

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

DOI: 10.21684/2587-8484-2018-2-4-70-80

UDC 316.723

## Ethoses of education and the modernization of the Russian society

Aleksander P. Pavlov<sup>1</sup>, Pavel A. Pavlov<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cand. Sci. (Philos.), Associate Professor,  
Department of Sociology, Siberian Federal University  
(Krasnoyarsk, Russian Federation)  
pavloff56@list.ru

<sup>2</sup> Cand. Sci. (Hist.), Associate Professor,  
Department of Sociology, Siberian Federal University  
(Krasnoyarsk, Russian Federation)  
savel-b@yandex.ru

**Abstract.** This article analyzes education as a productive resource of the Russian society in the modernization conditions in the early 2000s. The authors believe that these resources lie mainly in the educational sphere, precisely, in the educational ethos. Thus, this article studies educational space as a sphere of creative challenges and opportunities for young people in the modernizing Russian society. The authors differentiate the terms *educational space* and *learning space*. In the educational space, a young person acquires knowledge necessary for his or her life. In the learning space, a young person is formed as a participant of society reproduction—a social actor. However, the authors believe that the existing practices and learning methods are insufficiently oriented at the reproduction of actors conforming to the requirements of social modernization. The modernization sets new demands to the reproduction mechanism of the educational medium—autopoiesis, which is the society's ability to reproduce its own basic components, thus generating and reproducing another society. This article aims to demonstrate the possibilities for improving educational efficiency as an autopoiesis system. These possibilities lie in the structure of educational ethos, studied in detail (i. e. its phenomenon and peculiar features) in this work. The authors interpret educational ethos as a system of ethical and ontological relations, which involve the young people into the processes of educational autopoiesis as actors.

**Keywords:** ethos of education, autopoiesis, educational environment, classical education.

**Citation:** Pavlov A. P., Pavlov P. A. 2018. "Ethoses of education and the modernization of the Russian society". *Siberian Socium*, vol. 2, no 4, pp. 70-80.

DOI: 10.21684/2587-8484-2018-2-4-70-80



## INTRODUCTION

Modern sociological and pedagogical papers say a lot about the crisis of modern national education. It seems primarily important to explain a number of concepts and related topics and perspectives, which need to be clarified despite being evident and frequently used. First, what is the “crisis of education”? Indeed, when it comes to the crisis of education, it is important to determine what is meant by the researchers of this problem. The very word ‘crisis’ (from the Greek Κρίσις—decision, judgment, distinction) has a number of semantic shades: “turning point”, “deadlock situation”, “boundary”, “transition state”. Despite a wide range of semantic shades, it is possible to define a crisis as a deadlock situation, when the previous ways of existence of an object (institution, group, environment, etc.) are impossible. They will either destroy the object, or prevent its reproduction.

There is one more manifestation of crisis, which, in our opinion, takes place in the field of education: imitation. The object in a critical situation does not develop. It seems to be “frozen”. It creates the illusion of its self-development. In fact, the object can exist and function only when it receives a task from the outside, with external functions “overlapping” (J. Searle). Thus, the object (system) loses the quality of autopoiesis (self-development by means of its own elements).

All these manifestations of crisis apply to modern Russian education in varied ways.

It is important to define the “crisis of education”. Education is not the same as learning. Education is the environment where the process of reproduction of human social resources takes place. It includes various aspects of teaching and learning and also social, sociocultural determinants indirectly related to teaching and learning.

Thus, the improvement of education is not limited to the improvement of the elements of learning environment, including teacher training, material support, developing information technologies, etc. The modern stage of social modernization (and education is the most important social subsystem) evokes new requirements to the reproduction mechanisms of the educational environment, which are referred to as autopoiesis of education, in the article.

## MAIN PART

A few words should be said about the essence of autopoiesis (applicable to social objects). The concept and the term of autopoiesis were suggested by the Chilean scientists U. Maturana and F. Varela [10, p. 15]. The German sociologist N. Luhmann extrapolated this concept to social life [7]. The main principle of autopoiesis is that the reproduction of the world and the reproduction of actors are interrelated processes, or, better, it is a single process. The well-known sociologist G. Ritzer identified four characteristic features of autopoiesis: “society produces its own basic elements; creates its own boundaries and structures; it is self-referential and closed” [14, p. 223].

