



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

HOMENAJE A FRANCISCO JOSÉ
FRANCISCO CARRERA

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número 3

Julio / Septiembre

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Europa del Este

Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno

Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez

Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo

Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Rumyana Atanasova Popova

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa

Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal

Centro de Estudos Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el
Deporte, Cuba*

Dra. Noemí Brenta

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel

Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik

Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec

INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant

Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro

Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca

Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo

Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez

Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio

Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

**REVISTA
INCLUSIONES**
REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia
Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA
EDITORIAL**

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques
Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez
Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

**RESEARCH OF THE FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL
OF WORLD VIEW SETTINGS AT A YOUNG AGE**

Dr. Oksana Kononenko

Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8676-7410>
oksana.kroshka@gmail.com

Dr. Anatoliy Kononenko

Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5583-9036>
anatoliy.kononenko@gmail.com

Dr. Viktoriia Stynska

Vasyl Stefanyk Prekarpathian National University, Ukraine
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0555-3205>
svt9@ukr.net

Dr. Oleksandra Kachmar

Vasyl Stefanyk Prekarpathian National University, Ukraine
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2002-4603>
Ooleksandra75@ukr.net

Dr. (C) Liubov Prokopiv

Vasyl Stefanyk Prekarpathian National University, Ukraine
ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8661-510X>
prokopiv0304@gmail.com

Dr. Halyna Katolyk

Lviv State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine
katolyk@hotmail.com
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2169-0018>

Dr. Ihor Popovych

Kherson State University, Ukraine
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1663-111X>
ihorpopovych999@gmail.com

Fecha de Recepción: 20 de marzo de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 04 de mayo de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 20 de mayo de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2020

Abstract

The purpose of the empirical study is to construct the factor structure of *the model of world view settings* and to establish peculiar features of the formation of *world view settings* in the youth period. *World view settings* are important elements in shaping the formation of the educational process. Research methods: test methods with standardized questionnaires and factor analysis. The structure of the model of world view systems was determined by factor analysis. The most significant interrelations of world view settings and the studied variables were established at the level ($p \leq 0.01$; $p \leq 0.05$). A model of *the world view settings* of personality attitudes was developed, combining five factors (72.43%): F 1 “The Meaning of Life”; F 2 “Anxiety”; F 3 “Aggressiveness”; F 4 “Spiritual values / material values” and F 5 “Friendship”. The data obtained give an objective understanding of the psychological features of the world view settings of adolescents. It is expedient to operationalize the received knowledge in training and psycho-corrective activities.

Keywords

Consciousness – Self-Consciousness – Personality – The meaning of life

Para Citar este Artículo:

Kononenko, Oksana; Kononenko, Anatoliy; Stynska, Viktoriia; Kachmar, Oleksandra; Prokoviv, Liubok; Katolyk, Halyna y Popovych, Ihor. Research of the factor structure of the model of world view settings at a young age. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num 3 (2020): 98-116.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



Introduction

The problem of consciousness and self-consciousness has been of interest to mankind for many centuries. Its studies have been engaged in philosophers, beginning with ancient philosophy and ending with modern studies. Considerable attention has been paid to the study of consciousness and self-consciousness in theology, psychology and psychiatry. The diversity and complexity of the studied phenomena, the differences in the forms of manifestation, the multiplicity of components and functions led to the formation of different methodological approaches to the analysis of the subject of study. One such approach is to research the mental states of the human mind, its characteristics, functions and interrelations. This approach aims at exploring the phenomenon of consciousness through the various states in which it may reside¹.

The reasons for the formation of world view settings may be different factors. Significant factors include mother tongue, the environment of adulthood, upbringing and education of a person, his/her experience in acquaintance with other cultural traditions, as well as the experience of direct interaction with the sphere of spiritual, individual and collective unconscious². The relevance of addressing the outlined problems of *worldview formation* of a person is dictated by the complexity of the processes that are currently taking place in the dimensions of the study of social consciousness. As with all the turning points of history, the present day confronts man with the fundamental problems of his being. This activates a worldview search aimed at developing such foundations and *world view settings* that would be appropriate for a new stage of social development.

Literature review

There is no single precise definition of the term “*worldview settings*” in reference, encyclopedic or specialized literature. Quite often, this term is used as a synonym for the word “*outlook*”, is used in connection with the definitions of “*value*”, “*orientation*”, “*settings*”, and is reduced to the vision and attitude of man to the surrounding world³. It is also used in the context of the classification of types of worldviews, as a general system of views of the definition, for example, a “*theocentric worldview setting*” or “*anthropocentric worldview setting*”, although, in fact, these phenomena would be more appropriate to call *worldviews understanding*⁴. Researcher Yu. Shaigorodsky in his work “Worldview Systems: The Need for Synthesis”⁵ does not divide such definitions as “*worldview settings*” and “*worldview systems*”. He reduces these terms to the notion of a stable value system of a defined cultural environment. In V. Tsvirkun’s scientific research, *the worldview settings* are presented as:

“The constant, stabilizing link of the world view of a person ... they play a decisive role in the worldview of the individual ... experienced and

¹ O. I. Kononenko, “Theoretical approach to the implementation of the most important psychological characteristics”, Herald Odessa National University. Psychology, Vol: 16 num 7 (2011): 115-123.

² O. I. Kroshka, “Self-recognition is a form of emotional and social inclusion on the most advanced stages of ontogenetic development”. Herald Odessa National University. Psychology, Vol: 15 num 4 (2006): 117-212.

³ I. G. Mysyk, “Worldview installations of postmodernism”, Revista de Stiințe Socioumane, num 2 Vol: 24 (2013): 48-55.

