

daily regimen, an intellectual and social activity, a perception of general health, the symptoms of general and underlying disease, an economic situation, a welfare, the housing conditions are pointed out.

It is determined that the quality of life is an integral feature of psychological, physical, emotional and social functioning of person, based on his /her subjective sensation. The basic components of quality of life: psychological, social, physical and a spiritual well-being are described. There are determined the symptoms of patients with the problems of the cardiovascular system, they are: dyspnea, edema, asthenia, insomnia, a decreased physical activity, which significantly affects the overall condition, the perception of the patient and the severity of the symptoms. It is noted that cardiovascular diseases belong to a class of diseases associated with disorders of the heart or blood vessels.

There are suggested the following means of the cardiovascular disease prevention: change of the way of thinking and thoughts direction, which are based on emotions, sensations; physical exercises strengthen the heart muscle, vascular system, they also develop skeletal muscles, respiratory system, that improves greatly the work of the circulatory system.

Key words: health, quality of life, personality, late maturity, cardiovascular disease, population, psychological peculiarities, mental health, psychological well-being.

УДК 159.923:165.242.2

N.O. MYKHALCHUK, A.O. YATSURYK

THE PROBLEM OF UNDERSTANDING IN PSYCHOLOGY: PHILOSOPHICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Specific of ground of understanding in this article was described according to the philosophical study goes out the context of basic philosophical problem of correlation of real and ideal. It was shown that attitude toward understanding as to the result of cognition multiply changed in the process of the development of philosophical ideas. Not always and not all philosophical schools identically behaved to understanding as to the result of cognition of the surrounding world. It is important that only in methodology and philosophy in the end of 18-th – to the beginning of 19-th century in the process of comprehension of role of empiric researches gradually the heuristic role of the process of understanding began to be realized. The first (and, accordingly, most subzero) level of understanding is peculiar for scientific and logical judgements, laws, categories. Such judgements are free of influence of time, place, authorship (for example, it is knowledge in a pure form), estimation that comes true in obedience to the criteria of truth-fallaciousness. The second level of understanding is related to the actions. The third level of understanding is correlated with the displays of “living experience”, that is given as a display of internal spiritual life of a man.

Key words: understanding, correlation of real and ideal, the result of cognition, the levels of understanding, living experience.

Специфика обоснования понимания как предмета философского исследования относится к контексту основной философской проблемы соотношения реального и идеального. В статье показано, что отношение к пониманию как к результату познания менялось много раз в процессе развития философской мысли. Не всегда и не все философские школы одинаково относились к пониманию как к результату познания окружающего мира. Важно то, что только в методологии и философии конца 18 – начала 19 века в процессе осмысления роли эмпирических исследований постепенно начала осознаваться эвристическая роль процесса понимания. Первый (и, соответственно, низкий) уровень понимания свойственен для научных и логических суждений, законов, категорий. Такие суждения, как правило, свободны от влияния времени, места, авторства (то есть, это знания в “чистом” виде), оценка же их осуществляется согласно критериев истинности-ложности. Второй уровень понимания связан с действиями. Третий уровень понимания соотносится с проявлениями “живого опыта”, который рассматривается как проявление внутренней духовной жизни человека.

Ключевые слова: понимание, соотношение реального и идеального, результат познания, уровни понимания, жизненный опыт.

Introduction. Specific of ground of understanding as the article of philosophical study goes out the context of basic philosophical problem of correlation real and ideal. From the moment of origin of philosophy we always meet with attempts to invent, to describe ideal on the basis of functioning to the reflection, that is why the ever- first ideas about understanding have close connection with the gnosiological range of problems and questions in relation of attempts and ways of cognition of the modern world. In this context, understanding seems the ideal measure of the outer, so called material world that creates the independent area of clean objects and ideas (Plato), or certain quality that exists as a form and comes forward as the essence of material objects (Aristotle).

The review of recent researches. Aspiring to the decision of a question about essence of understanding was introduced in the dialogues of Socrates, the aim of that is finding out the essence of object through the discussion of the concrete and separate phenomena. Socrates asserted that if a man did not have the immortal soul, there would not be knowledge as such. Due to the existence of soul a man has the opportunity to become familiar with the knowledge obtained by him/her in ordinary lives. However, the soul can both improve and deteriorate. For this reason for the soul necessary is dialogical interaction, and it's the one, who wishes to get to know itself, must get to know the own soul.