Based on the ideas of the above mentioned scientists, it is possible to determine the essence of autopoiesis in the field of education. Education is a complex process

that goes beyond teaching and learning. It covers the sociocultural environment and social institutions where a young person is socialized (family, public organizations, cultural institutions, media, etc.). School is an institutional environment which accumulates a young person's social experience required in a given society. At the same time, young people do not only acquire competencies necessary for life but also master the qualities that allow them to constitute themselves as social actors. In other words, young people are able to be participants and most important elements of social reproduction (autopoiesis).

At different stages of human history and in different types of civilizations, education performed specific autopoietic functions.

Historical types (paradigms) of educational autopoiesis are as follows:

1. Imitative. The system "teacher–student". The evidence of the most ancient origin of this type is the Upanishads, the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC ancient Indian religious and philosophical treatise.

Spiritual teachers—the guru—shared their spiritual experience and knowledge. Students did not just study and receive knowledge from their teachers but they adopted their teachers' life experience directly. The meaning of the imitational paradigm of education is not so much the production of new knowledge but its reproduction. The main thing is to preserve the experience of the past since the spiritual source is there. The past experience did not only teach special knowledge but also rendered the cult magical practices, rituals, and special mythopoetic stories (epics).

2. Classic (eidetic). It appeared back in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC in Ancient Greece. Educational autopoiesis is based on a specific philosophical discourse (in other words, a way of thinking).

"The classical type of philosophizing presupposes the existence of a system of samples determining the comparison and understanding of the main aspects and spheres of being: nature, society, human life, activities, cognition and thinking" [5, p. 399].

Classical discourse is based on tradition, the authority of scientists, thinkers, scientific schools, religious tenets, ideological clichés, educational standards, etc.

Classical discourse underlies the classical type of educational autopoiesis. Its essence is that classical education is focused on the formation of the type of personality that corresponds to the historically established cultural patterns. Young people do not just master knowledge, they are brought up as actors, and their practical, professional competences are relevant to social (personal) competences.

Young people are assumed to be active in mastering school or university knowledge. While doing so, they follow socially accepted cultural patterns. The symmetry of the axiological (value, ethical) and utilitarian basics in classical education enables young people to be involved in the processes of reproduction of the society without destroying its architectonics (this is the essence of classical autopoiesis).

Classical education has its flaws. But it contributed greatly to the development of science, literature, painting, music, architecture, education itself, and also to the formation of modern civilizations. Classical education gave birth to Da Vinci,



Galileo, Newton, Descartes, Kant, Tolstoy and many other great scientists and artists. Classical education was a prerequisite for modern technologies, economic and political institutions (including democracy), and personal freedoms.

### 3. Non-classical and post-non-classical education.

The late 20<sup>th</sup> century and especially the early 21<sup>st</sup> century witnessed the beginning of the “information society”. This phenomenon has been paid considerable attention by national and international authors. The framework of the article and its main focus do not allow the concepts of the “information society” to be dwelled on.

It should be noted that the “information society” has its hidden and often unnoticed side. It is the humanitarian component. That is, the information society does not only mean developed information technologies. This is a new type of reproduction of the society and the person, or, in terms of this article, autopoiesis. It should be reminded that autopoiesis is interpreted by the authors of the article as a mechanism of double reproduction: reproduction of actors reproducing social connections (“networks”), which, in turn, create conditions for the reproduction of the actors themselves.

One of the first scientists who paid attention to the humanitarian component of the information society was A. Moles. [11] He showed that totally dominant mass communication forms a new type of personality with a split mind. Actors of this type do not have a substantial eidetic support. They do not have a fixed ontological role in social communication. And the communication itself has neither segments nor symbolic markings or habits. A. Moles called this communication “mosaic”.

How is autopoiesis possible under these conditions? (A. Moles did not use the term autopoiesis.) There is only one way: the social actor must be an “expert”. The expert is not just a narrow-minded specialist. This is an actor that can perform actor’s functions only by receiving tasks from the outside. The actor’s creative abilities are manifested in following the instructions correctly. With mass media (including the system of knowledge) emancipated and alienated from the actor, the latter becomes an object of manipulation by political and business elites.