⁴ L. N. Harchenko, “The modern concept of natural history: a course of lectures (Moscow-Berlin: Direct Media. 2015).

⁵ Yu. Shaigorodsky, “Svitoglyadny systems: the need for synthesis”, Political management, num 1 (2003): 37-48.

conscious state of being, active attitude to the world ... one of the most essential elements of *worldview consciousness*, human self-consciousness ... they are a basic factor in its development and realization, significantly determine the place of ideological consciousness in the system of human worldview”⁶.

That is, the researcher describes the degree of significance that *worldviews settings* play for the individual, for his or her views on the world and himself/herself.

According to researcher P. Makuton, *worldview settings*:

“Directing the vital activity of the individual, giving it energy impulses ... they are a factor in the development and improvement of human culture ... A *worldview setting* defines *worldview stereotypes* or paradigms, which, in turn, affect the whole meaningful coloration of the life of most people”⁷.

The researcher described only one of the characteristics of this complex term, although the intention is to describe the definition.

What, then, is meant by “*world-view settings*” that defines this notion? We should start by analyzing the components of this definition.

Therefore, *the world view* is a system of views of the world and the place of man, society and humanity in it. It reflects the attitude of the person to the world and himself, as well as the basic life positions of people, their ideals, and principles of activity, values and their corresponding views. That is, *worldview* determines how a person perceives the environment and treats it.

Formation of *worldview* is gradual as the individual grows older. It is formed initially in the form of subjectively unconscious practical social relations that unite feelings, desires, aspirations, motivations. Later, on the basis of primary experience, under the influence of education and received practical training, it is transformed into a certain internal scheme, structure of behavior, and at this level the worldview is already partially objectively defined. In adolescence and teenage years, based on an internal need for self-determination, *worldview* is formed through the sphere of reflection, self-consciousness and introspection, which complement the worldview with ideals, principles, goals and values⁸. That is, the period of adolescence is the stage at which the most important components of the *worldview* are formed and on which all life spheres will depend in the future. In the context of the disclosing of the subject of study, the scientific interest is the study of *responsibility*⁹, *social desirability*¹⁰, *perfectionism of youth*¹¹. So, this is the age

⁶ V. M. Tsvirkun, Formed of its ownoglyadnyh installations of an individual age of life. Candidate degree (Kyiv: KSU, 2001), 145.

⁷ P. Ya. Makuton, “Holy eyes and ideals, their role in culture”. Actual problems of spirituality, Vol: 13 num 2 (2002): 27.

⁸ L. I. Bozovich, Personality and its formation in childhood (St. Petersburg: Peter. 2008).

⁹ I. M. Halian, “Personal determinants of responsibility of future educators”, Insight: the psychological dimensions of society, num 1 (2019): 15-21.

¹⁰ A. V. Shevchenko, “Research on the correlation between social desirability and value orientations in adolescence”, Insight: the psychological dimensions of society, num 1 (2019): 90-94.

¹¹ K. V. Klenina, “Theoretical and methodological analyzing of content characteristics of an individual’s perfectionism”, Insight: the psychological dimensions of society, num 1 (2019): 84-89.

range that will be most interesting to study in this work, and this is exactly what we will start with in selecting a representative sample of the study.

At the final stage of the formation of a worldview system, it is an internal “*law of life*” and becomes a factor that determines the behavior of the individual as a subjective phenomenon. *The worldview* is approved as a result of the process of gaining experience, self-knowledge and surrounding reality.

From the above logically follows the fact that *the worldview* goes through some stages in its formation and that at each stage, it is formed mainly based on the received social and practical experience, as well as through reflection and self-knowledge.

To summarize the above, it should be noted that, first of all, it is essential that it is a system of views of the world, individual and society; second, that it is also the ideals, values and attitudes of individual, as well as the principles that determine his/her activity; and, third, that it is determined, first and foremost, by experience.

Understanding the essence of the definition of “*worldview*”, we go to the definition of the essence of the term “*setting*”.

Therefore, a *setting* is a state of readiness, the subject’s tendency for a particular activity in a certain situation, which arises when the subject anticipates the occurrence of a certain object or action. The *setting* provides purposeful activity for the object. Scientist D. Uznadze, author of the concept of settings, researched and found that settings accumulate experience and, by mediating the effects of external reality, balance relations between the subject and the environment. The *setting* is the subject's unconscious willingness to take future events and actions in a particular direction¹². The researcher proposed a social setting as a structure that contains emotional, semantic and behavioral aspects of willingness to accept and to act on social objects and situations.

Meaningful settings are the most “complex” level of *settings*, as it combines several components that determine the worldview, personal views and activities. In particular, the information component contains views on the world and place of the person in it, its direction. The emotional component combines likes and dislikes with meaningful objects. At the same time, behavioral determines readiness for activity. *Meaningful settings* and *settings* as a whole, also reflect values that are predetermined by the higher social needs of the subject, his/her activity, and are an indicator of the system of norms and values of the social environment. We conclude that *the setting* is not only willingness and tendency for activity, but also some essential mental components of the subject. These components include attitudes, direction, and value orientations, which are the determinants of readiness. In the works of researcher V. Tsvirkun, the following understanding of the setting is:

“One of the permanent elements of the personality *worldview* that reflects its self, its inner conscious and subconscious “Self” ... outside the *settings* find expression in the life position, which determines the relation of individual to the world, that is, they define the relationship “*Man – the World of Man*”¹³”.

¹² D. N. Uznadze, Psychology of attitude (St. Petersburg: Peter, 2001).

¹³ V. M. Tsvirkun, Formed of its... 145-146.

