

nem.]. – М. : “Rossijskaja politicheskaja jenciklopedija” (ROSPJeN), 2002. – S. 209–217.

4. Djurkgejm Je. Samoubijstvo: sociologicheskij etjud [Elektron. resurs] / Je. Djurkgejm ; per. s fr. s sokr.; pod red. V. A. Bazarova. – М. : Mysl', 1994. – 399, [1] s. – Rezhim dostupu : [http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/Sociolog/Durkgeim/](http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/Durkgeim/)

5. Makajver R. Real'nost' social'noj jevoljucii // Amerikanskaja sociologicheskaja mysl' : teksty [pod red. V. I. Dobren'kova]. – М. : Izd-vo MGU, 1994. – S. 76–91.

6. Ortega-i-Gasset H. Vosstanie mass / Hose Ortega-i-Gasset // Ortega-i-Gasset H. Vosstanie mass : sb.; per. s isp. – М. : OOO “Izd-vo AST”, 2002. – S. 11–208.

7. Ortega-i-Gasset H. Tema nashego vremeni / H. Ortega-i-Gasset // Ortega-i-Gasset H. Chto takoe filosofija? – М. : Nauka, 1991. – S. 3–50.

8. Rismen D. Nekotorye tipy haraktera i obshhestvo // Sociologicheskie issledovanija. – 1993. – № 5. – S. 144–151.

9. Sadler U. A., Dzhonson T. B. Ot odinochestva – k anomii / U. A. Sadler, T. B. Dzhonson ; per. I. Kosivoj, O. Takanskij // Labirinty odinochestva: per. s angl., sost., obshh. red. i predisl. N. E. Pokrovskogo. – М. : Progress, 1989. – S. 21–51.

10. Smelzer N. Sociologija : per. s angl. / N. Smelzer. – М. : Feniks, 1994. – 688 s.

11. Turkiashvili Sh. L., Gorozija V. E. Ponjatie anomii i politiki ego modernizacii / Sh. L. Turkiashvili, V. E. Gorozija // Chelovek: sootnoshenie nacional'nogo i obshhestvennogo: Sb. materialov mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma (g. Zugdidi, Gruzija, 19–20 maja 2004 g.) / Pod red. V. V. Parcevanija. – SPb. : Sankt Peterburgskoe filosofskoe obshhestvo, 2004. – Vyp. 2. – S. 249–258.

12. Feofanov K. Social'naja anomija: obzor podhodov v amerikanskij sociologii / K. A. Feofanov // Socis. – 1992. – № 5. – S. 88–92.

13. Park R. E., Burgess E. W. Introduction to the Science of Sociology / Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess. – Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1924. – 1059 p.

**Donij N. E.**, PhD, in Philosophy, Associate Professor, doctoral student of Social Philosophy and Philosophy of Education Department, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University (Ukraine, Kiev), [donyne@ukr.net](mailto:donyne@ukr.net)

#### Modern problem of anomie in the context of social devitalization of personality

*There has been examined the evolution of the semantic load of the concept “anomie” from ancient times to the present, and has been determined that its meaning changed from Antique “the lack of law, norms of” to modern “the impossibility of a comparison with other people, according to standards, as well as getting the person to an indefinite status”. Also has been found that anomie, due to the transition from the traditional to the industrial society in the late XIX–early XX century, from the phenomenon–partner turned into a threatening process of social development. Has been noted that anomie is a special sign of endlessness of the transition from one value to another, or even a complete deregulation of the value field. There has been focused that anomie in the society itself is a form to incite the individual to escape beyond the social space. It's been stated that violations of the border always carries the threat of social and biological vitality. And the last, there has been argued that anomie, as a bearer of ideas going beyond social permission, is one of the factors in the context of which the social devitalization of personality grows.*

**Keywords:** anomie, lawlessness, limit, social devitalization of personality.

**Доний Н. Е.**, кандидат философских наук, доцент, докторант, Национальный педагогический университет им. М. П. Драгоманова (Украина, Киев), [donyne@ukr.net](mailto:donyne@ukr.net)