In conversations of Socrates a philosopher puts before the students a lot of new and new questions, in order to make demonstration of knowledge of a man. Confirmation of it is that dialogues came true in search of answer the question: "What is "x"?" (so called uncertain and unknown knowledge). During a dialogue Socrates, accenting attention of interlocutors the threaded questions, went out from that already known interlocutor, then by the following questions found out the limits of his knowledge, and then already helped him to remember that already it was known to the man. Student of Socrates Plato suggested to begin a process of cognition with ability to think, although under thinking he understood the same, that is a "presentation" and "dreams": "Study to think. Begin with the simplest thoughts. Better in all begin to dream about the most wonderful objects. Able to dream brightly, experiencing bright offenses. Only dreams decide imagination... A dream is conceived in days' childhood, help thinking rudiments" [4, p. 25]. Attitude toward understanding as to the result of cognition multiply changed in the process of the development of philosophical ideas. Not always and not all philosophical schools identically behaved to understanding as to the result of cognition of the surrounding world. The origin of hypothetical method with the aim of understanding of concepts and phenomena is historically related to the early stages of the development of ancient mathematics. Yes, yet the Greek mathematicians as a method of the mathematical leading to widely used a deductive thoughtful experiment that meant formulation of hypotheses and exited from them by means of analytical deduction of consequences with the aim of verification of truth of certain guess-work and achievement of understanding.

Thus, **the objectives** of this article are:

1. To analyze specific of ground of understanding and to describe it according to the philosophical study goes out the context of basic philosophical problem of correlation of real and ideal.
2. To show that attitude toward understanding is the result of cognition multiply changed in the process of the development of philosophical ideas.
3. To ground the levels of understanding.

The main material of the research. Fundamentally the other approach near the lineation of understanding, as notices O.F.Losev [4], was offered by Plato, that examined understanding as a result of the analytically-syntactical method of proving, that is apt at providing of absolutely veritable character of understanding, worked out by a philosopher. In area of studies in relation to ideas Plato uses a principle, that is called "a semantic foresight", "a soil", "a basic principle", "a dominant" and others like that. Idea, after Plato, on the whole does not torn off from a certain thing, but it is a soil of intelligent existence and structure. It is "a principle, a soil, by a chart in basis of this thing" that is a result in his/her understanding [4, p. 30].

The similar analysis of heuristic role of understanding is not accepted by Aristotle, that in the philosophical conception will nurse from impossibility the usage of suppositions as references of the logistic proving (as in their quality confessed only general, necessary and absolutely true) what stipulated negative attitude toward understanding as to the form of unreliable or credible knowledge. Although the maiden attempts of realization of interpretation of texts on the basis of principles of interpretation and allegoric explanation were done in the V-th century to our era in Ancient Greece. As practical material works of Homer, and also dreams, customs and laws, speeches of oracles, were used.

In the period of Reformation an ideologist and a theorist of protestantism Matthias Flacius Illiriski carries out an attempt to decide the problem of polisemantics of signs on the basis of different contexts and, as a result, – senses. Matthias Flacius Illiriski was the first philosopher, who did attempts for being of principles and facilities with the aim of understanding of a sign, and also accenting attention on the variety of values by one, separately taken a sign. So, a philosopher used a principle of contextual interpretation and taking into account the aim of the author's intention, that is why the process of understanding acquires a subjective character. But in the most cases in ancient and medieval science and social science of new time with the aim of achievement of understanding the method of formulation of suppositions was used mainly only in the non-obvious, hidden form, within the limits of other methods of scientific cognition (in a thoughtful experiment, in genetically-structural and inductive methods). "Beginning" of Euclid and statics of Archimedes, and also history of forming of mechanics of Galilei, theory of Newton, molecular-kinetic theory testifies to it. Only in methodology and philosophy in the end of 18-th – to the beginning of 19-th century in the process of comprehension of role of empiric researches gradually the heuristic role of the process of understanding began to be realized. However to neither rationalism nor empiric directions it was not succeeded in classic methodology and philosophy to ground the necessity of achievement of understanding for scientific cognition and overcome contrasting of understanding the laws or knowledge. Understanding, after F. Shleyermaher, envisages reconstructing of work with the aim of scientific ground of such reconstructing. By the aim of understanding, a philosopher considers, there must be understanding of the author of work better than he understands himself [5].

