THE STRUCTURE OF THE CULTURAL SYSTEM AND ITS RECURSIONS WITH SOCIETY, PSYCHE AND BODY/BODYHOOD IN CULTURAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS SCIENCE. PART 1 ("CULTURE IN CULTURE")

СТРУКТУРА КУЛЬТУРНОЇ СИСТЕМИ ТА ЇЇ РЕКУРСІЇ ІЗ СОЦІУМОМ, ПСИХІКОЮ Й ТІЛОМ/ТІЛЕСНІСТЮ В КУЛЬТУРНІЙ І СОЦІАЛЬНІЙ СИСТЕМОЛОГІЇ. ЧАСТИНА І («КУЛЬТУРА В КУЛЬТУРІ»)

Stryhul M.V.
Candidate of Sociological Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Faculty of International Relations,
National Aviation University

The article is devoted to the problem of recursions of culture and society as registers of the hierarchical tetracluster "culture-society-psyche-body". The concluding part of the article emphasizes that the structure of the cultural system at the two highest levels includes the recursion of culture in itself (culture in culture) and the recursion of society in culture. Centering and verticalizing elements are located at the indicated levels, which include centrators, missions, sets of identities, worldviews, orientations, hierarchies/heterarchies of values, status-role sets, and their corresponding habits.

It was noted that in the autopoiesis of the cultural system, the centering elements perform a value-stating (value-standardizing) function since their purpose is to preserve the historical time-space and meanings of the macro community regardless of the changing circumstances of the environment. At the same time, the centrators are presented with absolute values that are archived in axiospheres (spheres of value consciousness) and the production, reproduction, retransmission of which in the subjective aspect is connected with cultural elites.

It was established that the selective internalization (inculturation) of absolute values as components of the centrator by elite and mass groups allows them to constitute their subjectivity based on the formation of sets of identities and understanding of their higher cultural and historical assignments in the macro community – missions. The completeness/incompleteness of the "staffing" of value consciousness at the level of centers, missions, and sets of identities can serve as one of the criteria for distinguishing between subjectivity/non-subjectivity and elite/mass groups.

It is noted and emphasized that the centering elements outline the possibilities of verticalization in the cultural system. Related to verticalization is the so-called middle censorship, which ensures the transcendence of individual and collective subjects. In transcendence, the key role belongs to worldview as an image-picture of the world, the "cartography" of which are categories. Worldview as a transcended image of the world allows individual and collective subjects to determine the continuum (world order) and the corresponding trajectories of movement in it. Relative values (or simply value orientations) determine the time budgets of movement within certain activities. Time budgets invested by certain subjects in certain types of activity depend on the location of this or that value.

Attention is drawn to the fact that hierarchical time budgets corresponding to certain types of activity correlate with status-role hierarchies that determine the importance of certain groups of people in the social system, i.e., social stratification. Inculturation and socialization of status-role hierarchies in the mental system of a person is determined through habits – sets of routines-customs that support the above elements of the cultural system in the form of certain time-space "ties" – rituals, habits, traditions, conventions-stereotypes, etc.

Key words: centrators, missions, identities, worldviews, absolute values, relative values, orientations, hierarchies/heterarchies of values, status-role hierarchies, social habits.

Статтю присвячено проблемі рекурсій культури та суспільства як регістрів ієрархічного тетракластеру «культура-соціум-психіка-тіло». У висновковій частині статті наголошено на тому, що структура культурної системи на двох найвищих рівнях охоплює рекурсію культури в самій собі (культуру в культурі) та рекурсію соціуму в культурі. На зазначених рівнях розміщуються центруючі та вертикалізуючі елементи, до яких відносяться центратори, місії, набори ідентичностей, світогляди, спрямованості, ієрархії/гетерархії цінностей, статусно-рольові набори та відповідні їм габітуси.

Відзначено, що в аутопоейзисі культурної системи центруючі елементи виконують ціннісно-статизуючу (ціннісно-стандартизуючу) функцію, оскільки їх призначенням є збереження історичного часо-простору та сенсів макроспільноти безвідносно до мінливих обставин оточення. При цьому центратори є представленими цінностями-абсолютами, які архівуються в аксіосферах (сферах ціннісної свідомості) і продукування, відтворення, ретрансляція яких в суб'єктному аспекті пов'язана із культурними елітами.