#### Современная проблема аномии в контексте социальной девитализации личности

*Рассмотрено эволюционирование с древнейших времен до современности семантической нагрузки концепта “аномия”. Показано, что аномия, благодаря переходу от традиционного к индустриальному обществу в конце XIX – начале XX в., из феномена–спутника превратилась в угрожающий процесс социального развития. Отмечено, что аномия является особым признаком незаконности перехода от одной ценностной системы к другой или даже полной разбалансированностью ценностной сферы. Акцентировано внимание, что само по себе господство аномии в социуме является формой провоцирование индивидов к выходу за пределы социального пространства. Отдельно указано, что нарушение границы всегда несет угрозу также биологической жизнестойкости человека. В итоге аргументировано, что аномия, как носитель идеи выхода за пределы социально разрешенного, является одним из тех факторов которые благоприятствуют разрастанию социальной девитализации личности.*

**Ключевые слова:** аномия, беззаконие, предел, социальная девитализация личности.

\* \* \*

УДК 392.3:316.3

**Dorozhko I. I.**,  
PhD, Associate Professor, Head of the Department  
of Psychology, Kharkiv National Pedagogical  
University H. S. Skovoroda (Ukraine, Kharkiv),  
[psychotherapy16@gmail.com](mailto:psychotherapy16@gmail.com)

#### THE PHILOSOPHIC DISCOURSE OF SPACIOUS STRUCTURES IN FAMILY UPBRINGING

*The article deals with topical questions, which arise in family upbringing area. Such notions as “social space”, “theory of causality”, “globalization”, “family” are considered. The development of the world and of an individual occurs via personality. The transformation of family relationships indicates destruction of other social institutions. The changes, affecting family and family upbringing, have revolutionary character.*

*The modern world exists in imaginary reality of consumption and prosperity. This reality presumes further increase and accumulation of services, material comforts and resources. Imaginary reality is a mechanism of deep mutation of humanity ecology. An individual in the society of prosperity isn't surrounded by other people, it is surrounded by the objects of consumption. J. Baurillard expresses an opinion that everyday communication ignores other individual. An individual's everyday communication doesn't presume communication with other individuals, it accumulates around prosperity achievements.*

*Family policy and family upbringing tend to vary depending on context and time, spacious characteristics. There is no doubt that the events that occur in the world today, deform any attempts regarding universal generalizations of the problem of family upbringing.*

**Keywords:** globalization, personality, family, social space, theory of causality.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

Family is constantly changing depending on context and time. This process causes discussions, such as transformational processes in society. The research of the problem of spacious characteristics in family upbringing area is a topical question. The development of the world and of an individual occurs via personality. The transformation of family relationships indicates destruction of other social institutions. The changes, affecting family, family upbringing have revolutionary character. Globalization and globalization processes affect both the world in general and family, family upbringing.

The analysis of the latest sources and publications demonstrates that spacious structures of society acquire new forms by means of the analysis of philosophical ideas of A. Giddens, J. Baurillard, P. Bourdieu. Family policy and family upbringing tend to vary depending on context and time, spacious characteristics. There is no doubt that the events that occur in the world today, deform any attempts regarding universal generalizations of the problem of family upbringing.

The aim of the article is to research the question of the principles spacious structures organization in family upbringing. The contemporary perception of family relationships is more diverse in structural forms.

Why is it necessary for us to define family by any means? On the one hand, it seems that everyone has to determine for oneself what the family means for him or her. However, people are constantly motivated to identify family from philosophical, legal and social reasons (grounds) [1].

Social space is defined by the presence of subjects in the space, it appears simultaneously in the combination of its “symbolic” and “physical” measurements. The “image of society”, suggested by P. Bourdieu, defines social reality as “social space”. The scientific novelty consists in the comparison of social space and physical one, in the research of internal structure. According to P. Bourdieu, physical space is interconnected with social one. Physical space reflects social one, serves as its expression. The distance between

subjects isn't only social but also physical. And here the question arises: how the process of estrangement and rapprochement of spaces can occur (social space can be presented in different distant places of physical one; or, on the contrary, the most distant borders of social space have to approach each other in physical sense).

P. Bourdieu describes social universe, the organization of which is done on the assumption of social and physical space integration; the social universe exists simultaneously in the area of two spaces. Social structures have different forms of expression. Social structures exist simultaneously as the reality, that is perceived on the assumption of the division of material resources, values, benefits and as the reality that exists in imagination, in the forms of thought (ideas, opinions, conclusions) in person's behavior. P. Bourdieu proposes his own theoretical construction such as separation of positions and dispositions of social space, researches the duality of social structures.