Accepting the point of view of F. Shleyermaher, the German philosopher William Diltey formulates the idea of the vital displays "fixed" in writing as to the method of historical interpretation of texts. Understanding the idea, William Diltey, comes true at the level of consciousness that fully sufficiently for a conclusion about spiritual life of a man : "We explain by means of intellectual processes, but understand by means of general operating of heartfelt capabilities on an object" [6, p. 79]. So, interpretation of external signs of human behavior gives an opportunity to open feature of the human soul. On such chart interpretation of the cultural phenomena comes true, namely literary myths, songs, dances. Here considers a process of that a man cognizes psychical understanding of W. Diltey, what a display it is. A philosopher meant actually, that only wherein there were subjective values and senses, wherein possible were a collaboration and singing of creation, – only on such conditions possible was the interpretation of work, historical facts, ancient culture, and understanding gives birth exactly in that space. So, W. Diltey outlines understanding as a certain type of human cognition on the basis of reflexive experience and certain cognitive maintenance that creates positive

terms for a search and implication of senses. On this basis a philosopher develops classification of levels of understanding, that is correlated with certain displays. The first (and, accordingly, most subzero) level of understanding is peculiar for scientific and logical judgements, laws, categories. Such judgements are free of influence of time, place, authorship (for example, it is knowledge in a pure form), estimation that comes true in obedience to the criteria of truth-fallaciousness. So, W. Dilthey considers this type of understanding which is not perfect enough, because in this connection does not appear between the specific form of display of theoretical description and a life in general. The second level of understanding is related to the actions. Actions are always contextually united with predetermined goals. But, on the other hand, actions, as displays of human life carry unintentional character. Therefore understanding of actions will be realized through the recreation of those aims that predetermine a self action. The feature of this type of understanding is that it is sent to the action, but not on a subject that carries out these actions. Unlike theoretical judgements, the criterion of understanding of action is success or failure in relation to the achievement. The third level of understanding is correlated with the displays of "living experience", that is given as a display of internal spiritual life of a man. These displays of living experience embrace an extraordinarily wide spectrum – from intelligent human work (such as literature, art) and to the involuntary and not realized acts of behavior. Such displays find out bases of human spirit and sometimes report about a person more than she knows about itself. The criterion of estimation of such understanding is considered authenticity of understanding of sense which is able to tell about a man even more, than any other form of theoretical description. The self understanding of such sense, is a central task of psycholinguistics. The brought classification over, in opinion of W. Dilthey, is conditional enough for theoretical abstraction. In fact, all marked types of understanding are closely casebound. The levels of understanding have found a reflection in the "philosophical fairy-tales" of M.I. Kozlov: "Prompt for understanding: around there are normal teachers, go around with notebooks, tired, but without these high-humane heartfelt shocks. And, maybe, is it ability indeed? Yes, but it must be realized. And that is why a psychologist submerges in methodical work: he develops EDUCATIONAL COURSE. It is an educational school course, but in an attractive form, such as Clear after essence and Easy after a form. And that is why at lessons he begins to give clever Theoretical Knowledge, and in order that this whole understanding, tells Interesting "Psychological Fables". As a result of it the veritable understanding is arrived at, so that this is not only capture students by knowledge, but also deep understanding of events that took place around [3, p. 75]. Martin Gaydegger, unlike F.Shleyermaher and W.Dilthey, analyses understanding at fundamentally new level, examining it as a method of existence of a man in the world. Understanding, after Martin Gaydegger, is given to us with things, in co-operating with objects and others like that. Understanding provides a basis for any contact of a man with a surrounding world, finds out the same the basic method of human existence. A follower M.Gaydegger Gans Geogr Gadamer names such understanding as "previous" things [2, p. 259], which are set by a certain cultural tradition in that a man is and, that it is important, – thinks in the process of prosecution of a text. Unfortunately, G.G.Gadamer asserts, to free oneself from previous understanding a man can not, as he or she does not exist out of a culture, a history, by traditions and others like that. Thus, G.G.Gadamer the first in a philosophical way who has walked up to consideration of understanding in unity with thinking about a personality, that outlines new directions of the development of scientific thoughts by a way to the ground of the investigated phenomenon. Martin Buber expounds ideas that veritable understanding of a man exists only in a dialogue. Examining existence as dialogue between God and a man, a man and the world, Martin Buber walked up to contrasting subject-subject (I-You) and subject-object (I-It) relations. The World for a man is double, Martin Buber asserts. It is determined by duality of all in its positions. It appears already in a basic pair – I and you. "Who talks to you has nothing as the object" [1]. You is boundless. It is the entire world, but it is united with I. The other pair is I and It. A man cognizes the world; she or he meets with things and objects that surround us, studies their structure and gets knowledge. Yes, I do recognize Something. But wherein there is Something, it does exist and other Something. Every of It, in opinion of M.Buber, has connections with other It. The world of things allows to study yourself, but it does not react on human actions and acts. Tradition of philosophical cognition (I-It) is matched against other person. This dialogue of M.Buber, in turn, contrasts monologue, and in an order to overcome it, a philosopher calls to more old, essential Biblical sources. M.Buber names three major spheres in that connection which will be realized between I and you and understanding is arrived at. The first sphere is life with nature (relations are unspeech). The second sphere is the most essential for the development of psychological conceptions, it is life with people. Relations accept a speech form, we can give forward and accept you. The third sphere is spiritual life. Relations expose itself without broadcasting, but generate a language. We can hear no "You", but feel an appeal, and we answer, thinking, operating, recreating offenses. We talk a basic word with all essence are you, but we do not have enough courage to say or claim that.