Some scholars argue that the absence of substantial barriers and the “groundlessness” of the world lead to the emancipation of man from fetters restricting the human freedom of traditions, freedom from ideological dictate and national prejudices, which reveals man’s self-development. Others, on the contrary, see it as a severe and irreversible humanitarian crisis, which inevitably leads (if it has not led yet) to the “death of the subject” as a sovereign actor, because, having no “ground”, it becomes a thing that can be manipulated.

Both positions have their own arguments. This situation can be called the “bifurcation point”, the breach of two related but contradicting trends—on the one hand, emergence of universal communication codes that allow actors to operate with large amounts of heterogeneous information and, on the other hand, neglect the classic “roots” of knowledge, which is accompanied by actors losing “authorship”. Authorship is an ability of people to play their own role in communication. The absence of such a role leads to the “death of the author”.

It is obvious that the “death of authorship” should not be taken literally. Of course, authorship and authors are alive and well. It is only the metaphor borrowed from postmodernism reflecting the subjectlessness of autopoiesis in education.

The idea of the subjectlessness of autopoiesis may seem rather controversial and improper. If autopoiesis does not have a subject, then who produces modern techniques and technologies, who develops modern science? This is not about the degradation of human intelligence, but the role of man in the society and in communication.

The classical paradigm of education could exist in a stable, “stationary” society. In the non-classical era of the mosaic culture and the culture of “experts” (A. Moles), elements of classical education remained but were severely criticized for formalism, bureaucracy, disrespect for the child’s personality, lack of freedom of expression, etc. It is shown in a famous film *The Wall* (1982) by A. Parker. The film portrays the school as a gigantic virtual meat grinder, which grinds children into impersonal human material.

Modern reality can face the crisis of classical education. The word “crisis” does not mean that classical education has exhausted its possibilities. It is just the opposite.

It is apparent that since the 1990s, after the collapse of the USSR, many education reformers thought that classical education was outdated and did not follow modern trends. In their opinion, there is no need to reproduce the classical patterns of education or take into account the national features in the context of globalization and the deideologization of the global socio-political and cultural space. The modern “network society” is not tied to the basic cultural patterns, “eidetic roots”.

The most important indicator of neglecting classical education is the crisis of its humanitarian component. This conclusion may seem strange, given the real “boom” in higher humanitarian education in modern Russia. The crisis of humanitarian education is not only expressed in the reduced amount of classes given to the humanities in general education schools and universities but in other things. The humanitarian component of education is necessary when teaching “non-humanitarian” sciences: physics, chemistry, mathematics, etc. Its social meaning is the formation of a person who is ready and able not only to apply knowledge in practice, but also to create and reproduce the “practice” itself—the space of opportunities for being a social actor.

Nevertheless, the crisis of classical education does not indicate its degradation at all. The educational systems that incorporate elements of classical education with due account of the national social traditions and culture operate effectively. The need to rehabilitate classical education as autopoiesis is especially relevant in the context of the emerging “network” principles of societal order and the associated post-non-classical communication models.

It is classical education that is a counterbalance to the destructive anti-humanitarian tendencies to eliminate a person as a sovereign and sole subject of autopoietic processes in the society, to “take it off the scene”.

There are various theories justifying the idea that not only people, but any things and beings can be subjects (actors) of social reproduction and modernization in the



“network society”. The French sociologist B. Latour believes that in the “network society” actors (“actants”) are not only people, but also any processes, artifacts, social groups, and even microbes that are involved in the autopoiesis of social networks [6].

Indeed, we live in a world where everything is interconnected. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to determine the share of participation of an individual subject in the social processes of the “network world”. Of course, all this does not mean that we do not appreciate the contribution of great people to the development of modern technologies, science, culture, and politics (B. Gates, I. Mask, S. Spielberg, M. Zuckerberg, V. Putin, etc.) But the vast majority of people are involved in the “network” autopoiesis anonymously, in absentia.

The danger of neglecting or underestimating classical education may not worry people much today. This may be due to the fact that many of them, especially young people, associate their education and self-realization with the “networks” and the Internet. The “networks” and the Internet today are the most important channels for replenishing the identity crisis, existential vacuum, anomie, especially after the collapse of the USSR, the destructive anti-humanitarian processes that took place in Russia in the 1990s, when the socio-political system and the ideology of socialism were destroyed, and the basic semantic guidelines were lost.