Констатовано, що вибіркова інтерналізація (інкультурація) цінностей-абсолютів як складників центратору елітними та масовими групами дозволяє конституювати їх суб'єктність на основі формування наборів ідентичностей та розуміння своїх вищих культурно-історичних призначень в макроспільноті – місій. Повнота/неповнота «укомплектованості» ціннісної свідомості на рівні центраторів, місій та наборів ідентичностей може слугувати одним з критеріїв розрізнення суб'єктності/безсуб'єктності та елітних/масових груп.

Відзначено та наголошено, що центруючі елементи окреслюють можливості вертикалізації в культурній системі.

Ключові слова: культурна система, соціальна система, інкультурація, соціалізація, інтерналізація, центратор, місії, ідентичності.

Formulation of the problem. The interrelationships between culture, society, psyche and body/bodyhood in their recursive sense remain an under-researched issue. For sociology, the heuristic potential of neo-functionalist recursion theory in understanding the cross-cutting interpenetration of the cultural, social, psychic, and bodily-organismic is a kind of gap that can be partly explained by interdisciplinary and interdisciplinary boundaries within the positivist understanding of science, and partly by the rejection of integrality concepts with too high a level of speculation that brings science closer to philosophy.

The psyche as a system contains the presence of culture, society, and the body/ corporeality, and thus is subject to inculturation, socialisation, and somatisation as recursive influences from culture, society, and the body. On the other hand, culture, society and the body are subject to psychification and contain isomorphic mental structures and their corresponding functionality, which are "representations" of the psyche. The scientific literature on sociology and socio-humanitarian studies contains a fairly large number of studies that allow for a fragmented understanding of the interactions between culture and society (sociology of culture, sociology of art), society and psyche (social psychology), body and psyche (psychology of body consciousness, psychosomatics), society and body (sociology of corporeality, visual sociology). At the same time, sociology lacks theoretical models that would facilitate the conceptualization of the cross-cutting interactions between culture, society, psyche, and body/bodyhood.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The theoretical foundations of the article are set out in a number of works by authors whose topics and issues are related to various psychological trends (systems of psychological theorizing), whose representatives used a number of concepts with a common semantic field to describe and analyze culture and society, in particular "censorship", "superego" (in the orthodox psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud); (neuro)logical levels (spirituality, mission, identity, values and beliefs in the theories and practices of neuro-linguistic programming by G. Bateson and R. Dilts); the higher unconscious (super-unconscious) in R. Asagioli's psychosynthesis; knowledge as social constructs of the community in the social constructionism of K. Gergen and R. Harre; the neo-Jungian theory of centrality of E. Neumann, based on the understanding of centrality as "the innate tendency of the whole to create the unity of its parts and synthesis into systems...through which the whole becomes a self-creative, expanding system"; M. Rokic's theory of instrumental and terminal values; theories of social identity by E. Erikson, M. Kozlovets and L. Smokova, etc. [1–20].

The theoretical foundations of the study are represented not only in sociology but also in inter-disciplinary studies, including social psychology, social philosophy, and philosophy of culture, the conceptual and categorical apparatus of which is facilitated, first of all, by the analysis of the highest axiostasis of the cultural system in its relation to the psyche and society and the mechanisms of autopoiesis and recursion, which in the author's model cover the tetracluster "culture-society-psychic-body". In particular, we are talking about the theory of time-space rotations (S. Krymsky, Y. Pavlenko), T. Parsons' structural functionalism, and N. Luhmann's neo-functionalist theory of social systems [3; 14; 17].

The main material. The interrelationships between culture, society, psyche, and body/bodyhood in their recursive sense remain an under-researched issue. For sociology, the heuristic potential of neo-functionalist recursion theory in understanding the cross-cutting interpenetrations of the cultural, social, psychic, and bodily-organismic is a kind of gap that can be partly explained by interdisciplinary and interdisciplinary boundaries within the positivist understanding of science, and partly by the rejection of integralist concepts with too high a level of speculativeness that brings science closer to philosophy.