I-You of copulas between people can not attain certain reciprocity, if they keep this character, but, as underlines M.Buber, they are very important in mutual relationships between the real educator and his/her pupil. In an order to expose potential of a student, it is necessary to see him in concrete personality, to perceive him integrally. It is very important therefore that a student every time was a partner in the situations of dialogue with an educator. In a teacher experiences a partner described "meeting" (in our case it is a dialogue) at this form as for itself, and also for the partner. But, in opinion of M.Buber, I-You of copulas between an educator and pupil can not be to mutual fully, even when interpersonal relations accept a character of friendship, and understanding between distinguished personalities by proof character.

Dialogical principle of M.Buber more in detail is analysed by a philosopher in his other research which is titled "A problem of Man". So, M.Buber criticizes monologue existence of Man (according to M.Gaydegger), disagrees neither with individualism nor with a collectivism as with approaches of cognition of a Man. Individualism sees a man

only in his/her correlation with by a soba, collectivism in general does not see a man, but only a society. In individualism the face of a man is flexural, and in a collectivism it is mostly closed. M.Buber specifies on a way, that helps to go out outside individualism and collectivism for the achievement vitally of important decisions of future generations. And here M.Buber draws the third way of cognition that must help people again to get the present I in own personality and to find a real society. The basic article of such science will be not an individual, not collective relations, but a Man with a Man. Only in relationships with other people everyone can directly get to know himself/herself, understand it and me, hidden trains of own consciousness, only due to dialogical principle of mutual relations a man finds own essence, “absorbing” for itself related to human, comparing itself and relating with other people [1]. Thus, M.Buber gives advantage of dialogical communication in an achievement of understanding between people.

The ideas of G.Gadamer and M.Buber considerably influenced on the search of ways to the lineation of the phenomenon of understanding by Paul Ricker. Philosopher, taking into account three major spheres in that realized, after M.Buber connection between I and you, studies influence of human discussions in relation to certain work on interpretation the last one. The central idea of P.Ricker was an idea of “a paradigm of the text” that is generated by the specific of writing broadcasting. In this case actual information of a text and intension of the author can not coincide, that is why there will be a “conflict of interpretation”. In order to explain the sense of a text, P.Ricker calls to the key concept about existence of a man in the world. Thus, a sense of a text, a philosopher considers, can be the determination in forming of a new look of the person in the world. According to his opinion, “paragmatic text” predetermines the “paradigm of reading” and dialectics at last. Dialectics, in turn, carries out motion from understanding to explanation. Thus, dialectics is based on the objectivity of a text and subject position of the author. By another definition of P.Ricker, that he enters there is “deep semantics” of the text in a scientific concept vehicle. A philosopher too narrows this concept, understanding under it only so called relating text with the world. In this case P.Ricker absolutely determines levels of authorial intention that does not help the development of theory of understanding, and, vice versa, brakes possibilities of this research, though the complication of this phenomenon lights up much .

Conclusions. The analysis of philosophical ideas demonstrate inconsistency in the use of different categories, such as “understanding”, “explanation”, “interpretation” and others like that. So, philosophers used the same category in the cases of description of different procedures, or, vice versa, there are different concepts for one procedure. Although obvious is that understanding it follows to examine, first of all, as the philosophical and methodological problem plugged in the context of general theory of cognition.

