in understanding the processes of consumption is the thesis that consumption is conditioned by a certain system of values that exists in culture. In postmodern societies, the value context of consumption is presented through the prism of lifestyles and the analysis of consumption as symbolic exchange.

The link between lifestyle and values has opened the way for deeper segmenting of consumers. In marketing research, as a rule, the most significant value is used to assign consumers to the relevant market segments, combined with information of socio-demographic content. Consumers with a focus on intrinsic values (self-realisation, excitement, a sense of achievement, and self-esteem) have been shown to seek to control their lives by making independent decisions. Consumers with an outward orientation (sense of belonging, respect from others, safety) are more likely to align their purchasing behaviour with the majority opinion in society.

Consumer objects, both material and spiritual, are perceived by the individual not so much as objects that satisfy certain needs, but as signs behind which there is something more important to him – status in society, connections and success, prestige and fashion, and the like. They call the act of consumption "a systematic act of manipulating signs", because in modern conditions consumption is an act of creating a certain system of signs, intended for interpretation by other people. They note that objects that are never consumed in themselves (in their consumer value) are always manipulated objects as signs that distinguish or attach to one's own group, taken as an ideal standard, or separate from it and attach to a group with a higher status. Consequently, consumption is a kind of social communication process (the idea of relationships between people is consumed). From here there is no limit to consumption, because it goes far beyond only

the satisfaction of vital needs. Consumption in this process acquires the features of a social action included in social exchange as a communication process within a certain socio-cultural space, where status in society, communications and success, prestige and fashion are significant values.

The downside of consumption in modern society is the unification of consumer practices, which is referred to as the “process of McDonaldization”, when the principles applied in the organisation of fast-food restaurants begin to prevail in more sectors of society. McDonaldization is one of the hallmarks of a globalised society, introducing the same standards of service and behaviour, quality control, elements of corporate culture. Efficiency, accountability, predictability and control become the core values in this process. It is becoming more and more obvious that the consequence of cultural globalisation is not only a certain Westernisation (“McDonaldization”, “Cocacolonization” and similar synonyms), but also related phenomena of commodification, consumerisation of all aspects of life, export of “Western” values and standards to the “rest” the world, but also a new relationship between the global and the local (local, regional, national) in the cultural world.

On the other hand, the dominance of standard (standardised) models of consumer behaviour is becoming key elements of economic growth, the consequence of which is the dominance of consumerism as a trend focused on a constant increase in consumption in society. As a result, indiscriminate, irrational consumption of goods and services. Consumerism also carries its own system of values, when values of a hedonistic nature dominate at the top of consumption, aimed at satisfying personal, sometimes selfish, goals. In this regard, it is believed that consumption develops into consumerism, when material objects become an object of passion, a means of self-affirmation of a person, and even replace the desire for self-expression.

The value rethinking in the consumption system leads to an increase in social differentiation, individualisation and the existence of fashion, which changes many times during the life of one generation. Regarding the latter, the influence of the symbolic aspect of consumption increases, when the value is not the product itself, but the thing, the reaction, the impression that they cause in the consumer. Consumption becomes a marker of social status, reflecting a certain way of life of individuals from

unified, mass forms to sophisticated and elite ones. Along with this, in economically developed countries, the trend towards sustainable consumption is growing, which implies a change in consumer behaviour from unbalanced (non-ecological) forms to balanced, gentle and environmentally justified (the concept of balanced consumption). Such consumption is, first of all, consumption with the thought of future generations and is focused on the preservation and rational use of natural resources, protection of health and the environment. In the modern world, the value of green (ecological) goods is increasing, as well as an approach to a balanced attitude towards buying, various uses of already purchased things, and the like. A new concept of “measure” is being formed as a value capable of resisting unbalanced, lean consumption.

CONCLUSIONS

Problems of national security, security of human life and society acquire value-based content, which puts on the agenda the survival of the civilized world. The growth of uncertainty, conflicts and the like make scientists think about the nature of crisis phenomena and the priorities of the further development of mankind. One of the ways to overcome deep contradictions in society is a “value synthesis”, when old and new values are not necessarily in opposition to each other, but can create productive interaction in the mentality of many people and accordingly have a manifestation in their real behaviour. In developed societies, value change occurs rather due to a shift in emphasis from the values of duty and the acceptability of the value of self-development. Thus, traditional values do not disappear or are replaced, but only lose (not completely) their previous significance. In new social conditions, the latter can be revived in a specific way, which is clearly evidenced by the “value synthesis”.

