https://doi.org/10.53656/phil2022-01-02

Contemporary Philosophy
Съвременна философия

THE IMAGE OF THE OTHER IN THE CULTURAL PRACTICES OF THE MODERNITY

Prof. Dr. Serhii Vytkalov[1)], Dr. Lesia Smyrna[2)], Prof. Dr. Iryna Petrova[3)], Prof. Dr. Adriana Skoryk[4)], Prof. Dr. Olena Goncharova[3)]
[1)]Rivne State Humanitarian University (Ukraine)
[2)]National Academy of Arts of Ukraine (Ukraine)
[3)]Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (Ukraine)
[4)]Petro Tcnaikovsry National Academy of Music (Ukraine)

Abstract. The cultural diversity and the culture of plural coexistence becomes the global problem of existence. Mutual penetration and leveling of the boundary having divided the world into Other and Own is relevant, as it challenges identity in the conditions of openness and unification. Own culture is able to reveal its potential and present its essential features and original character only in the context of a different cultural dimension. The complex intertwinings, connections, influences of the cultures of different peoples and their worldviews in a single world cultural space are illuminated by the dialogue. Dialogue determines the nourishing interaction, which allows to get richer by knowing the unique, valuable experience of the Other, to expand the horizons of one's own existence. The atmosphere created by the dialogue is marked by humanism, implies the dignity and the right of each participant to argue their own point of view, therefore, to use their own intellectual abilities, knowledge and values.

Keywords: globalization; localization; Own; other; cultural practices; dialogue of cultures; culture of dialogue; tolerance

1. General problem formulation

The rapid development of information and communication technologies are significantly changing the realities of the modern world. They affect all levels of the megastructure of the material world, cause the formation of a special, science-intensive, high-tech industry, radically change the foundations of human existence and the world as a whole. The modern world is becoming fundamentally different. The media and information resources role increasing leads to the deepening and expansion of globalization processes and at the same time actualize the localization processes. The interaction and interpenetration of globalization and localization

as the interdependence of the common and the individual, their synthesis cause a "synergetic explosion". In fact, such interaction can lead to the emergence of the innovative solutions and structures, especially their implementation. The nature of the universe, permeated by integration processes, is becoming more and more ambivalent. On the one hand, the development of the modern world tends to preserve the uniqueness and diversity of cultures, and on the other hand, is characterized by integrity and reciprocity, openness to dialogue and transparency in the development of internal and external processes and more.

Radical problems in the modern socio-cultural nature of the world have led to a number of problems in the relationship between the Self and the Other (alien, different), prompting a rethinking of the constructivist role of the universality. Note that the problems are dual in nature. It means, on the one hand, a need to determine the ways of isolating the Other and its further marginalization in the history of mankind in the form of the Stranger. On the other hand, the need to find ways of adequate coexistence and mutual development, without interdependence, mutual repulsion or loss of self-integrity, is relevant. In the context of rapid globalization, these problems are always reflected in practical migration crises, growing ideological misunderstandings, political conflicts and military confrontations between different peoples and social groups, and so on.

The next group of problems that looms around the status and perception of the Other in its otherness and difference is related to the development of science-intensive and information technologies. On the one hand information and communication technologies make the world close and heard. They allow to overcome great distances, and, consequently, contribute to the "unification" of various lifestyles, cultural heritage, significantly affect the system of worldview values and guidelines. Stability is not the way of human life, it is mobility, constant being within different, cultural communicative fields. The "other worlds" approaching affects the life practices, moral worldviews, stereotypes of a modern man perception. It is about a person ability to gain new knowledge, skills and experience, develop the ability to overcome the boundaries of his own cultural environment and adapt and live effectively in other cultural environments, losing the outlines of alienation and hostility to him. Thanks to the ubiquitous advertising, the international system of consumption, social networks, one's own world of culture is increasingly marked by the signs of the Other. It is worth noting that the interpretation of the Own-Other relationship has an axiological content. It is about the generally accepted understanding of the Own as something correct, positive, safe, native and close. At the same time, the conceptual model of the Other is usually characterized as different, unusual, wrong, negative, alien and even hostile. Note that the axiology of this opposition is relative and depends on the ethical guidelines of a particular human community. This opposition, as a special way of categorizing reality, belongs to a number of universal and comprehensive. The key to understanding one's own

inner world is the need to know the Other, because Own-awareness is possible only in opposition, in the light of the Other. Note that the binary opposition Own-Other is a natural and necessary condition for human existence. Human consciousness cannot operate on only one of these two concepts.