The list of literature

1. Бубер М. Я и ТЫ : [пер. с нем.] / М. Бубер. – М. : Высш. шк., 1993. – 176 с.
2. Гадамер Г.-Г. Истина и метод. Основы философской герменевтики / Г.-Г. Гадамер ; [пер. с нем., общ. ред. и вступ. ст. Б. Н. Бессонова]. – М. : Прогресс, 1988. – 700 с.
3. Козлов Н. И. Философские сказки для обдумывающих жизнь, или весёлая книга о свободе и нравственности / Н. И. Козлов. – [4-е изд., перераб. и доп.]. – М. : АСТ-ПРЕСС КНИГА, 2002. – 425 с.
4. Лосев А. Ф. Философия. Мифология. Культура / А. Ф. Лосев. – М. : Мысль, 1991. – 525 с.
5. Шлейермахер Ф. Речи о религии к образованным людям, её презирующим : монологи / Ф. Шлейермахер ; [пер. с нем., предисл. и послесл. С. Франк ; под ред. Т. Янковенко]. – М. : Refl – book ; Киев : ИСА, 1994. – 417 с. – (Серия собрание латинского клуба).
6. Diltey W. Gesammelte Schriften / W. Diltey. – Leipzig-Berlin : Urania – Verl., 1926. – Bd. 7. – 79 s.

References

1. Buber M. Ja i TY : [per. s nem.] / M. Buber. – M. : Vyssh. shk., 1993. – 176 s.
2. Gadamer G.-G. Istina i metod. Osnovy filosofskoj hermenevtiki / G.-G. Gadamer ; [per. s nem., obshh. red. i vstup. st. B. N. Bessonova]. – M. : Progress, 1988. – 700 s.
3. Kozlov N. I. Filosofskie skazki dlja obdumyvajushhih zhit'jo, ili vesjolaja kniga o svobode i npravstvennosti / N. I. Kozlov. – [4-e izd., pererab. i dop.]. – M. : AST-PRESS KNIGA, 2002. – 425 s.
4. Losev A. F. Filosofija. Mifologija. Kul'tura / A. F. Losev. – M. : Mysl', 1991. – 525 s.
5. Shlejermaher F. Rechi o religii k obrazovannym ljudjam, ejo prezirajushhim : monologi / F. Shlejermaher ; [per. s nem., predisl. i poslesl. S. Frank ; pod red. T. Jankovenko]. – M. : Refl – book ; Kiev : ISA, 1994. – 417 s. – (Serija sobranie latinskogo kluba).
6. Diltey W. Gesammelte Schriften / W. Diltey. – Leipzig-Berlin : Urania – Verl., 1926. – Bd. 7. – 79 s.

Михальчук Н.О., Яцюрик А.О. ПРОБЛЕМА РОЗУМІННЯ В ПСИХОЛОГІЇ: ФІЛОСОФСЬКЕ ТА МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНЕ ОБҐРУНТУВАННЯ

Специфіка обґрунтування розуміння як предмета філософського вивчення виходить із контексту основної філософської проблеми співвідношення реального та ідеального. В статті показано, що ставлення до розуміння як до результату пізнання змінювалося багато разів в процесі розвитку філософської думки. Не завжди та не всі філософські школи однаково ставилися до розуміння як до результату пізнання оточуючого світу. Важливим є те, що лише в методології і філософії кінця 18 – початку 19 століття в процесі осмислення ролі емпіричних досліджень поступово почала усвідомлюватися евристична роль процесу розуміння. Перший (і, відповідно, найнижчий) рівень розуміння є властивим для наукових і логічних суджень, законів, категорій. Такі судження вільні від впливу часу, місця, авторства (тобто, це знання у „чистому” вигляді), оцінка ж їх

здійснюється згідно критеріїв істинності-хибності. В. Дільтей вважає цей вид розуміння не досить досконалим, тому що в ньому не виявляється зв'язок між специфічною формою прояву теоретичного опису і самим життям. Другий рівень розуміння пов'язаний з діями. Дії завжди контекстуально поєднані з цілепокладанням. Але, з іншого боку, дії, як прояви людського життя носять неінтенційний, ненавмисний характер. Тому розуміння дії реалізується через відтворення тих цілей, що зумовлюють саму дію. Особливістю даного типу розуміння є те, що воно спрямоване на дії, а не на суб'єкта, який здійснює ці дії. На відміну від теоретичних суджень, критерієм розуміння дії є успіх чи невдача щодо досягнення цілей. Третій рівень розуміння співвідноситься з проявами „живого досвіду”, які подаються як вияв внутрішнього духовного життя людини. Ці прояви „живого досвіду” охоплюють надзвичайно широкий спектр – від осмислених продуктів людської творчості (таких, як література, мистецтво) і до мимовільних та неусвідомлюваних актів поведінки. Такі прояви виявляють самі основи людського духу та інколи повідомляють про особу більше, ніж вона про себе знає. Критерієм оцінки такого розуміння вважається аутентичність розуміння смислу, здатного розповісти про людину більше, ніж будь-яка форма теоретичного опису. Саме розуміння такого смислу, за В.Дільтеєм, є центральним завданням герменевтики.