Positions express real state, individual's situation in social space, and dispositions reflect individual's thought, estimation, self-estimation, behavioral patterns, the perception own positions. The combination of positions reflects the objective profile of social space. Accordingly, the combination of dispositions points to the subjective profile of physical space [2, p. 333].

The study of general modes of space and time is done by means of cause-and-effect relations analysis. Social universe uniting social and physical space is found within clarification of causality questions. This question is directly connected with understanding of principles of material world creation and its cognition. Causality, in combination with object, spacious characteristics and time, makes up fundamental structure of individual consciousness. The theory of causality presumes the study of mechanisms of cause-and-effect relations, which take place between an individual and consequences.

Five principles of causality are presented: the principle of mentalism, the principle of correspondence, the principle of vibration, the principle of rhythm, the principle of cause-and-effect relations.

1. The principle of mentalism: everything that exists is a thought. The Universe is an imaginary image.

2. The principle of correspondence: opposite positions are in correspondence with each other.

3. The principle of vibration: everything moves, everything vibrates.

4. The principle of rhythm depends on time and is formed by it. The principle of rhythm ensures the existence of something new in some period of time. If rhythm changes, the outdated will stay out of time.

5. The principle of cause-and-effect relations: each cause has its effects, each effect has its cause. Everything happens place according to the law of causality. There is a great number of causality plans, but nothing will escape law [3, p. 7].

The modern world exists in imaginary reality of consumption and prosperity. This reality presumes further increase and accumulation of services, material comforts and resources. Imaginary reality is a mechanism of deep mutation of humanity ecology. An individual in the society of prosperity isn't surrounded by other people, it is surrounded by the objects of consumption. J. Baurillard expresses an opinion that everyday communication ignores other indi-

vidual. An individual's everyday communication doesn't presume communication with other individuals, it accumulates around prosperity achievements. Accumulated resources become objects of manipulation starting from household to "city equipment", material communicative connections and professional services. The notions "environment", "surroundings" become popular in modern society. Social relationships, interpersonal attitudes are influenced by the things that emphasize incredible power and potential prosperity. Unfortunately, incredible power in the world gives out the warning of the distance of one person from another one. As an example, J. Baurillard tells us about a child who lived in a pack of wolves. The child changes into a wolf as a result of living with predators. Humanity gradually becomes functional. Society is under the influence of material things, it lives in their rhythm. Humanity observes how things appear, improve and die. In previous civilizations things and long-lasting monuments lived longer than connections between generations in society chronotopes.

J. Baurillard writes: "We live in the epoch when people can't fulfill the waste of their time in full measure in order to stop the necessity of finding time that is fatal for their lives. Nobody can become free from time as you can get free from underwear. It's impossible to kill time, to lose it as money, because both of them are considered as the system of exchange value" [4, p. 198]. The author explains that in symbolic measurement money and gold are garbage, waste. Objective time falls under this characteristic, too. Actually, it is rarely possible and in the society of consumption it is nearly impossible, to return their lost function of waste to the notions of "money" and "time". But another situation is observed, too. J. Baurillard slightly emphasizes that in the system of calculation and capital humanity becomes garbage, the waste products of money and time. In the society of consumption temporal characteristics have privileged positions. The demand for special prosperity (time) is equal to demands for other benefits and resources. There is no doubt that, the calculation of free time by means of chronometric units is not an absolute value for an individual in the society of consumption any more.

Total changes in all aspects of the activity of a society such as economic, political, moral and spiritual, influence the activity of a family. In general, there is a radical turn in the character of social relationships, the existence of family and family upbringing. As a result of changes, which are observed in the space of family relationships, there are deformations on the level of social relationships, in fact re-institutionalization is taking place. The transformational processes of certain norms, rules, principles of social interaction, of the whole system of statuses and roles become widespread. The philosophic discourse of family upbringing in the chronotope of society of risk reveals itself through the prism of social tendencies, which become initial conditions and factors of the following changes of statuses and roles. The changes in social activity, summarized by A. Giddens, are worth our attention, too. They take place in the process of transformation of traditional societies into industrial ones.

a) Patriarchal family in a traditional society is the main unit of economy. That is why a man is not only a breadwinner of the family but also the head of a production enterprise. A countryman, a craftsman and a merchant could be

the head. Modern technological revolution has ousted the family out of role positions, it has influenced its preceding productive role. Modern industry denies the fact of household existence. As a result, family can't be transferred to those positions on the level of which industrial production could function. A. Giddens, analyzing the agrarian sector, states, that family farms are on the outskirts of agricultural production, large enterprises rank as more important. Gradually man's dominating social role is changing considerably.