It should also be noted that the existence of *settings* is, to one degree or another, predicted by the *worldview*, since the latter is a determinant of the totality of social behavior. Social behavior is realized through ideals, norms, principles, values, and therefore, at least in part, determines an individual's willingness to act. From this we can conclude that the *worldview* and *settings*, since are phenomena, a) are determinants of the activity and behavior of the subject, b) combine a system of values and c) contain an information component, are related definitions and to some extent are complementary. That is, worldview and settings form a rather narrow conceptual and terminological plexus, which is an amalgamation of the "*worldview settings*" notion.

Thus, we can conclude that "*worldview settings*" is a collective term that combines both the definition of "*worldview*" and the definition of "*setting*". *World view settings* are a system of views of the subject on the outside world, the place of the person in it, its direction, and attitude to the world. *Worldview settings* consist of information, value and behavioral components. This combination is determined by experience, social interaction, practice activity and reflection. We deliberately combine the definitions of "*worldview*" and "*setting*", and in the context of scientific work, we strive to characterize and capture as precisely as possible the range of psychic phenomena outlined in the study of this work. Therefore, the definition of "*worldviews settings*" in the context of our study will be used only in the above sense. We assume that the study of the factor structure and the construction of a *model of worldviews settings of adolescents* will provide significant empirical results that will contribute to the objective understanding of youth; the use of the received knowledge will be essential in the conduct of training and psycho-corrective actions for adolescents. The purpose of the empirical study is to construct the factor structure of *the model of worldview settings* and to establish peculiar features of the formation of *worldview settings* in the youth period.

Methodology and methods

The methodological basis for the empirical study of psychological features, the factor structure of *the model of worldview settings* in adolescence is an algorithm, which involves a series of actions using a number of psychodiagnostic tools. The selection of tools was guided by the requirement of relevant display of the research subject. The proposed methodological provisions have been tested by researchers in various types of human activities¹⁴ in *modeling the social expectations of the individual*¹⁵. All the outlined experimental and empirical studies are relevant in the context of establishing the factor structure of *the model of worldview settings* at a young age.

¹⁴ I. Popovych; O. Blynova; A. Zhuravlova; M. Toba; T. Tkach y N. Zavatska, "Optimización del desarrollo y psicocorrección de expectativas sociales de estudiantes de filología extranjera", *Revista Inclusiones*. Vol: 7 num Especial, (2020): 82-94; I. Popovych; O. Kononenko; A. Kononenko; A. Stynska; N. Kravets; L. Piletska y O. Blynova, "Research of the Relationship between Existential Anxiety and the Sense of Personality's Existence", *Revista Inclusiones*, Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 41-59 y I. Popovych; L. Lymarenko; N. Tereshenko; T. Kornisheva; O. Yevdokimova; A. Koverznieva y M. Aleksieieva, "Research on the Effectiveness of Training Technologies' Implementation in Student Theater", *Revista Inclusiones*, Vol: 7 num 2 (2020): 104-121.

¹⁵ V. V. Khmill & I. S. Popovych, "Philosophical and Psychological Dimensions of Social Expectations of Personality", *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, num 16 (2019): 55-65 y I. Popovych; A. Borysiuk; L. Zahrai; O. Fedoruk; P. Nosov; S. Zinchenko y V. Mateichuk, "Constructing a Structural-Functional Model of Social Expectations of the Personality", *Revista Inclusiones*, Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 154-167.

Participants

The study was conducted on the basis of Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University (ONU I. I. Mechnikov) and Kherson State University (KSU). 120 respondents aged from 18 to 23 years were participated, including 55.0% (n=66) female and 45.0% (n=54) male. The average age of the sample population was 21.8 years (SD = 2.32).

Based on Hollingshead four factor index¹⁶, the participants' families corresponded to the following categories: 11.67% low Familiar Socioeconomic-Status (FSS), 20.00% FSS low-medium, 20.00% FSS medium, 25.00% FSS medium-high, 23.33% FSS high. The information was provided by all respondents.

Instruments

In order to organize the empirical research, questionnaires and psychodiagnostic techniques were applied during the academic semester. The questionnaire was used to collect the respondents' biographical information which is needed for the survey. The psychodiagnostic technique "Sensation Seeking Scale" ("SSKS")¹⁷ was applied. The essence of the "SSKS" technique is to set the level of needs for all kinds of feelings. It is established how young people are ready and looking for new experiences. Because the search for feelings is of great importance for a young man, because it stimulates emotions and imagination, it develops the creative potential that ultimately leads to its worldview. At the same time, excessively high values of indicators can indicate that there is a desire, sometimes uncontrolled, for new, "acute" impressions, which can provoke the researcher to participate in risky adventures and activities. Another technique used is the psychodiagnostic technique "Diagnosis of the Real Structure of Value Orientations of Personality" ("RSVF")¹⁸. The methodology ("RSVF") combines eleven scales: a pleasant rest time; high material well-being; search and enjoyment of the beautiful; help and compassion for others; love; knowledge of the new in the world, nature, man; high social status; recognizing and respecting people and influencing others; social activity to achieve positive change in society; communication; health. Responses were scored 1 point if the study participant answered "yes" and 0 points if "no". The following psychodiagnostic technique is "Life-Meaningful Orientations" ("LMO")¹⁹: Life Goals, Process, Result, Locus of Control – Self, Locus of Control – Life, General Awareness of Life. Twenty pairs of assertions were evaluated by the Steppe bipolar scale, the values of which ranged from 0 (both statements are equally equal) to 3 (absolutely agree). The reliability index obtained with the α -Cronbach statistics was $\alpha = .733$. The final psychodiagnostic technique is the "Freiburg Personal Questionnaire" ("FPI-B") (Form B) (adaptation by Lutsenko)²⁰. "FPI-B" combined twelve scales: neuroticism, spontaneous aggressiveness, depressiveness, irritability, sociability, balance, reactive aggressiveness, shyness, openness, extraversion / introversion, emotional lability, masculinism / feminism.