The “networks” and the Internet have won the minds of almost all young people. This is more than an accessible and operational source of information. “Networking” helps young people feel freer and independent from the authority of adults. “Network” communication is distinguished by a high degree of independence from the social context (social, political, ideological, and even material conditions of life). First, the actors of the network world are free to make decisions and judgments, give evaluations, and build personal life strategies. The actors of the network society do not accept any dictate or submission. Actions of actors do not carry a burden of moral or status obligations, or any braces.

Second, the actors are practically independent of each other, or at least this dependence is not forced. The network society has no hierarchy, or vertical dependence. The actors are responsible for their actions and report solely to themselves.

Third, as soon as they are not “tied” to a particular social context, the actors do not take social responsibility. Social identity is not expressed since the actors are rather building partnerships with members of the virtual community. There are no loyalty issues.

Fourth, the actors do not normally have “long-term” strategies, there are no stable preferences. They prefer to make plans for the near future here and now. It should be emphasized that this is primarily about young people—hyper-mobile, responsive to social change, understanding social, professional, economic conditions, not afraid to risk money (which is usually scarce) and reputation (which is often perceived as unimportant capital).

But what about classical education and related issues (direct dialogue between the teacher and students), classical forms of education (teaching, upbringing, discipline)? It is not only young people and/or their parents, but also a number of

“progressive” education innovators, scientists, and psychologists who believe that classical education has become outdated, moreover it hinders social development. For some reason, many experts in theory and practice, namely reformers of education in Russia after the collapse of the USSR and the associated communist ideology (the Soviet explanation), decided that young people, children, and teenagers should be emancipated from the “ideological dictate” of adults. No one has the right to interfere with young people’s personal freedom.

As mentioned above, education as an autopoietic system can exist in its own constantly generated space, which, in turn, is incorporated into the sociocultural space of the society.

To understand the nature of the social space of education, one can use Popper’s Three Worlds but in a rather different edition. According to Popper, Three Worlds coexist interconnected: 1) the objective reality; 2) the subjective world of mind; 3) the world of objective content of thinking, the products of people’s mental activity [13].

From the socio-ontological point of view (socio-ontological approach), the concept of Three Worlds takes on a slightly different look.

World One is **the world of human existence**, of direct human being. It is about the so-called “world of life”. This is a pre-predicative, pre-reflective world in which the existentials of human existence are found manifesting: the fundamental mood of “being,” the presence-in-the-world as the primary ontological beginning of human existence. Within a given world, autopoiesis is manifested in the concern for a shared-with-others world.

World Two can be called **the societal world**, or the world of “System”. If “World One” is the world of care for being, then “World Two” is instrumental, a world of resource. People are not only concerned with their presence in the world, reliable, ontologically safe, but also with the resources of this world. The autopoiesis of “World Two” is the reproduction of human existence (material, organizational).

World Three is a structurally organized **space of knowledge, meanings, and patterns**. It is about the eidetic sphere ensuring the involvement of individuals in social communications. World Three forms semantic boundaries, within which ideal types of social actors are constituted. Each civilization constitutes types of actors (personalities) that correspond to samples of the eidetic picture of the world.

Thus, World Three is the most important component of social autopoiesis since it connects the existential-ontological and instrumental modes of social reproduction with the personal one. The basis of “World Three” is the educational environment, the central element being a young personality. Therefore, the educational environment includes the whole complex of conditions that form a young person as an active social actor.

The educational environment does not exist isolated from other spheres (“worlds”) of social being. But the connection between them is not only practical. Of course, a modern educational system needs modern equipment, information and management technologies, qualified teachers, etc. But the ontological connection is just as important. It is less tangible since it concerns the existential component of education.



What happens to the educational space in the era of “network society”? First of all, it loses the ability to reproduce and retain social reality, which loses its eidetic integrity and clarity. In other words, modern man lives in an excessively complex mosaic world resembling a labyrinth with traditional communication channels destroyed. There is no sole reality—there are many realities that suddenly appear and just as suddenly dissolve in an endless communicative network flow, where the object and the subject, the meaning and the sign, are constantly changing places (remember Latour’s theory).

An important element of education as autopoiesis is the ethos of education. Translated from Greek, ἔθος means custom, rules of conduct. The framework of the article does not allow dwelling on various approaches and theories of ethos.