b) Mechanization, and later automatization of production is gradually reducing the spheres of using labor force (production process reduces the demand for males). As the time goes by, production process involves women to perform the men's duties. As a result of these changes women become self-sufficient and independent. Women's self-sufficiency is a guarant or their independence from men. Economic factors influence and create conditions in which monogamous family becomes unstable (the family becomes separated from functions of production). A. Giddens defines the differences between the patriarchal family in a traditional society and a modern family in an industrial society (according to Peter and Brigitte Berger). Patriarchal family in a traditional society has the following structure: a man tries to find a woman who is useful in his work; he gets rid of a woman if he needs to spend money for supporting her. And vice versa, modern family in an industrial society is like this: the production process contributes to the financial independence of women. As a result of this, the situation changes considerably. A woman tries to break up family relationships if her husband becomes a burden in their marriage, she divorces her husband if he prevents her career development.

c) The development of industrial society changes reproductive function of women. The necessity to have as many children as possible remains in the past. Having the largest number of children remains the characteristic feature of all pre-modernist cultures.

d) The motives for having a family were of business character. The economic (and sometimes) political aspects were defined. Expanding prosperity within one family for the expense of another family is a tendency, that became widespread among propertied classes. The elite looked at getting married from the scope of thoughts about their dynasty. The elite tried to strengthen its political force by means of uniting interests of different clans. Peasants and craftsmen tried to acquire new workers in their family business, that was why they agreed to get married.

Time and spacious structures enable us to outline retrospective changes in family relationships. As a result of changes that can be observed in the area of family relationships, some deformations are taking place, actually, the re-institutionalization is taking place [5].

The statistics shows that since 1970 people started getting married later in life. The number of women who hadn't been married before doubled between 1970 and 2000 (from 36% to 73%). For the same period of time the number of women, aged 30–34, who hadn't been married increased three times (from 6% to 22%). Men started getting married later, too. The number of unmarried men, aged 20–24, increased by 55% in 1970 and by 84% in 2000. The percentage of unmarried men between 30–34 years old increased from 9% to 30%. People who have higher education get

married earlier, than those who are less educated, these people delay getting married. In 1956 the age of the first marriage for both men and women was younger – 22,5 years old. In 2008 men first got married at the age of 27,4, women first got married at the age of 25,6. Here's an interesting fact: in 1980 men first married at the age of 26,1 that is very much different from the age of getting married in 2008, that is 27,4 years old.

In 2004 4,27% of all households were defined as "partner household of unmarried couples". This category includes couples living together, both homosexual couples and heterosexual couples. In spite of this fact between 1980 and 1993 the number of couples increased up to 4 million people. The centres of diseases control have estimated that at the age of 30 about half of American women have lovers (2002). The data about couples living together and married couples are interrelated. The increase of "partner households" rates compensate the falling rate of marriages. We'd like to add that nearly half of all first marriages started with living together [1, p. 12].

The organization of spacious structures in family upbringing in globalization processes attracts attention. The transformation of family relationships indicates destruction of other social institutes. The family is constantly changing depending on context and time and causing various discussions connected with transformational processes in society. Families integrate into the world economy through formal and informal work, through production and consumption, through their relationships with the nations. Communication and informational technologies are constantly developing, enabling families and individuals to get access to other spheres. These kinds of relationships are accompanied by new conceptualization of the corresponding way of life, a person's identity and ideology, even among those individuals who will never be able to get access to them. In the West we can observe a stronger accent on individualism, family life democratization, the decrease of a husband's authority, growing recognition of an alternative way of life – cohabitation, divorce, a same-sex marriage, various trajectories of a person's life.

Globalization is a complex phenomenon: on the one hand, it has led to restructuring the economy, which has opened a variety of work places and social relationships. On the other hand, the vital aspect of globalization of the centres of expansion and distribution of new images and ideology in the most remote corners of the world is important, too. Moreover, globalization occurs simultaneously on a few levels. It is realized on a local, national and transnational levels and it is accompanied by the time compression [6].

Changes in the socio-spacious and socio-temporal features of social life are determined by a number of political, economic, social and psychological characteristics. In our further research we are planning to study social and psychological factors which determine an individual's life strategies in the family area. The conditions of present-day life put forward high requirements to a person. These requirements transform life strategies in family relationships.