¹⁶ A. Hollingshead, Four factor index of social status. Unpublished manuscript (New Haven; Yale University, CT, 1975).

¹⁷ M. Zuckerman, Sensation Seeking and Risky Behavior (NY: American Psychological Association, 2007).

¹⁸ S. S. Bubnova, "Value orientations of personality as a multidimensional nonlinear system", Psychological Journal, num 5 (1999): 38-44.

¹⁹ D. Leontyev, Test of life-meaningful orientations ("LMO"). Psychodiagnostic series (Moscow: Smysl, 2006).

²⁰ O. I. Lutsenko, "FPI Freiburg Personal Questionnaire – Validation and Local Standardization", Journal of the V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Psychology Series, num 61 (2016): 49-54.

Procedure

An empirical study was conducted between September 2019 and December 2019. The organizers of the study were randomly selected adolescents who voluntarily agreed to participate in the empirical study. In advance, we received permission and advice from the administrations of higher education institutions: ONU I. I. Mechnikov and KSU. Each respondent completed four questionnaire forms and a questionnaire with socio-demographic characteristics. Participation in the study was voluntary and confidential. Particular attention was paid to ensuring the confidentiality of the data received and avoiding random responses.

The research is conducted according to ethical standards of committee on the rights of experiments of Helsinki declaration²¹.

Data analysis

Statistical processing of the results and graphical presentation was done using “Statistical Package for the Social Sciences” v. 23.0 and “Microsoft Office Excel 2007”. Karl Pearson (r_{xy}) correlation coefficients were used to find and establish correlation relationships. Factor analysis with Varimax rotation applied.

Arithmetic mean value of parameters (M), standard error (Sx) and mean-square deviation (SD) were calculated. Differences between values of parameters at level $p \leq 0.05$ considered statistically significant.

Results

Research of descriptive characteristics of worldview settings at a young age

The obtained psychological content parameters were evaluated according to the methods “SSKS”, “RSVF”, “LMO” and “FPI-B”. Arithmetic mean value of parameters (M), standard error (Sx) and mean-square deviation (SD) are presented in Tabl. 1.

Scale	M	Sx	SD
“SSKS”			
Sensation seeking	11.31	.21	2.01
“RSVF”			
Vacation	4.27	.05	1.02
Material Welfare	3.41	.04	1.22
Pleasure	3.44	.04	1.37
Help	4.11	.06	1.34
Love	3.67	.04	1.25
Knowledge	3.43	.03	1.34
Social Status	3.00	.03	1.36
Respect	4.01	.06	1.27
Social Activity	2.86	.02	1.41
Communication	2.73	.02	1.01
Health	3.12		1.33

²¹ “WMA Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects”. (2013).

“LMO”			
Life Goals	31.23	.47	7.48
Process	29.25	.32	5.28
Result	26.01	.27	4.71
Locus of Control – Self	19.49	.28	4.19
Locus of Control – Life	28.04	.28	4.42
General Awareness of Life	101.10	.88	13.65
“FPI-B”			
Neuroticism	4.69	.15	1.64
Spontaneous Aggressiveness	3.72	.19	2.04
Depressiveness	3.77	.16	1.77
Irritability	4.57	.16	1.73
Sociability	4.21	.14	1.50
Balance	5.97	.21	2.31
Reactive Aggressiveness	5.61	.16	1.80
Shyness	5.60	.16	1.80
Openness	6.20	.16	1.70
Extraversion / Introversion	5.56	.17	1.82
Emotional Lability	5.18	.17	1.89
Masculinism / Feminism	5.19	.19	2.12

Note: M – arithmetic mean; Sx – standard error; SD – mean-square deviation.

Table 1

Mean values and standard deviations of the scales of the parameters (n=120)

The empirical cross section and the analyzed frequency characteristics made it possible to conclude that the studied indicators of some psychological meaningful parameters by the methods “RSVF” and “LMO” are somewhat overestimated: Material welfare (M = 3.41), Pleasure (M = 3.44) and General Awareness of Life of the whole sample (M = 101.10).

Research of the correlation relationship of sensation seeking (“SSKS”) and the studied psychological content parameters by the methods “RSVF”, “LMO” and “FPI-B”

Let us analyze the strongest relationships between the selected parameters studied for the “RSVF”, “LMO”, “FPI-B” with sensation seeking (SSKS) methods using the Pearson criterion (see Tabl. 2).

Scale	Sensation seeking
Vacation	-.140
Material Welfare	-.130
Pleasure	.158
Help	.245
Love	-.070
Knowledge	.157
Social Status	.064
Respect	.049
Social Activity	-.140
Communication	.104
Health	.313*
Life Goals	-.022
Process	.130
Result	.202
Locus of Control – Self	.122
Locus of Control – Life	.070

General Awareness of Life	.087
Neuroticism	-.220
Spontaneous Aggressiveness	.277*
Depressiveness	.030
Irritability	.030
Sociability	-.030
Balance	.262*
Reactive Aggressiveness	.288*
Shyness	-.240
Openness	.010
Extraversion / Introversion	.080
Emotional Lability	.040
Masculinism / Feminism	.100

Note: * – statistical significance of $p \leq .05$; ** – statistical significance of $p \leq .01$.