The psyche as a system contains the presence of culture, society, and the body/corporeality, and thus is subject to inculturation, socialization, and somatisation as recursive influences from culture, society, and the body. On the other hand, culture, society and the body are subject to psychification and contain isomorphic mental structures and their corresponding functionality, which are "representations" of the psyche. The scientific literature on sociology and socio-humanitarian studies contains a fairly large number of studies that allow for a fragmented understanding of the interactions between culture and society (sociology of culture, sociology of art), society and psyche (social psychology), body and psyche (psychology of body consciousness, psychosomatics), society and body (sociology of corporeality, visual sociology). At the same time, sociology lacks theoretical models that would facilitate the conceptualisation of the cross-cutting interactions between culture, society, psyche and body/bodyhood. The purpose of the article is to build a descriptive and analytical scheme of recursive interactions between culture and society as registers of the hierarchical tetracluster "culture-society-psychic-body".

The article is devoted to the problem of recursions of the cultural system in its higher axiostasis.

As already noted, culture, society, psyche, and body/corporeality, according to the author's understanding, which follows from the neo-functionalist methodology, form a hierarchical tetracluster and are in recursive interrelationships, which means their autopoiesis in themselves and

Table 1
Recursions of culture in culture and society in culture

Levels of the cultural system	Structural elements	Functional load
Культура в культурі	Centres, missions, sets of identities	Setting axiostasis (centring)
Society in culture	Worldviews, orientations, value hierarchies, status-role sets and habituses	Setting hierarchies (cultural hierarchisation)

subordinate registers. Culture is the highest register of sense-producing, value-standardizing and normative-regulatory content about society, psyche, and body/ corporeality, which recurs in itself and creates corresponding isomorphs/isofunctionals in society, psyche, and body/ corporeality [6, p. 65].

The recursions of culture in itself include, according to the logic outlined in the first article, four sub-registers with corresponding elements. The highest (centering) sub-register of culture, called "culture in culture", includes a centre, a mission, and a set of identities. The two intermediate registers (verticalizing and ordinalising), which correspond to "society in culture" and "psyche in culture", include worldviews, hierarchies/heterarchies of values, orientations, and habitus (society in culture) and character, social scripts and norms (psyche in culture). The relationship between the registers and elements can be represented in the following table.

Culture within culture

The centrator (in the previous author's version – attractor [8, p. 92–123]) has a complex structure in the form of a hierarchy of subordinate systems of value consciousness (axiosphere), the meanings of which can be selectively and fragmentedly internalized by the psyche of an individual/community. These value systems are represented by religions, philosophies, ideologies, systems of social morality, law, and art. In the most general sense, these "funds of value-absolutes" have different levels of closure/openness, depending on the content of these values and the extent of their cultural internalization (inculturation).

However, regardless of the content and scope of the absolute values, they have a psycho-formative value, as they influence the historicity of time for both the community and individuals. The center determines what dominates time and what value "axes" it revolves around. These axes have different names in different conceptions of socio-humanitarian studies.

One group of authors (e.g., S. Krymsky and Y. Pavlenko) calls them time-turns, another (E. Ukhtomsky) – "chronotopes", and the third – time dominants [3, p. 30–66]. The most success-

ful concept, in the author's opinion, describing the elements of the centraliser as a hierarchy of axiosphere is the concept of "values-absolutes", which was used by one of the representatives of neo-Kantianism, G. Rickert [18].

The values-absolutes are represented in the axiosphere listed below and are endowed with self-sufficient meaning as timeless intrinsic values. S. Eisenstadt [9, p. 60–111] comprehensively denoted the reality of the values of absolutes by the term "sacred" ("sacred"). Therefore, in the logic of the researcher, which is fully shared by the author of this article, the centrator denotes the images of value-absolutes that are components of various axiosphere (spheres of value consciousness – religions, philosophies, ideologies, systems of social morality, and art) and are comprehensively covered by the concept of the "sacred" ("sacred"), which is separate from the values-relatives (these values are comprehensively covered by the concept of the "profane") and determines its ("profane") meaning and significance.

The center as an image/images of absolute (sacred) reality in personal or community psychic internalization is often an "absolute reality" only nominally. The individual values-absolutes of the centrator, in simpler terms, often represent several meanings that are timeless, therefore, do not undergo any changes over time, are immobilized and static in the value consciousness of a person/ community to the changing world for various reasons.