The concept of ethos is rarely used in social sciences. One can assume that this concept appeared in the thesaurus of social sciences, promoted by M. Weber’s well-known paper *Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*, where the German sociologist examined the religious and ethical foundations of social development, in Western European civilizations in particular.

A common thing for these scientists is an attempt to explain the nature of social phenomena and processes by the peculiarities of the value (cultural) core of a particular society rather than by the structural properties and institutional mechanisms of social systems [2, 3, 15].

Social membership and the ability of individuals to be actors in a given society are determined by their attitude to the cultural core, around which social life is built and ordered. But the cultural core does not just unite people but it acts as a cultural attractor. It acts as a central intention and at the same time as a horizon of opportunities for individuals to express themselves as social actors. The cultural core forms a discursive space forming traditions, which make it possible to maintain the identity of the social order of a given society [15].

V. I. Bakshtanovsky and V. Yu. Sogomonov think that ethos is “an intermediate level between varied manners and proper morality, between what is real and what is proper” [1, p. 96]. According to another point of view, ethos is “undeclared or undefined norms and values which guide people in their acts” [12, p. 31].

Summarizing all the said above and introducing a certain wording into the statements made, we can give our own definition of ethos. Ethos is the root value system, visible or invisible, explicit or implied, present in everyday human life. Ethos can exist within the space it constructs. Such spaces can be a community, school, university.

What is the educational ethos? This is a system of stable and horizontal relationships between participants in the educational process: teachers, students, parents, and school (university) authorities. The educational ethos does not share knowledge directly. But it creates and consolidates the environment in which students (school-children, university students) are brought up as actors of the educational process; “on the whole, a constantly deteriorating quality of our education—general and vocational—comes from a decline in the level of educational ethos, including academic culture” [8, p. 208].

The attributes of the educational ethos are various forms of solidarity (friendship, fraternity), special behavioural rituals (initiation). Ethos enables a person to feel the boundaries of one's true being. This is a world a person must always return to. The architectonics of the ethos is not established by any institutions, but is constituted by direct members of ethical solidarity. Different kinds of ethos are inseparable from the actors who reproduce them. The educational process is possible when teachers and students carry out a common cause, a "work" (poiesis).

Ethos always presupposes solidarity—the natural connection of interested participants in a common cause. But this is not a system connection. In the system, each element is an integral part of the whole. In the ethos there are no elements (constructs) that make up the whole. In the ethos there is no hierarchy or subordination. In the ethos, each participating unit is self-sufficient.

Thus, the attributes of the educational ethos are: a sense of one's place in the ethical community, self-esteem, confidence in the teacher, and others. Of course, all that has been said is so obvious that it does not need special explanations and comments. But all these ethical qualities cannot be brought up or introduced artificially into young people's minds.

There must be a special ethical environment and a system of ethical practices and rituals associated with it, allowing young people to feel involved: dedication (initiation); maintaining the corporate spirit of the ethos and its members; the formation of myths, legends, "stories" of ethos, the formation of their own style; promotion of leaders representing the interests of the ethical community, etc. The ethical environment allows young people to build and put into practice their life strategies [16].

Moreover, it is necessary to recognize present signs of "extinction" in the modern educational ethos. The extinction of the ethos does not mean its disappearance. It is just the situation when the ethos "adapts" to new conditions, ceasing to be the environment where young people are brought up as actors of educational autopoiesis.

There are external and internal threats to the educational ethos. External threats lie in "colonization" of ethos by the administrative system. The "colonization" of ethos occurs when the administrative system tries to incorporate the ethos artificially, to impose its own rules and codes on it, to subordinate it to the "official" imperatives and instructions.

Internal threats lie in forming a parallel ethos. The ethos can replace the administrative system, performing unusual functions. For example, intracorporate solidarity of teachers, professors, and students who form their own virtual "magic corporations". Internal threats are connected to external ones. Resisting the pressure of the administrative system ("colonization"), the ethos forms its own internal structures that are self-contained. It becomes the so-called "parallel ethos".

Sometimes these corporations form symbioses, "networks" of relations establishing destructive informal institutions or structures that lock themselves in and "grow isolated". A "parallel" ethos makes its own rules, codes of conduct, and forms of solidarity. Withdrawing, the ethos will simply collapse or will be a de-



structive amorphous formation. Modern schools and even universities suffer from different kinds of parallel ethos with their inherent negative features: “mutual responsibility”, protectionism, pressure on teachers (especially those who are persistent and demanding).