Table 2

Correlation matrix of relationships of the studied parameters with the sensation seeking (n = 120)

The data in Table 2 indicate a statistically significant positive correlation between the “Sensation Seeking” scale and the “Health” scale ($p < .05$). The analysis allows us to conclude that the higher the need for new ones, previously unknown and thrills, the higher the desire to have good health. The result indicates the desire of individuals with high rates of need to find the senses to maintain physical integrity, despite the physical risk for intense emotional experience. There was no statistically significant relationship between “Sensation Seeking” scale and the other “RSVF” methodology scales.

According to the data in Table 2 we find that the “Sensation Seeking” scale has no statistically significant correlation with any of the “LMO” scales.

The results of determining the correlation between the “Sensation Seeking” scale and the “FPI-B” scale are presented in Table 2. We note that there is a statistically significant relationship between the “Sensation Seeking” scale and “Spontaneous Aggressiveness”, “Balance”, and “Reactive Aggressiveness” scales. Analyzing the data shows that the higher the individual's level of need in sensation seeking, the higher his/her inability or unwillingness to delay (reschedule to later) the satisfaction of desires. Accordingly, the more pronounced the desire for acute experiences, the less for socialized desires and the less pronounced the social conformity (correlation with the scale of “Spontaneous Aggressiveness”). These data also indicate that the higher the need for sensation seeking, the greater the freedom from internal conflicts, satisfaction with oneself and their achievements and lower is the measure of internal tension (correlation with the “Balance” scale). And finally, the higher the “Sensation Seeking”, the higher the indifference to praise and punishment, the level of disrespect for duties, moral and ethical standards, and higher is the desire for carnal pleasure, delight and thrill with the desire for prompt, immediate gratification of desire (correlation with the scale “Reactive Aggressiveness”). Among these scales, the most correlated is the relationship on the scale of “Sensation seeking” with the scale “Reactive aggressiveness”. There is no statistically significant correlation with other scales.

Research of correlation relationships between the studied psychological semantic parameters by the method “RSVF” and the methods “LMO” and “FPI-B”

Let us analyze the strongest relationships between the selected studied parameters of the “LMO” and “FPI-B” methods and the parameters of the “RSVF” method according to Pearson's criterion (see Tabl. 3).

Scale	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
Life Goals	-.020	.080	.063	.139	.018	-.040	.005	.017	-.020	-.070	.211
Process	.090	-.150	-.040	.230	.231	-.090	.211	.068	.004	.062	.154
Result	.006	-.080	-.100	.300*	.037	-.080	.120	.073	-.060	-.030	.196
Locus of Control – Self	-.030	-.050	.234	.267*	.151	.067	-.030	.024	-.060	.068	.227
Locus of Control – Life	-.020	-.060	.123	.155	.161	-.010	.156	.129	.020	.105	.078
General Awareness of Life	-.010	-.060	.031	.242	.125	-.020	.137	.097	-.010	.078	.182
Neuroticism	.209	.093	.048	-.204	.081	-.038	.011	.126	.395**	-.012	-.074
Spontaneous Aggressiveness	.119	-.105	.017	-.089	-.199	.069	.139	-.005	.090	.095	.063
Depressiveness	.172	.134	.100	-.205	-.113	.069	.068	.035	.345**	-.047	-.134
Irritability	.119	-.065	-.036	-.070	-.015	-.038	.160	.114	.235	-.043	.049
Sociability	.172	-.237	.304*	.097	.257*	-.071	-.037	.125	.113	-.062	.129
Balance	-.026	.070	.121	.088	-.038	.056	-.107	-.432**	-.102	.230	.148
Reactive Aggressiveness	-.041	.086	-.094	-.041	-.409**	.115	.248	.023	.034	.277*	.119
Shyness	.146	-.056	.199	-.048	.113	.128	-.057	.271*	.227	-.171	-.024
Openness	-.018	-.006	.169	-.111	.022	.035	.180	-.083	.028	.294*	-.190
Extraversion / Introversion	.067	.011	.141	.096	.042	-.179	.055	-.034	.121	.071	.098
Emotional Lability	.006	-.058	.027	-.087	-.100	.150	-.005	.129	.175	-.065	-.089
Masculinism / Feminism	.160	-.081	.074	-.129	-.116	.051	.062	.055	.124	.172	.026

Note: I – Vacation; II – Material Welfare; III – Pleasure; IV – Help; V – Love; VI – Knowledge; VII – Social Status; VIII – Respect; IX – Social Activity; X – Communication; XI – Health; * – statistical significance of $p \leq 0.05$; ** – statistical significance of $p \leq 0.01$.

Table 3

Correlation matrix of interrelations of the studied parameters by the “RSVF”, the “LMO” and “FPI-B” methods. (n = 120)

There is a positive correlation between the “RSVF” and “LMO” data scales at a statistically significant level ($p < .05$) between the “Result” and “Help” scale and the “Locus of Control – Self” scale and the “Help” scale. These correlations indicate that the higher the scale of the “Help”, that is to say the higher the desire for humanism, the orientation to help other people, the more important is the individual's life span and its meaningfulness. The higher the satisfaction with self-realization (correlation with the “Result” scale), the higher the perception of oneself as a person who controls his/her own life according to his/her desires, aims and goals. Other scales of these methods have no statistically significant correlation.