Thus, the elimination of the traditional lines of division between the Own and the Other, cultural diversity and the culture of coexistence of the plural acquires a dimension of the global problem of existence. In the impossibility of hiding outside one's own, the peculiarities of the perception of the Other in the globalizing world are revealed.

Another problem in understanding and perceiving the Other in the context of the rapid development of science-intensive technologies is the intensification of all aspects of human life, which causes haste, a superficial clip perception of the realities of life. As a result, a person never feels, experiences and comprehends the world and events in it. Lack of experience, direct perception and vivid feeling, loss of sincerity cause inertia, indifference, haughtiness and arrogance, which are increasingly perceived as the norm of relations. Therefore, the idea of life in the system of modern culture should appeal not only to the mind, but also to emotions and feelings, to the problem of interaction of the Self-Other (alien, different) and the characteristics of human feelings through the prism of otherness.

Mutual penetration and leveling of the boundary that divided the world into Other and Own is relevant, as it challenges identity in conditions of openness and unification. The question how to perceive the world of a different, another culture within one's own becomes relevant: how to perceive another culture - as a hostile and destructive world or as one that provides nourishment and guidelines for the further development of one's own culture. The "challenge" of cultural diversity is also the basis for further social processes, as it determines the reorientation of the usual cultural institutions of public life to the recognition of the different cultures possibility to fully develop within a particular community.

It should be noted that the problem of attitude to otherness becomes especially relevant also in periods of socio-cultural transformations. During such periods, other experiences and achievements are able to outline the priorities and set horizons for further change, make adjustments to social progress more radically. At the same time, since ethnic and cultural identities are usually the means of "insight", the search for differences inevitably leads to the creation of stereotypes, such as the result of perception leads to the creation of a distorted understanding of the Other and ultimately forms the boundaries of its "rejection". For Ukrainian society, where the processes of identity formation are accompanied by difficulties and military actions in the East, the boundary states of identification systems and the mental space with the interweaving of the Own-Other markers are intensified. Given these circumstances, the influence of the Other on the cultural practices of Ukrainian society is gaining interest and relevance.

2. Formulation of the goals of the article (problem formulation)

Solving the outlined problems involves finding and using effective methodological tools, as well as outlining ways to develop dialogue practices as those that build human relationships basing on equality and empathic identification.

The aim of the article is to consider the phenomenon of the Other as a socio-cultural basis in understanding the nature of the challenges of the modern world and outline the ways to find the creation of human solidarity, which is based on empathy and recognition of the right of others to be another and different.

The outlined goal is realized through a number of tasks: to determine the methodological guidelines of the Self in the modifications of culture; to outline the strategies for developing the dialogue of cultures and their potential in creating human solidarity on the principles of respect and recognition of the Other as an equal and meaningful category; opportunities to implement the principle of the "unity in diversity" in creating a culture of dialogue.

The solution of the outlined tasks involves the use of the effective methodological tools. Note that understanding the cultural processes of today does not involve the search for the only correct, unalterable approach. The complexity and multifaceted processes of cultural interaction actualize the productivity of different methodological approaches and guidelines. The basis of their use is the idea of synthetic theorizing. With its help, various approaches in explaining the cultural practices of today are not considered as oppositional, but as complementary. Socio-philosophical analysis is used for the purpose of the civilizational context of cultural transformations. The application of the phenomenological approach allows us to consider the Society as a certain, authentic world. Through the concept of intersubjectivity, reconstruction, the idea of equal status of different cultures in the modern world, joint responsibility, cooperation and interdependence, etc. is presented. The post-positivistic approach presupposes an attitude to methodological, epistemological and ideological pluralism, the desire for anthropological methods of analysis. The article also uses systemic, structural-functional and comparative methods of analysis.

3. Analysis of the recent research and publications that have begun to solve this problem

The problem of the interaction of the Own and the Other in cultural practices is reflected in modern humanitarian research. Researchers of past epochs have tried to explain the world and man from the standpoint of objective-subjective rationalism. Within this approach, man was understood as one who is unable to go beyond his own immanent nature and perceives the world around him as a manifestation of the identity, not the otherness. The first sprouts of subjective-individual ontology are contained in German classical philosophy. Thus, its founder I. Kant drew attention to the need for anthropological rethinking of the prerequisites for knowledge of religion, morality in order to answer the fundamental question of philosophy: what is man? (Kant, 1989).