The lack of healthy corporate relations between administrative structures and ethos, based on mutual trust, on the one hand, and on publicity and openness, on the other, is a serious problem for the development of modern education.

### CONCLUSION

Education problems have always been the focus of attention of sociologists. But in modern reality, this topic is more relevant than ever. This is connected with the quality of teaching and learning in general, with the insufficient provision of information technology to schools and universities, and the bureaucratization of the entire education system. Disputes and discussions about what kind of education is necessary in Russia have always been going on, and there is no doubt they will continue in the future. But it is desirable that “pundits”, sociologists, educators, psychologists, and politicians involved in this problem should pay more attention to the fact that the word *education* comes from the Latin *educare*. The meaning of education is not only in teaching skills, abilities, and knowledge but in caring for people who can and should be actors of the modern world and their own lives as elements of this world.

The article substantiates the idea that, despite the “tectonic” changes in all areas of social life, with Russia entering the “global village” called the “network society”, the role of classical education with all its attributes should be kept. This is proved by the positive experience of education in such developed countries as Japan, Sweden, South Korea, and Finland [18].

What should be stressed is such attributes of classical education, as educational space and educational ethos. The question of how to include classical education in modern educational processes is a matter of a different research.

### REFERENCES

1. Bakshtanovskiy V. I., Sogomonov Yu. V. 2006. Introduction to Applied Ethics. Tyumen: Research Institute for Applied Ethics of the Industrial university of Tyumen. [In Russian]
2. Benedict R. 1934. Patterns of Culture. Boston; New York.
3. Eisenstadt S. N. 1973. Tradition, Change, and Modernity. New York: John Wiley & Son.
4. Hübner B. 2000. Beliebigkeitsethos und Zwangsästhetik. Minsk: Propilei. [In Russian]
5. Kemerov V. E. 1998. “Classical, non-classical, postclassical”. In: *Sovremennyy filosofskiy slovar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised. London; Frankfurt am Main; Paris; Luxemburg; Moscow; Minsk: Panprint. [In Russian]

6. Latour B. 2000. "When things strike back: a possible contribution of 'science studies' to the social sciences". *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 51, no 1, pp. 107-123.
7. Luman N. 2004. *Society as a Social System*. Moscow: Logos. [In Russian]
8. Lyubimov L. L. 2009. "Fading educational ethos". *Voprosy obrazovaniya*, no 1, pp. 199-210. [In Russian]
9. Maturana H. R. 1975. "The organization of the living: a theory of the living organization". *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, vol. 7, pp. 313-332.
10. Maturana H. R., Varela F. J. 2001. *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya. [In Russian]
11. Moles A. 2008. *Sociodynamics of Culture*. Translated from French. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Moscow: LKI. [In Russian]
12. Prigozhin A. I. 2006. "The Russian Ethos: Treasure or Cure?". *Obshchestvennyye nauki sovremennost'*, no 2, pp. 29-40. [In Russian]
13. Popper K. R. 1979. "Epistemology without a Knowing Subject". In: Popper K. R. *Objective Knowledge. An Evolutionary Approach*, ch. 3, pp. 106-152. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
14. Ritzer G. 2002. *Modern Sociological Theory*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Saint Petersburg: Piter. [In Russian]
15. Shils E. 1961. "Centre and periphery". In: *The Logic of Personal Knowledge: Essays Presented to Michael Polanyi*, pp. 117-130. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
16. Trufanov D. O., Pavlov A. P. 2011. *Life Trajectories of Urban Youth of the Krasnoyarsk Territory (Based on a Sociological Study)*. Krasnoyarsk: Sankt-Peterburgskiy institut vneshneekonomicheskikh svyazey, ekonomiki i prava. [In Russian]
17. Vakhshayn V. 2015. *The Case of Everyday Life: the Sociology in the Judicial Precedents*. Moscow; Saint Petersburg: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ. [In Russian]
18. Walker T. D. 2018. *Teach Like Finland: 33 Simple Strategies for Joyful Classrooms*. Moscow: Alpina Publisher. [In Russian]