We continue to analyze the results of correlation analysis according to the “RSVF” and “FPI-B” methods in Table 3. There is a direct statistically significant correlation ($p < .01$) between the “Neuroticism” scale and the “IX – Social Activity” scale which indicates that the higher the neuroticism rate, the higher the anxiety, sensitivity and fatigue, the higher the desire for social activity aimed at shaping positive changes in society. Also, there is a direct significant correlation ($p < .01$) between the “Depression” scale and the “IX – Social Activity” scale which indicates that the higher the “Depression” Scale, that is to say the lower the mood background, the higher the depth in their own experiences and willingness to sacrifice themselves, the higher the level of social activity aimed at positive changes in society. The “Sociability” scale and the “III – Pleasure” scale form a direct correlation of mean power ($p < .05$) which indicates that the higher the level of sociability, emotional manifestations, casual behavior and attentive attitudes toward people, the higher the focus on the search for the beautiful in life, the greater the opportunity to enjoy the beautiful. Between the “Balance” scale and the “VII – Respect” scale, there is an inverse correlation of mean strength ($p < .05$), which indicates that the higher the indicators of balance, self-satisfaction, and the lower the internal tension, the lower the individual's orientation toward seeking public acceptance and respect, and the lower the desire to influence others. Also, the scale “VII – Respect” is correlated with the “Shyness” scale, but it has a direct correlation ($p < .05$). This shows that the higher the factor of uncertainty, indecision, avoidance of risky situations of the individual, the higher his/her need to obtain acceptance from the environment and the desire to influence others. It can be assumed that such individuals seek at the expense of accepting others to compensate for their own self-doubt and indecision. The “Reactive Aggressiveness” and “V – Love” scales form a negative correlation of mean power ($p < .01$) which indicates that the higher the reactive aggressiveness index, the greater the desire for sensual pleasure and immediate satisfaction of desires, the lower the focus on love as a value in forming a lasting love relationship. In addition, the “Reactive Aggressiveness” Scale has a slight weak correlation with the “X – Communication” scale ($p < .01$), indicating that the higher the “Reactive Aggressiveness” scale, the higher the desire for contact, communication, interaction with other people. Also, the “Openness” scale correlates with the “X – Communication” scale, the type of correlation is straightforward ($p < .05$) which indicates that the higher the trusting attitude and level of interaction with the environment, the greater the need for contact with others and communication with other people in general.

Research of correlation relationships between the studied psychological semantic parameters by the method “LMO” and the method “FPI-B”

Let us analyze the strongest relationships between the selected parameters of the “LMO” methodology and the “FPI-B” parameters of the Pearson test (see Tabl. 4).

Scale	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Neuroticism	-.159	-.319*	-.351**	-.248	-.140	-.298*
Spontaneous Aggressiveness	.107	-.008	.032	.006	-.030	.013
Depressiveness	-.360**	-.432**	-.468**	-.385**	-.346**	-.475**
Irritability	.054	-.200	-.070	.000	-.170	-.100
Sociability	.140	.230	.210	.273*	.100	.250
Balance	.064	.151	.174	.168	.097	.139
Reactive Aggressiveness	.318*	.125	.236	.224	.108	.224
Shyness	-.150	-.265*	-.250	-.256*	-.040	-.220
Openness	-.080	-.050	-.070	.003	.125	-.020
Extraversion / Introversion	.151	.113	.261*	.248	.137	.203
Emotional Lability	-.178	-.362**	-.292*	-.252	-.184	-.300*
Masculinism / Feminism	.060	-.120	.110	.010	-.170	-.040

Note: I – Life Goals; II – Process; III – Result; IV – Locus of Control – Self; V – Locus of Control – Life; VI – General Awareness of Life; * – statistical significance of $p \leq .05$; ** – statistical significance of $p \leq .01$.

Table 4

Correlation matrix of interrelations of the studied parameters by the method “LMO” and method “FPI-B” (n=120)

Table 4 presents the Pearson correlation between the scale of the “LMO” and the “FPI-B”. The most significant correlation ($p < .01$) with the whole “LMO” method is the “Depression” scale. This scale is negatively correlated with all test scales which indicates that the higher the respondent's indicators on the “Depression” scale, that is to say the lower the overall mood, the higher the indecision, uncertainty, depth in their experiences, the lower the indicators on all “LMO” test scales. These data indicate that high depressiveness is associated with low meaning of life, lack or low number of aims in the future, dissatisfaction with both real life and life lived, self-realization, as well as a lack of belief in the ability to control life and belief in the lack of freedom of choice. The “Neuroticism” scale has a negative correlation ($p < .05$; $p < .01$) with some of the “LMO” scales, namely the “II – Process”, “III – Result” and “VI – General Awareness of Life” scales. This means that the higher the neuroticism index, the higher the anxiety, the lower the emotional saturation of the present life and the lived, as well as the overall level of meaningfulness of life. On this basis, we can assume that a person who is prone to neuroticism, anxiety, hypersensitivity, loss of temptation's control, experiences his/her life less meaningfully and less emotionally saturated. Such a person has low thresholds of excitability, an outburst of annoyance that does not allow you to focus on the flow of life as such, does not allow you to think and fill it emotionally. The “Emotional Lability” scale ($p < .05$; $p < .01$) has a negative correlation with these scales. This confirms the assumption made above, as high rates of emotional lability also indicate anxiety, sensitivity, loss of ability to control aspirations and their negative correlation with the scales “II – Process”, “III – Result” and “VI – General Awareness of Life”, also shows that the higher they are, the lower the meaningfulness of life, its richness and emotionality, with both the true and lived connotation of life. The “Sociability” scale is directly correlated with the “IV - Locus of Control – Self” scale ($p < .05$) which means that the higher the sociability, the brightness and the richness of emotional expressions, the spontaneous and natural behavior, the higher the perception of one's personality as a strong person who has the freedom of choice, endowed with the belief in the ability to control life's events. This scale is also interrelated with the “Shyness” scale ($p < .05$) but has a negative correlation. This means that the higher the indecision and uncertainty that characterize shyness, the lower the confidence in the ability to control one's life and the lower the perception of oneself as a

strong personality. The correlation with the “II – Process” scale is negative so the higher is the shyness; the lower is the satisfaction and the saturation of the real life. There is a direct correlation between the “Extraversion / Introversion” and “III – Result” scales ($p < .05$). This means that the higher is the extraverted personality, its focus on the object, the greater is the importance of social success, social acceptance, the higher its satisfaction with life and self-realization.