J. Fichte interprets the Me-not-Me connection as a continuous act of Own-identification that always "gives birth" to a new image of the Own. However, the "creation" of the Own in its own cognitive closed space does not allow it to "find", to realize, to comprehend the Other (Fichte 1998). And only modern humanities present the world of the different and the other as a unique world of existences. The Me-Another relationship acquires an ontological and anthropological meaning. The connection between non-identical, autonomous, equal Me-Another is understood as a unique world of existence (Ganaba 2010). Otherness is another dimension of the world that is in the process of transcending beyond the delineated Own, remaining incomprehensible to the end, as the phenomenon of Otherness is lost. E. Husserl in his work "Cartesian Reflections" presents the phenomenon of otherness as a product of Own-consciousness). Another researcher, M. Buber, argues that the non-recognition of the Other leads to a simplified understanding of the world as a one-dimensional layer-phenomenon of the existence, where there is no focus on personality (Buber 1962). B. Vandenfels is solidary with the above position. The philosopher advocates the idea of diplomatic sovereignty, the inviolability of others (meaning rather otherness, difference, than hostility). Own and (Other) Stranger, in his opinion, are not autonomous units that interact only in the external world, they also show an internal presence: Own is not deprived of Stranger (Other), the Stranger (Other) contains Own inside (Vandelfels 2004). Me-Another interaction is presented as the destruction of rational and universal dominants and the transition to a culture of diversity in the postmodernist practices of J.-F. Lyotard. Otherness is another dimension of the world that is in the process of transcendence beyond the delineated Own. Otherness can never be fully known, because the phenomenon of otherness will be lost and it will be reduced to a certain averaged mode of It (Lyotard 1998).

4. Presentation of the main material with a full justification of the obtained scientific results

Understanding the Other as a prerequisite for the development of oneOwn is an important methodological guideline in understanding the culture of today (Hanaba & Bakhmat 2020). It is about recognizing the universal and personal rights of people who represent different cultural communities. Its culture is able to reveal its potential and present its essential features and original character only in the context of a different cultural dimension. The situation when the phenomenon of excellence in culture disappears contains a number of dangers, which is manifested in standardization, unification, totality, discourse of monoculture. The disappearance or leveling of the distinct, the alien (other) in culture is dramatic for the development of one's culture, as it deprives it of the projection of further development. B. Vandenfels "Topographies of the Stranger: Studies in the Phenomenology of the Stranger" advocates the idea of diplomatic sovereignty and inviolability of the Stranger. The basic idea of his reasoning is the recognition that one's own and another's are not autonomous units that interact only in the external world. The basis of their interaction is the understanding that

the Own is not deprived of the Other, the Other contains the Own. Such an internal interdependence of one's own and another's does not presuppose the creation of a single unified universal unity. On the contrary, it presupposes the creation of a kind of inter-worlds, a cultural inter-space, which is presented and realized as universality in the plural (Vandelfels 2004). Thus, the difference, the alienation as a difference to one's own culture and as a result of cultural interaction with them claim that one's culture demonstrates the ability and possibilities to crystallize new facets and meanings of one's nature, to perceive oneOwn in an unusual perspective, i.e. to generate "the otherness in oneOwn". It is obvious that another and different culture is the elixir of life and development. Own and Other (Strange) are understood as correlates of intersubjective constitution of reality.

The next methodological guideline is the recognition of the equal status of different cultures in a given society, joint responsibility, cooperation and interdependence. The Me-Another relationship is understood as a correlate of intersubjective constitution of reality. The point is that the interaction of individuals on the condition of equality is valuable, recognizing that each of them is able to present their unique world and experience in interaction, while maintaining an "individual face" (Hanaba 2020). The complex intertwining, connections, influences of the cultures of different peoples and their worldviews in a single world culturological space illuminates the dialogue. In dialogical interaction, Otherness does not obey, it is not assigned to my Own, it remains an "insoluble" individuality (Hanaba et al. 2019). "Meeting" with another dimension of the reality is not considered as an abstraction or an object of neutral analysis, which must be understood or appropriated to my Own. M. Buber draws attention to this circumstance. He expresses the belief that in dialogue a person is guided not only by the acquisition of his inner world, but also doomed to constantly "encounter" and withstand the onslaught of another's reality. This reality not only pushes a person out of his usual path of life, but also encourages the creation of new perspectives (Buber 1962, 81). Note that a single culture is not a static system that has created and closed its "world". It is dynamic, changeable, the one that is constantly "looking for places" of its own identity. It can seek and assert its identity only through the contact with other cultures.