Thus, the analysis carried out recorded the situation of the plurality of both the values of modernity and the multiplication of attempts at their cultural understanding. The problem of values is widely represented in all major varieties of cultural knowledge, and this reflects the multidimensionality and complexity of this socio-cultural phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- Alcalde, Judit and Richard Walsh-Bowers. 1996. “Community Psychology Values and the Culture of Graduate Training: A Self-Study”. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 24(3): 389–411.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02512028>

- Booth, Anny. L. and Norman Skelton. W. 2011. "There's a conflict right there": Integrating indigenous community values into commercial forestry in the Tl'azt'en First Nation". *Society and Natural Resources* 24(4): 368–383.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920902755390>
- Browning, Matthew H.E.M., Mark J. Stern, Nicole M Ardoin, Joe E. Heimlich, Robert Petty, and Cheryl Charles. 2017. Investigating the sets of values that community members hold toward local nature centers. *Environmental Education Research* 23(9): 1291–1306.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2016.1177713>
- Cauce, Ana Mari. 2007. "Bringing community psychology home: The leadership, community and values initiative". *American Journal of Community Psychology* 39(1-2): 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9096-1>
- Ellerbusch, Fred. 2006. "Brownfields: Risk, property, and community value". *Local Environment* 11(5), 559–575.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13549830600853486>
- Fernando, Felix N. and Dennis R. Cooley. 2016. "Attitudes toward shale oil development in western North Dakota: The role of place-based community values in attitude formation". *Journal of Rural Studies* 46: 132–146.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.06.008>
- Franklin, James C., Michael Mainelli, and Robert Pay., 2014." Measuring the value of online communities". *Journal of Business Strategy* 35(1): 29–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-04-2013-0027>
- Hashim, Kamarul F. and Felix B Tan., 2018. "Examining the determinant factors of perceived online community usefulness using the expectancy value model". *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, 20(2): 152–167.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JSIT-11-2016-0068>
- Haynes Writer, Jeanette. (2017). "Sustaining the essence: community values, knowledges, and ways of being". *Kappa Delta Pi Record* 53(4): 168–173.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2017.1369277>
- Hopp, Bobby, Arthur Santana, and Valerie Barker., 2018. "Who finds value in news comment communities? An analysis of the influence of individual user, perceived news site quality, and site type factors". *Telematics and Informatics* 35(5): 1237–1248.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2018.02.006>
- Jakes, Susan, Annie Hardison-Moody, Sarah Bowen, and John Blevins. 2015. "Engaging community change: the critical role of values in asset mapping". *Community Development* 46(4): 392–406.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2015.1064146>
- Kutnjak Ivković, Sanja, Robert Peacock, and Irena Cajner Mraović. 2020. "The role of organisational justice and community policing values in the model of external procedural justice in Croatia". *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 44(1–2): 47–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2019.1599972>
- Marcelino, José A.P., Luís Silva, Patricia V Garcia, Evere Weber, and António O. Soares., 2013. "Using species spectra to evaluate plant community conservation value along a gradient of anthropogenic disturbance". *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 185(8): 6221–6233.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-012-3019-9>
- Martin, Emeline and Sonia Capelli. (2018). "Place brand communities: from terminal to instrumental values". *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 27(7): 793–806.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-10-2017-1654>
- Peaks, Harold. E. and Sandra Hayes. 1999. Building roads in sync with community values. *Public Roads* 62(5): 7–14.
- Pongsakornrungrasit, Siwarit and Jonathan E. Schroeder. 2011. "Understanding value co-creation in a co-consuming brand community". *Marketing Theory* 11(3): 303–324.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408178>
- William Rosa., 2014. "Reflections on self in relation to other: Core community values of a moral/ethical foundation". *Creative Nursing* 20(4): 242–247.
<https://doi.org/10.1891/1078-4535.20.4.242>
- Salako, Solomon E. 2010. "Research ethics committees and community values: Devlin, Dworkin, Hart and beyond". *Medicine and Law* 29(1): 37–50.
- Skålén, Per, Stefano Pace, and Bernard Cova. 2015. "Firm-brand community value co-creation as alignment of practices". *European Journal of Marketing* 49(3–4): 596–620.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2013-0409>
- Sun, Li-the and Qi Jiang. 2000. "Community values according to the I-Ching". *International Journal of Social Economics* 27(1–2): 99–113.

Received on 16-10-2020

Accepted on 16-11-2020

Published on 07-12-2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.165>

© 2020 Chmil et al.; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.