#### References

1. Segrin C. Family communication / C. Segrin, J. Flora. – New York : Taylor, 2011. – 492 p.
2. Громов И. Западная социология / И. Громов, А. Мацкевич, В. Семенов. – СПб : Изд-во "Ольга", 1997. – 372 с.
3. Гоч В. Теория причинности / В. Гоч, С. Белов. – К. : Ника-

Центр, 1999. – 304 с.

4. Бодрийяр Ж. Общество потребления. Его мифы и структуры / Ж. Бодрийяр ; [Пер. с фр. Е. Самарская]. – М. : Культурная революция; Республика, 2006. – 269 с.

5. Гидденс Э. Трансформация интимности / Э. Гидденс. – СПб. : Питер, 2004. – 208 с.

6. Trask B. Globalization and Families / B. Trask. – L. : Dordrecht Heidelberg, 2010. – 220 p.

### References

1. Segrin C. Family communication / C. Segrin, J. Flora. – New York : Taylor, 2011. – 492 p.

2. Gromov I. Zapadnaya sotsiologiya / I. Gromov, A. Matskevich, V. Semenov. – SPb : Izd-vo "Ol'ga", 1997. – 372 s.

3. Goch V. Teoriya prichinnosti / V. Goch, S. Belov. – K. : Nika – Tsent, 1999. – 304 s.

4. Bodriyyar Z. H. Obshchestvo potrebleniya. Yego mify i struktury / Z. H. Bodriyyar ; [Per. s fr. Ye. Samarskaya]. – M. : Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya; Respublika, 2006. – 269 s.

5. Giddens E. Transformatsiya intimnosti / E. Giddens. – SPb. : Peter, 2004. – 208 s.

6. Trask B. Globalization and Families / B. Trask. – L. : Dordrecht Heidelberg, 2010. – 220 p.

**Дорожко І. І.**, кандидат психологічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри психології, Харківський національний педагогічний університет ім. Г. С. Сковороди (Україна, Харків), psychotherapy16@gmail.com

### Філософський дискурс просторових структур родинного виховання

Розкриваються актуальні питання, що постають у площині родинного виховання. Розглянуто такі поняття, як "соціальний простір", "теорія причинності", "глобалізація", "сім'я". Розвиток світу та людини відбувається саме через особистість. Трансформація родинних відносин свідчить про руйнацію інших соціальних інститутів. Зміни, що впливають на сім'ю, родинне виховання, мають революційний характер. Сучасний світ у фантастичній реальності споживання та достатку. Ця реальність передбачає подальше збільшення та накопичення послуг, матеріальних благ, ресурсів. Фантастична реальність є механізмом глибокої мутації у екології людства. Особистість у суспільстві достатку оточена не іншими людьми, а об'єктами споживання. Ж. Бодрийяр висловлює думку про те, що повсякденне спілкування ігнорує іншу особистість. Повсякденне спілкування особистості не передбачає спілкування з собою подібними, воно акумулюється навколо досягнення благ. Сімейна політика та родинне виховання мають тенденції змінюватись залежно від контексту і часу, просторових характеристик. Безперечно події, які відбуваються у сучасному світі деформують більшість спроб щодо універсальних узагальнень проблематики родинного виховання.

**Ключові слова:** глобалізація, особистість, сім'я, соціальний простір, теорія причинності.

**Дорожко І. І.**, кандидат психологических наук, доцент, заведующая кафедрой психологии, Харьковский национальный педагогический университет им. Г. С. Сковороды (Украина, Харьков), psychotherapy16@gmail.com

### Філософський дискурс просторових структур родинного виховання

Раскрываются актуальные вопросы, возникающие в плоскости семейного воспитания. Рассматриваются такие понятия, как "социальное пространство", "теория причинности", "глобализация", "семья". Развитие мира и человека происходит именно через личность. Трансформация семейных отношений свидетельствует о разрушении других социальных институтов. Изменения, влияющие на семью, семейное воспитание, имеют революционный характер. Современный мир в фантастической реальности потребления и достатка. Эта реальность предполагает дальнейшее увеличение и накопление услуг, материальных благ, ресурсов. Фантастическая реальность является механизмом глубокой мутации в экологии человечества. Личность в обществе изобилия окружена не другими людьми, а объектами потребления. Ж. Бодрийяр высказывает мнение о том, что повседневное общение игнорирует другую личность. Повседневное общение личности не предполагает общение с себе подобными, оно аккумулируется вокруг достижения благ. Семейная политика и семейное воспитание имеют тенденции изменяться в зависимости от контекста и времени, пространственных характеристик. Бесспорно события, которые происходят в современном мире, деформируют большинство попыток относительно обобщений проблем семейного воспитания.