Research of the factor model of worldview settings

In the process of studying the role of altered states of consciousness in the formation of *worldview settings*, a factor analysis was conducted in order to establish a factor *model of worldview settings*. Factor analysis was performed using the traditional principal component method, the rotation method of Varimax. Five factors (component) were received that together accounted for 72.213% of the variance of features (see Tab. 5).

Parameters	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
Sensation seeking			.403		
Vacation				-.515	
Material Welfare				-.662	
Pleasure				.496	
Help				.672	
Love			-.469		
Knowledge				.600	
Social Status				-.466	
Respect		.525			
Social Activity		.540			
Communication			.376		
Health				.562	
Life Goals	.807				
Process	.785				
Result	.855				
Locus of Control – Self	.817				
Locus of Control – Life	.840				
General Awareness of Life	.972				
Neuroticism		.744			
Spontaneous Aggressiveness			.763		
Depressiveness		.565			
Irritability			.510		
Sociability					.811
Balance		-.649			
Reactive Aggressiveness			.833		
Shyness		.724			
Openness					
Extraversion / Introversion					.659
Emotional Lability		.606			

Masculinism / Feminism			.629		
Dispersion, %	19.441	16.671	15.255	15.216	5.630
∑ dispersion, %	19.441	36.112	51.367	66.583	72,213
Value	5.076	4.353	3.983	3.973	1.470

Note: the loadings of the significant variables are given in bold type.

Table 5
Matrix of factor pressure of model of *worldview settings*

The results of the factor analysis of the sample were as follows: five factors with different pressure values were identified, which included thirty scales of the “SSKS”, “RSVF”, “LMO” and “FPI-B” methods which are relevant to the subject of the study. We describe the received factors.

Factor 1 “Mindfulness of Life” brings together all the scales of the “LMO” methodology. The total factor (pressure) load is 5.076. All scales show a fairly high level of load, the highest recorded on the scale of “General Awareness of Life” (.971). We believe that this factor describes the general level of awareness of the life of the subjects, the presence of the purpose of life, fullness and satisfaction with the present and lived life, as well as the degree of controllability and control of one’s life.

Factor 2 “Anxiety” combines the following scales: “Respect”, “Social Activity”, “Neuroticism”, “Depression”, “Balance”, “Shyness” and “Emotional Lability”. The total factor load is 4.353. The highest load is shown by the “Neuroticism” scale, followed by the timidity scale and negative balance indicators. This factor interprets the general level of anxiety, insecurity (scale of neuroticism, depression, shyness, negative balance), as well as possible ways to reduce uncertainty and anxiety – the focus on social activity and conformity.

Factor 3 “Aggression” combines the following scales: “Sensation Seeking”, negative indicators of “Love” scale, “Communication” scale, “Spontaneous Aggressiveness”, “Irritability”, “Reactive Aggressiveness”, “Masculism / Feminism”. The total factor load is 3.983. The highest load is indicated by the scale of reactive aggression, followed by the scale of spontaneous aggression and masculism / feminism. We state that this factor shows the level of aggressiveness, spontaneity, impulsivity of the individual, the degree of his/her desire for rapid satisfaction of desires, despite the limitations, the brightness of manifestations of affect, as well as the level of social conformity.

Factor 4 “Spiritual values / material values” combined the following scales: negative indicators of the “Vacation”, “Material Welfare” and “Social Status” scales, positive indicators of “Pleasure”, “Help”, “Knowledge”, “Health”. The total factor load is 3.973. The highest load is shown by the scale of help and charity towards other people and the negative indicators of the scale of high material wealth. On this basis, this factor demonstrates the prevalence of spiritual or material values in the structure of personality orientations. The focus on spiritual goods is clearly monitored, such as help and charity for others, knowledge of the new and the search for the beautiful in combination with the focus on high material well-being, social status and enjoyable time.

Factor 5 “Sociability” combines two scales “Sociability” and “Extraversion / Introversion”. The load of this factor is 1.470. The most loaded scale is sociability. This factor demonstrates the level of friendliness (sociability) and external orientation of the respondent.

The following F insignificant ($\sum FI$) factors are loaded less. The value of their load is beyond the total variance (.942 and less). We note that the results of empirical processing reflect five major factors (72.213%) and one cumulative factor that combined the insignificant (27.787%). The defined factors have determined the factor structure of the *model of the world view* of the studied (see Fig. 1).




Figure 1
Factor structure of the *model of worldview settings* of the studied

Thus, the factor model of the studied sample is represented by five factors, which reflected the structure and key features of the respondents' *worldview settings*.

Discussion and conclusions

1) The essence of the “*worldview setting*” is revealed as a system of the subject's views on the surrounding world, on the place of the person in it, its direction, and relation to the world, which consists of information, value and behavioral components. *The worldview setting* determines activity through components and is based on experience, social interaction, practical activity and reflection, combines a system of norms, values, orientations, ideals, principles and goals.

2) It is stated that the value orientations of the personality constitute the substantive side of the personality direction and the basis of relation to the world, other people, to themselves and are the basis of the worldview and the core of motivation of person's life activity.