Ключові слова: розуміння, співвідношення реального та ідеального, результат пізнання, рівні розуміння, життєвий досвід.

УДК 316.614.5:159.922.7–056.49

М.І. МУШКЕВИЧ

МОДЕЛІ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ ПСИХОЛОГІЧНОГО СУПРОВОДУ СІМЕЙ, ЯКІ МАЮТЬ ПРОБЛЕМНИХ ДІТЕЙ

Стаття присвячена аналізу моделей психологічного супроводу сімей, які мають проблемних дітей. Виділені такі основні теоретичні моделі, як психологічна модель, педагогічна модель, медична модель, соціальна та діагностична моделі. Зроблено акцент на основні пункти роботи із сім'ями, які мають проблемних дітей у дефіцитарній, плюралістичній, ресурсній моделях, моделях групової терапії та батьківського всеобучу, моделях, які базуються на транзактному аналізі та психоаналітичній теорії. Запропоновано змістові складові психологічного супроводу, які включають в себе систему організаційних, діагностичних, навчальних і розвиваючих заходів і характеризується: етапністю, динамічністю й гнучкістю, варіативністю, результативністю. Вказано, що представлена структура психологічного супроводу сім'ї, яка має проблемну дитину визначається методом, процесом, суттю поняття, технологією, метою, завданнями, принципами, функціями, формами реалізації, механізмами.

Ключові слова: психологічний супровід, моделі супроводу, проблемна дитина, сім'я, медична модель, педагогічна модель, діагностична модель, соціальна модель.

Статья анализирует модели психологического сопровождения семей, имеющих проблемных детей. Выделены такие основные теоретические модели, как психологическая модель, педагогическая модель, медицинская модель, социальная и диагностическая модели. Сделан акцент на основные пункты работы с семьями, которые имеют проблемных детей в дефицитарной, плюралистической, ресурсной моделях, моделях групповой терапии и родительского всеобуча, моделях, основанных на транзактном анализе и психоаналитической теории. Представлено основные составляющие психологического сопровождения, которые включают в себя систему организационных, диагностических, учебных и развивающих мероприятий и характеризуется: этапностью, динамичностью и гибкостью, вариативностью, результативностью. Указано, что представленная структура психологического сопровождения семьи, которая имеет проблемного ребенка определяется методом, процессом, понятием, технологией, целью, задачами, принципами, функциями, формами реализации, механизмами.

Ключевые слова: психологическое сопровождение, модели сопровождения, проблемный ребенок, семья, медицинская модель, педагогическая модель, диагностическая модель, социальная модель.

Постановка проблеми. Актуальність розробки психологічного супроводу сімей, які мають проблемних дітей, зумовлена новими соціальними вимогами, важливими завданнями яких є забезпечення захисту психологічного здоров'я, профілактика дисфункційних явищ, підвищення психологічної культури, посилення позитивного виховного компоненту сім'ї. В основу нових підходів до роботи психологічного супроводу покладені сучасні напрямки дослідження соціальних інституцій: сім'я, родина, батьківство (Т. Алексєнко, Ю. Бохонкова, М. Боярин, О. Васильченко, Т. Говорун, З. Зайцева, З. Ковальчук, А. Капська, Р. Овчарова, Л. Пілецька, В. Тернопільська, М. Тоба), їх положення про концептуальні моделі батьківства (В. Брутман, О. Ісеніна, О. Копил, С. Мещерякова, К. Седих, Г. Філіппова та ін.); положення і принципи активного соціально-психологічного навчання (О. Блинова, О. Бондарчук, А. Борисюк, В. Бочелюк, С. Гарьковець, Н. Завацька, Т. Яценко); положення про специфічні зміни в емоційному стані батьків і дитячо-батьківські стосунки (І. Багдасар'ян, Є. Баєнська, А. Варга, Є. Мастюкова, О. Нікольська, Л. С. Печнікова, А. Прихожан, Є. Савіна, А. Співаковська, В. Ткачова, О. Чарова, Е. Ейдєміллер, В. Юстицькіс та ін.). У той же час питання про психологічні фактори, що лежать в основі індивідуальної варіативності поведінки батьків, вивчені