Table 2
Types of centres and their content [6, p. 85–86]

Type of centrepiece	Content of centrepiece
Noocentric (spiritualistic)	Image/images of spiritual (spiritual reality), which is outside of consciousness (superconscious spiritual reality)
Cosmocentric and sociocentric	Images of social reality
Anthropocentric (psychocentric)	Images of people and mental reality
Somatocentric (naturocentric)	Images of physical (organismic) reality

For this reason, communities and individuals may hold certain meanings or fragments of these meanings in a "sacred" place, which often have nothing to do with either the sacred or the absolute. For example, some people have learned several moral guidelines since childhood, such as "to be as well-mannered and reserved as your grandfather"; for others, it may be fragments of communist ideology and ideas of universal equality in the redistribution of property; someone may unconsciously imitate a famous film character from con-

temporary films because they like her elegance and beauty, etc. The time of people/social groups in these different examples will revolve around these images so that they will center their activity around them.

The centring of a person's/community's activity around the time span will determine its meaning throughout life, or the purpose of life – the mission. The mission is a strategy for the life of an individual/group of individuals that determines the value purpose of their activity. From the functional point of view, the mission is the practical embodiment of the image of the Absolute reality (which, as we have already understood, can often consist of conventions, relations, dubious values, etc.), about which the community/person defines itself as a subject. Subjectivity is constituted through the mission, however, the latter is perceived by the majority in a selective and fragmented way.

Awareness of the mission is common for elite groups, but in the context of the fragmented formation of the central government, it is marked by one-sidedness, if at all. In addition, due to the multiplicity of elites, mission awareness also becomes multiplicity. This also leads to limitations of the subjectivity itself, and thus to the possibility of its reliance (disposition) and opposition.

Missions as strategic imperatives (in E. Neumann's terminology – "centroversions") [15, p. 46–64; 100, 112, 116–156] of activity determine the cultural and historical metaprogramme of the community/individual because it is through this cultural and historical metaprogramme (or simply the program of life activity) that the structure of a set of identities becomes clear. In this set of identities, which is built from the most significant activity vector in terms of time, the (self-)definition of the meanings with which the subject identifies himself or herself takes place. This selective (self-)identification with meanings makes it possible to communicate with different communities both consciously and unconsciously and thus makes communication possible.

Continuity itself characterizes time-space, so any identity in the content aspect is a continuum (time-space), or the unity of a significant time of continuous reproduction of subjectivity. In the psychic and psychological sense, all identities are maintainers of stability in a changing and chaotic living environment, time-space constants.

However, in the existing set of identities, there is a central (meta)identity of the highest level, which sets the hierarchy of continua (time-space continuities). A community or an individual can stay in certain spaces for a longer or shorter period. The length of this time of continuous stay in these spaces determines the place of a particular identity in the hierarchy of identities and, accordingly, its time and space possibilities.

Such time- and space-tasking possibilities are lost in circumstances of loss of hierarchy in a set

Table 3

Key types of identities, their content and hierarchy

Types of identities		Content
Value and macro-group identities (macro-identities)	Religious Philosophical and worldview Ideological Moral Legal (legal) Artistic Racial and anthropological Ethnic National (national-territorial) Political	Determine the time-spaces of value consciousness and macro-communities identified with it (continents, macro-regions, ethnic groups, nations, states)
Meso-identities	Social Professional	Define time-spaces of social and professional communities hierarchised or heterarchised by various characteristics (gender, age, professional and educational, economic and property, etc.) depending on the type of society
Micro-identities	Informal micro-communal Family Gender	Define time-spaces of social micro-communities, hierarchised or heterarchised on various grounds

of identities, when instead of their hierarchy, a heterarchy is formed, hence, a side-by-side relationship instead of a "higher/lower" relationship in terms of significance. In the author's understanding, a set of identities (in the form of a hierarchical or non-hierarchical set) consists of value identities, or top-level identities, meso-identities, and micro-identities. Their correlation can be presented in the form of the following table.