3) It is established that the most important socio-psychological characteristics of a person is a measure of the activity of one's own efforts aimed at overcoming life's difficulties; a sense of personal responsibility for events that occur to him/her that relate to his/her belief in a successful future.

4) Factor analysis established the structure of the *model of worldview settings* of the studied adolescents, consisting of five main factors (72.43%): F 1 "Meaningfulness of life"; F 2 "Anxiety"; F 3 "Aggressiveness"; F 4 "Spiritual values / material values" and F 5 "Sociability".

5) Our hypotheses confirmed that the received data are important for an objective understanding of the psychological features of the worldview of adolescents; the received knowledge should be operationalized in training and psycho-corrective activities.

Acknowledgments

The research was conducted within the framework of the fundamental scientific and practical theme of the Department of General and Social Psychology of Kherson State University and Department Differential and Special Psychology of Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University, the state registration number is 0119U101096.

References

- Bozovich, L. I. Personality and its formation in childhood. St. Petersburg: Peter. 2008.
- Bubnova, S. S. "Value orientations of personality as a multidimensional nonlinear system". Psychological Journal, num 5 (1999): 38-44.
- Halian, I. M. "Personal determinants of responsibility of future educators". Insight: the psychological dimensions of society, num 1 (2019): 15-21. DOI: 10.32999/2663-970X/2019-1-2
- Harchenko, L. N. The modern concept of natural history: a course of lectures. Moscow-Berlin: Direct Media. 2015.
- Hollingshead, A. Four factor index of social status. Unpublished manuscript. New Haven; Yale University, CT, 1975. Retrieved from URL https://www.academia.edu/927771/Four_Factor_Index_of_Social_Status
- Khmil, V. V. & Popovych, I. S. "Philosophical and Psychological Dimensions of Social Expectations of Personality". Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, num 16 (2019): 55-65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.187540>
- Klenina, K. V. "Theoretical and methodological analyzing of content characteristics of an individual's perfectionism". Insight: the psychological dimensions of society, num 1 (2019): 84-89. DOI: 10.32999/2663-970X/2019-1-13
- Kononenko, O. I. "Theoretical approach to the implementation of the most important psychological characteristics". Herald Odessa National University. Psychology, Vol: 16 num 7 (2011): 115-123.

Kroshka, O. I. "Self-recognition is a form of emotional and social inclusion on the most advanced stages of ontogenetic development". Herald Odessa National University. Psychology, Vol: 15 num 4 (2006): 117-212.

Leontyev, D. Test of life-meaningful orientations ("LMO"). Psychodiagnostic series. Moscow: Smysl. 2006. Retrieved from: <https://www.twirpx.com/file/83225/>

Lutsenko, O. L. "FPI Freiburg Personal Questionnaire – Validation and Local Standardization". Journal of the V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Psychology Series, num 61 (2016): 49-54.

Makuton, P. Ya. "Holy eyes and ideals, their role in culture". Actual problems of spirituality, Vol: 13 num 2 (2002): 19-29.

Mysyk, I. G. "Worldview installations of postmodernism". Revista de Stiințe Socioumane, num 2 Vol: 24 (2013): 48-55. Retrieved from: https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/Mirovozzrencheskie%20ustanovki%20postmodernizma.pdf

Popovych, I.; Blynova, O.; Zhuravlova, A.; Toba, M.; Tkach, T. y Zavatska, N. "Optimization of development and psycho-correction of social expectations of students of foreign philology". Revista Inclusiones. Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 82-94. Retrieved from: <http://www.archivosrevistainclusiones.com/gallery/1%20vol%206%20numespbrasilapha%201%202019enemarnclu.pdf>

Popovych, I.; Borysiuk, A.; Zahrai, L.; Fedoruk, O.; Nosov, P.; Zinchenko, S. y Mateichuk, V. "Constructing a Structural-Functional Model of Social Expectations of the Personality". Revista Inclusiones, Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 154-167. Retrieved from: <https://www.revistainclusiones.com/gallery/11%20vol%207%20num%20majaespecialleabr iljunio2020revincludi.pdf>

Popovych, I.; Kononenko, O.; Kononenko, A.; Stynska, V.; Kravets, N.; Piletska, L. y Blynova, O. "Research of the Relationship between Existential Anxiety and the Sense of Personality's Existence". Revista Inclusiones, Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 41-59. Retrieved from: <https://www.revistainclusiones.com/gallery/5%20vol%207%20num%20especialleabriljunio2020revincludi.pdf>

Popovych, I.; Lymarenko, L.; Tereshenko, N.; Kornisheva, T.; Yevdokimova, O.; Koverznieva, A. y Aleksieieva, M. "Research on the Effectiveness of Training Technologies' Implementation in Student Theater". Revista Inclusiones, Vol: 7 num 2 (2020): 104-121. Retrieved from: <https://www.revistainclusiones.com/gallery/6%20vol%207%20num%20eabriljunio2020revincludi.pdf>

Shaigorodsky Yu. "Svitoglyadny systems: the need for synthesis". Political management, 1 (2003): 37-48.

Shevchenko, A. V. "Research on the correlation between social desirability and value orientations in adolescence". Insight: the psychological dimensions of society, num 1 (2019): 90-94. DOI: 10.32999/2663-970X/2019-1-14

Tsvirkun, V. M. Formed of its ownoglyadnyh installations of an individual age of life. Candidate degree. Kyiv: KSU. 2001.

Uznadze D. N. Psychology of attitude. St. Petersburg: Peter. 2001.

“WMA Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects”. 2013. Retrieved from: <http://www.wma.net/es/30publications/10policies/b3/17c.pdf>

Zuckerman, M. Sensation Seeking and Risky Behavior. NY: American Psychological Association. 2007.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.