**Ключевые слова:** глобализация, личность, семья, социальное пространство, теория причинности.

\* \* \*

УДК 392.3

**Смельяненко Є. О.**,  
кандидат філософських наук, докторант,  
Національний інститут стратегічних досліджень  
(Україна, Запоріжжя), gileya\_zaporizhzhya@ukr.net

### Витоки та підґрунтя феноменів маргінального

Досліджуючи маргінальність так чи інакше доводиться звертатись до питання її онтологічних підґрунть. Вони є визначальним фактором щодо формування феноменологічних форм, які ми бачимо як прояви маргінальності в соціокультурній практиці.

Застосовуючи метод феноменологічної редукції, здійснюється спроба виокремити витоки та підґрунтя маргінальності як феномену. В основі пошуків лежить уявлення про типізацію та стандартизацію як мисленеві операції, що дозволяють людині та суспільству осягнути незвичне і невідоме, і, відповідно, постають першим підґрунтям маргінальності. Типізація виділяє певні "місця", "поля" в соціальному просторі в межах яких все є звичним та зрозумілим, оскільки володіє переліком необхідних рис та характеристик. Ці риси і характеристики – габітус – постають критеріями можливості знаходження індивіда в межах певного соціокультурного простору, а їх відсутність, або наявність інших, незвичних рис – критеріями для винесення індивіда на межу цього простору. З іншого боку маргінальність розглядається як категорія простору. Чужацтво – надмірна мобільність та активне переміщення людини, неможливість з певністю віднести її до певної країни, культури тощо – обумовлює існування цього індивіда поза або на межі соціокультурного середовища, і також є підґрунтям маргінальності. Ці підґрунтя є тісно взаємопов'язаними, проте чітко відокремленими один від одного при чому одне з них обов'язково поставатиме як первинне.

**Ключові слова:** маргінальність, соціальний статус, соціокультурний простір, типізація, габітус, чужацтво.

Досліджуючи маргінальність так чи інакше доводиться звертатись до питання її онтологічних підґрунть. Вони є визначальним фактором щодо формування феноменологічних форм та процесів, які ми бачимо як прояви маргінальності в соціокультурній практиці.

Питання походження маргінального та його феноменології на сьогодні привернуло увагу низки авторів. Загальні питання, що спрямовані на дослідження маргінальності як соціального явища, розкриті в роботах таких закордонних та вітчизняних авторів: Е. Нейман, Й. Халасінський, А. Керкхофф, Т. МакКормик, Р. Парк, Е. Стоунквіст, Т. Веблен, Т. Шибутані, У. Самнер, А. Фарж, Б. Манчіні, М. Голдберг, Р. Мертон, Є. Стариков, Є. Рашковський, Б. Шапталов, В. Муляр, А. Атоян, З. Голенкова, О. Ігітханян, В. Шапінський, І. Казарінова, М. Степико, Є. Головаха та інші. Проте вузьке питання феноменології та онтології маргінального привернуло увагу значно меншої кількості науковців. Так, цієї проблематики торкались Є. Балабанова, С. Баньковська, М. Бурлуцька, С. Гурін, А. Дьомін, А. Качкін, І. Попова, В. Казакова.

Даний аспект досліджень маргінальності є недостатньо розкритим і, відповідно, актуальним. Тож, метою даної статті постає осмислити та систематизувати можливі витоки та підґрунтя феноменів маргінального в соціальній практиці.

Першим відправним пунктом міркувань постає теза: *будь-яка діяльність людини підлягає стабілізації у формі звички, так званій "габітуалізації"*. Частіше за все остання сприяє зменшенню чисельності низки життєвих продуктів людини та позбавляє її від необхідності визначати кожен ситуацію заново. Цей психологічний підтекст формування усталених форм поведінки є очевидним. Автоматизація людської діяльності, насиченість її зразками, шаблонами та стереотипами звичних дій є психологічно комфортною для людини. *Адже, габітус – сукупність зовнішніх ознак, зовнішній вигляд.*