Identities as internalized and fragmented-appropriated meanings allow us to simultaneously define the subject based on understanding his/her self-references (systems of meanings in the form of axiosphere and communities with which he/she identifies/identifies) and, at the same time, to determine the circle of subjects opposite to him/her (counter-subjects) with whom he/she disidentifies/de-identifies.

In connection with the above, N. Luhmann notes that systems that operate in the medium of

meaning can and even must distinguish between self-reference and other-reference; and they do so in such a way that the actualization of self-reference is always accompanied by the actualization of other-reference, and, at the same time, in the course of the actualization of other-reference, self-reference is necessarily set as the corresponding other side of the distinction.

One cannot but agree with the author in the aspect that "any forming in the medium of meaning must be carried out about the system, regardless of whether self-reference or other-reference is currently emphasized. Only this distinction makes possible the processes that are usually called learning, system development, or evolutionary construction of complexity, which allows us to proceed from two constitutive semantic, but extremely different in their operations, mental and social systems, which reproduce themselves through consciousness or through communication to generate certain initial grounds for distinguishing between self-reference and other-reference, but, despite this, always relate to each other through transmitted or actualized other-reference" [14, p. 26].

The construction of a hierarchical matrix of identities expresses the tendency of the system to move from heteroreferential (environmentally and environmentally dependent) to autoreferential and autopoietic self-reflection, which consists in recursive interaction in the matrix (set) of identities and parallelism of their semiosis [6].

Identities interact with certain components of the hub through constant identification, since only such identification makes it possible to maintain recursion and thus refract in the mission. At the same time, the mission, by maintaining the value pattern of all identities, recurs to all other identities as a kind of submission.

Value identities and community macro-identities are the results of a more or less complete/fragmented identification of a person/community with the relevant cultural and/or social meanings of religious, philosophical, ideological, ethnic, political, etc. content, which at the level of life of a person and community allow the mission to be deployed as a value-exemplary fullness of life fulfilment in a set of real time-space life fulfilments. For example, a Christian at the level of his or her own mission can constantly identify with Christ as the Absolute, which means the realisation of his or her mission as the suffering Christ, who conquers death by his or her death in order to have eternal life. A philosopher who spiritually practices a certain worldview (since philosophy is a spiritual and practical form of consciousness) must demonstrate examples of behavioral adherence to his or her philosophy. An identifier of a particular ideology may consciously and/or behaviourally demonstrate his or her commitment to ideological values of a particular content, etc. At the same time, consistent identification with value identities in the postmodern era and simulacra is becoming less and less likely and is being replaced by all kinds of linguistic identity games, which, of course, have no equivalent in spiritual practice.

Identification with the respective identities can occur both consciously and unconsciously. Some identities (in particular, value identities – religious, philosophical, ideological, and meso-identities – social (political), professional, etc.) require conscious and volitional efforts, and appropriate forms of training (mentoring, tutoring, etc.) to master them, while others (for example, family and kinship identities and microgroup (familial) identities close to them) are mastered unconsciously and latently.

At the same time, the identities accentuated in behaviour form the persona of the individual and the community as a series of "hardenings" that are identifiable and, therefore, subject to a cultural, social and psychological diagnosis. In social psychology, such "hardenings" are usually defined as heterostereotypes (images of others in the minds of certain communities). In the context of our study, we note that any stereotypes are fragments of the respective identities and their simplifications. At the same time, these simplifications at the conscious and behavioural levels refer to the respective identities and allow them to be identified.

The formed set of identities as a lower substructure of culture within culture, or in the author's modified-modernized terminology of S. Freud, of higher censorship, is hierarchized as a hierarchy of images, in which the world-forming image of the world, worldview, that is, the identity of the highest level of generalization (generality), takes its place. It is this identity that forms the boundaries of the image of the world as a space-time (continuum), defined in the mission through constant efforts aimed at centering, and thus bringing missions into line with the centers. The boundaries of the world image in culture are determined by the society or societies in which certain models of cultural and social world orders are formed through sets of identities. Thus, the worldview as an element of the cultural system is no longer a recursion of culture itself, but a recursion of society in culture, since the cultural and social order in its extra-social existence is unimaginable.