The dialogue of cultures and the culture of dialogue

Culture cannot function without dialogue, which is understood as a way of knowing and improving the interpersonal, socio-group, societal and planetary world. Dialogue practices involve a departure from a unified view of the world and present its diversity and variety. Its product is "truth", which is always "born" in the singing of action, co-creation and is realized in the plurality of senses, meanings, connotations and meanings. Thus, complex intertwining and mutual influences of the cultures are not subject to a single rational-systemic conceptual dominant, but they complement to otherness and differences. It is obvious that cultural differences are recognized as valuable, sovereign and valuable. In the light of a different cultural space the Own identification takes place. According to Charles Taylor, the identity of one's own culture is extremely dependent

on dialogical relations with another, different world. The researcher argues that the discovery of the identity of my culture is possible not in isolation, but also with the opportunity to implement it in dialogue with others (Taylor 2004, 37).

We note that intercultural dialogue is a complex and controversial process that consists of many components and is ambivalent. Its complexity and contradiction are manifested in two aspects: in the plane of interactions and transformations of cultural, ethnic, worldview systems and as a direct communicative dialogue of representatives of different cultural societies.

Let's look at these aspects in more detail. Through intercultural dialogue, they are able to build understanding and respect for other, dissimilar peoples and cultures. Respect for other cultural heritage and values, positive interaction with other cultures involves expanding the range of personal values, enrichment with new cultural heritage and social experience. Coexistence with the Other, not its denial, recognition of the Other, not obedience and tolerance to violence, humanization and loyalty to the Other, and not opposition to it – are the fundamental ideas of tolerance. In a broad sense, this concept is understood as the highest spiritual quality that allows a person without aggression to perceive a person with other values, a loyal attitude to his thoughts, beliefs and views. Human behavior in contradictory and conflict situations is aimed at the desire and search for ways to understand and reconcile different positions without the use of violence and humiliation of human dignity. It should be noted that despite the enrichment of new cultural heritage and psychological readiness for tolerance, the unprecedented leap in expanding international cooperation, contrary to all expectations, has not led to the severity of interethnic, religious, cultural and environmental problems. The world has become more conflictual, which only actualizes the search for ways of peaceful coexistence and fostering a culture of dialogue. The basic idea of this search is the recognition that intercultural interaction presupposes the mutual transformation of cultures. In this regard, we can outline three strategies for the possible development of intercultural dialogue:

– one of the cultures dominates in intercultural interaction;

– synthesis of cultures into a new culture without preserving the authenticity of each of the cultures;

– synthesis with preservation of uniqueness and originality of cultures taking part in intercultural interaction.

A productive strategy that can ensure the realization of the condition of "unity in diversity" is synthesis with the preservation of uniqueness and originality in intercultural interaction. In response to the strengthening and deepening of globalization processes with their dangers of unification and standardization in modern countries and regions, the processes of cultural Own-determination of ethnic groups, the revival of ethnocultural, religious, etc. traditions have intensified. The principle of “unity in all diversity” implies an equivalent vector orientation: both to the “unity” of cultures, and to nurture the cultural diversity of the world at the same time. According to P.