Conclusions. The structure of the cultural system at the two highest levels includes the recursion of culture in itself (culture in culture) and the recursion of society in culture. At these levels, there are centering and vertically aligned elements, such as centres, missions, and sets of identities. In the autopoiesis of a cultural system, the centralizing elements perform a value-stabilizing (value-standardising) function, since their purpose is to preserve the historical time-space and meanings of the macro-community regardless of the changing

circumstances of the environment. At the same time, centralizers are represented by values-absolutes that are archived in axiosphere (spheres of value consciousness) and whose production, reproduction, and retransmission in the subjective aspect is associated with cultural elites.

The selective internalization of values-absolutes as components of the centralizer by elite and mass groups allows for the constitution of their subjectivity based on the formation of sets of identities and understanding of their higher cultural and historical purposes in the macro-community – missions. The completeness/incompleteness of the value consciousness at the level of centres, missions and identity sets can serve as one of the criteria for distinguishing between subjectivity/non-subjectivity and elite/mass groups.

The centring elements outline the possibilities of verticalization in the cultural system. Related to verticalization is the so-called middle censorship, which ensures the transcendence of individual and collective subjects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Бистрицький Є., Пролєєв С., Білий О. Національна ідентичність та громадянське суспільство. Київ : Дух і літера, 2018. 464 с.

2. Козловець М.А. Феномен національної ідентичності: виклики глобалізації : монографія. Житомир : Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2009. 558 с.

3. Кримський С.Б., Павленко С.Б. Цивілізаційний розвиток людства. Київ : Фенікс, 2007. 316 с.

4. Луман Н. Поняття цілі і системна раціональність: щодо функції цілей у соціальних системах / пер. з нім. М. Бойченко, В. Кебуладзе. Київ : Дух і літера, 2011. 336 с.

5. Романенко Ю.В., Святненко І.О., Зінченко А.А. Візуалізації в медійно-комунікаційному просторі: соціо-системологічний підхід. Київ : Видавничо-поліграфічний центр Інституту міжнародних відносин, 2014. 458 с.

6. Етнічні ідентичності в дзеркалі тілесності та практик харчування : монографія / Ю.В. Романенко, І.О. Святненко, А.О. Поцелуйко, А.Ю. Тащенко, Ю.Ю. Мєдвєдєва. Київ : Вид-во ДУТ, 2015. 460 с.

7. Erikson Erik H. Identity: Youth and Crisis. NEW YORK-LONDON, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1968. 336 p.

8. Bourdieu Pierre. Forms of Capital: General Sociology. Volume 3: Lectures at the Collège de France 1983–84 Polity Press. 2021. 450 p.

9. Eisenstadt S. Revolution and the Transformation of Societies. A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. London, 1978. 294 p.

10. Fichter Joseph H., Milton Rokeach. Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Jan. Wiley, 1970. URL: https://doi.org/10.2307/1384840.

11. Freud S. The interpretation of dreams. Part I., S.E. 4. 1900. P. 1–338.

12. Freud S. The interpretation of dreams. Part II., S.E. 5. 1900. P. 339–625.

13. Laplanche Jean, Pontalis Jean-Bertrand. Id. The Language of Psychoanalysis. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge. 2018. URL: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/The_Language_of_Psychoanalysis.html?id=PsvZpv0ZRw0C&redir_esc=y.

14. Luhmann N. Einfuhrung in die Systemtheorie. Heidelberg : Carl-Auer[de], 2002. 360 p.

15. Neumann E. Depth Psychology and a New Ethic. Shambhala; Reprint edition, 1990. 168 p.

16. Neumann E. 2The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype Translated by Ralph Manheim Foreword by Martin Liebscher. 2015. 624 p.

17. Talcott Parsons. The Concept of Society: The Components and Their Interrelations. T. Parsons. Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice-Hall. 1966. P. 5–29.

18. Rickert Heinrich. Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft, 6th and 7th expanded editions, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/Archives/Win2020/entries/heinrich-rickert/.

19. Smokova L. Social group identity and acculturation strategies of people from immigrant backgrounds: an interaction perspective. Kassel University Press GmbH c/o VUZF University: Sofia, 2013. P. 180–202.

20. Smokova L. Acculturation process and ethnic identity of Immigrants in Germany. *International Scientific Journal «Diogen Psychology».* 2016. № 24 (1). 2016. P. 33–44.