Teilhard de Chardin, a world abandoned to cultural priorities in the development of some cultures and disregarding the possibilities and peculiarities of others will deprive humanity of hostility and irreconcilability. The researcher compares humanity with a tree, and consider peoples to be its branches. He is convinced that it is an unnatural phenomenon when one shoot, a branch, absorbs all the sap of a tree and as a result all other branches are forced to die. To remain symmetrical and beautiful, the tree must change as a whole (Chardin 1965). And for humanity the future also is possible under the condition of parity of all peoples. By joining and borrowing the values of other cultures through cultural interaction, one's culture transforms them into one's own. However, the question arises whether cultural interaction will not lead to the loss of their own identity and uniqueness? The point is that cultural interaction does not mean blind benevolence and trust. On the contrary, it is a conscious and active interaction with other cultures. Such interactions can reveal cultural differences that no one expected. Another, different culture, even interacting with it, when we borrow its experience and share it with ourselves, remains essentially unknown and alien to us. Meeting another, different culture inevitably changes the horizons of one's own cultural progress, and the danger is that these changes for one's own culture are unpredictable and unexpected. Coincidence turns out to be the scariest and most difficult thing when meeting with the heritage of another culture. Of course, there can be no guarantees here. As an option, culture will not be able to lose its individual face, provided that it retains its own cultural "core". According to T. Skubashivska, it is impossible to preserve a culture, “recoding” it in the manner of another culture, abandoning its own code (Skubashivska 2004, 109). As an example of confirmation of her arguments, the researcher presents her version of the mechanism of intercultural dialogue in which each culture appears in the form of a unique system consisting of several subsystems. The result of cultural interaction is the creation of an appropriate subsystem, in which there is a complex process of adaptation of their own cultural codes with the codes of another culture. This subsystem is understood as a kind of boundary, it is a relative zone of attraction and area of mutual repulsion. It forms a specific matrix of the space of relations, which is formed at the junctions of culture. In case of failure of cultural adaptation, the activity of this subsystem is curtailed, but not the system of the whole culture in general. Successful promotion of cultural adaptation may lead to a wider impact of the already modified by the relevant subsystem of external cultural influences on the entire cultural system (Skubashivska 2004, 109 – 110).

Thus, the dialogue of cultures is possible only if we preserve our own cultural code, which is the core of culture. In cultural dialogue and interaction, the peculiarities of each individual culture become visible and valuable. Intercultural dialogue is not only a guarantee of social harmony, but also a source of social activity. Its important factor is the avoidance of such phenomena as: cultural arrogance and narcissism, contempt and envy of other cultures, stereotypical perception of oneOwn and others, unwillingness to change and double standards in relation to oneOwn and others. The culture of

dialogue is designed to develop the principles of tolerance, to strengthen democracy, stability, to overcome prejudices and stereotypes in public life, to facilitate coalitions of representatives of different cultural and religious communities and, as a result, to prevent or deploy conflicts (in post-conflict situations and "Frozen conflicts"). Its result is not only the cultivation of respect for man as the highest value, a sense of responsibility and Own-importance, but also a positive perception of the cultural diversity, which is based not on renunciation of one's own identity, but on enriching its cultural heritage, the need for an act of tolerance, that can be produced only in real intercultural interaction. Such a dialogue changes the nature of the perception of life, which becomes much far-sighted, pluralistic and capable of preventing the degradation of culture, its isolation. The ideas outlined above are relevant and productive in the context of the formation of a new universal spiritual community, free from divisive patterns and stereotypes, capable of developing new principles of the world organization.

5. Conclusions

The realities of the modern world permeated by the processes of integration and globalization have an ambivalent socio-cultural nature. It testifies that, on the one hand, it strives to preserve the uniqueness and diversity of cultures, and on the other hand, it is characterized by the integrity and reciprocity, openness to dialogue and transparency in the development of internal and external processes, and so on. In the context of rapid globalization, this ambivalence is always reflected in migration crises, growing ideological misunderstandings, political conflicts and military confrontations between different peoples and social groups, and so on. The "challenge" of cultural diversity is also the basis for further social processes, as it determines the reorientation of the usual cultural institutions of public life to recognize the possibility of different cultures to develop fully within a particular community.

The methodological guidelines for understanding the I-Other connection in the modifications of modern culture as sovereign and valuable are their understanding as correlates of the intersubjective constitution of reality. It is a recognition that each of them is able to present their unique world and experience in interaction, while maintaining an "individual face". Understanding the Other as a prerequisite for the development of my self is an important methodological guideline in understanding the culture of today. It is about recognizing the universal and personal rights of people who represent different cultural communities. Its culture is able to reveal its potential and present its essential features and original character only in the context of a different cultural dimension. The situation when the phenomenon of difference in culture disappears contains a number of dangers, which is manifested in standardization, unification, totality, discourse of monoculture.

The complex intertwining, connections, influences of the cultures of different peoples and their worldviews in a single world culturological space illuminates the dialogue. In dialogical interaction, the Other does not obey, is not assigned to one's Self,

it remains an "insoluble" individuality. Dialogue determines the nourishing interaction, which allows you to get rich through knowledge of the unique, valuable experience of the Other, to expand the horizons of their own existence. The atmosphere created by the dialogue is marked by humanism, presupposes the dignity and the right of each participant to argue their own point of view, therefore, to use their own intellectual abilities, knowledge and values.

The prospect of further research is to consider the peculiarities of the implementation of the problem of I-Other in the plane of dialogue intopractices in the practices of historical education.

REFERENCES

BUBER, M., 1962. Ich und Du. Munchen, 77 – 171. [in English].

CHARDIN, P. T., 1965. The phenomenon of a man. Transl. from French by O. N. SADOVSKY. Moscow: Progress, 320. [in Russian].

FICHTE, J. G., 1998. On human dignity: trans. V. ABASHNIK. *The problem of rationality in the late twentieth century*. *Materials of the Vth Kharkiv International Skovorodin readings (September 29 – 30, 1998*). Kharkiv: University of Internal Affairs. Affairs, 361 – 363. [in Ukrainian].

GANABA, S., 2010. *Historical education in the methodological focus of intersubjectivity: a monograph.* Kamyanets-Podilsky: K-PNU named after Ivan Ohienko, 152. [in Ukrainian].

HANABA, S., 2020. Image of the Other in Teaching History: Humanistic Potential of the intersubjective Approach. *Istoriya-History*, **28**(3), 302 – 321. [in English].

HANABA, S. & MIROSHNICHENKO V. & SHUMOVETSKA S. & MAKOHONCHUK N. & HALIMOV A. & BLOSHCHYNSKY I., 2019. Strategies for Treating the Other in the Methodological Focus of intersubjectvity. *Postmoderm Openings*, **10**(4), 168 – 181. [in English].

HANABA, S. & BAKHMAT, N., 2020. Methodological orientations and educational strategies in the formation of the modern age thinking. *Filosofiya-Philosophy,* **29**(3), 277 – 285. [in English].

HUSSERL, E., 1998. Cartesian reflection; [trans. from German by D.V. SKLYADNEVA]. Sankt-Peterburh: Nauka-Yuventa, 315. [In Russian].

KANT, I., 1989. Answer to the question: What is the Enlightenment. *Universe,* 4, 135 – 138. [in Ukrainian].

LYOTARD, J.-F., 1998. The state of postmodernism. Sankt-Peterburh: Aleteyya, 188. [in Russian].

SKUBASHIVSKA, T., 2004. The problem of tolerance in the context of intercultural dialogue. *Practical Philosophy*, 4, 108 – 113. [in Ukrainian].

TAYLOR, C., 2004. Multiculturalism and "politics of recognition". Kiev: Alterpress, 172. [in Ukrainian].
VANDENFELS, B., 2004. Topography of the Stranger: studies of the phenomenology of the Stranger: a guide of philos. disciplines. [trans. from German by V.I. Keluadze]. Kyiv, PPS, 204. [in Ukrainian].

✉ **Prof. Dr. Serhii Vytkalov**
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-5345-1364
Rivne State Humanitarian University
12, Bandery St.
Rivne, Ukraine
E-mail: sergiy_vse@ukr.net

✉ **Dr. Lesia Smyrna, Senior Researcher**
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-0483-1915
Scopus iD: 57219057180
National Academy of Arts of Ukraine
20, Bulvarno-Kudryavska St.
Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: lsmyrna@naqa.gov.ua

✉ **Prof. Dr. Iryna Petrova**
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-8146-9200
Scopus iD: 57210147512
Web of Science Researcher iD: N-4884-2019
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
36, E. Konovalets St.
Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: petrovaiw@gmail.com

✉ **Prof. Dr. Adriana Skoryk**
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-4158-8352
Web of Science Researcher iD: AAD-9140-2021
Petro Tcnaikovsry National Academy of Music
1 – 3/11, Architect Gorodetsky St.
Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: adaskor@ukr.net

✉ **Prof. Dr. Olena Goncharova**
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-8649-9361
Scopus iD: 57217102458
Web of Science Researcher iD: F-6473-2015
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
36, E. Konovalets St.
Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: o.m_goncharova@yahoo.com