

VALERII PYLYPENKO,

Doctor of Sciences in Sociology, Professor, Principal Research Fellow at the Department of History and Theory of Sociology, Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (12, Shovkovychna St., Kyiv, 01021)

pilipenko290457@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9918-6217>

GULBARSHYN CHEPURKO,

Doctor of Sciences in Sociology, Head of the Social Expertise Department, Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (12, Shovkovychna St., Kyiv, 01021)

gichepurko@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7540-5174>

Value-driven issues throughout the development of sociological theory

Of great importance — both to science and to society as a whole — is the problem of human beings and values they live by. As an object of evaluation, an individual can be analysed from different perspectives such as sociopolitical, economic, moral, aesthetic, psychophysiological, etc. To put it another way, the value of each person is multifaceted since in real life he/she acts as a set of different biological and social relationships. In this regard, the value of the person can be determined on the basis of knowledge about their actions and/or activities in various areas. Both normative and axiological characteristics of the individual, as well as their behaviour, can be assessed in accordance with objective criteria. Therefore, when we think of someone as a bearer of a particular value, they turn from a subject into an object. In this case, the value is expressed by the relation of the objective being of an individual “under evaluation” to the spiritual needs of the evaluating subject.

Value-driven issues have always been relevant to sociology since a sociologist has had (at least, has been supposed to have) a clear idea of a specific state of society at a given moment, as well as of its potential and development prospects, with taking into consideration the adopted system of values, value orientations and attitudes. For this reason, the latter have been the central theme of numerous (including the most recent) studies. Axiological issues are of particular relevance to society in times of crisis, when both societal life and the very structure of soci-

ety undergo dramatic change, and divergence of beliefs and values considerably affects the society's proper functioning and development.

Local (Ukrainian) transformations pose plenty of questions for social researchers. One of them concerns the values that emerge when the old societal system is being transformed into a new, which is different in kind. The Soviet-era values are still present in the collective Ukrainian consciousness, but new ones, intrinsic to a consumer society, are also being shaped (particularly among young people). Humanist values are no longer in demand, whereas consumerist and hedonic ones are gaining in popularity. Such a major change in value orientations of our fellow citizens needs a thorough understanding and development of a new value matrix, which is expected to work well in new societal conditions.

Practical relevance of studying values is obvious; however, building a solid theoretical framework for these studies is of equal importance – given the emergence of alternative schools of sociological thought such as non-classical, interpretive, postmodern, etc., which also take an interest in axiology. That means a paradigm revision for social scientists from around the world. Another point to consider is the impact of technological advances on all areas of people's lives, especially on social interactions. The global human community, integral in nature, is being formed, and production of human values now matters more than production of things; hence the “expansion” of value-focused approaches in contemporary sociology.

For a long time, structural functionalism had been considered the most “reputable” sociological theory. Closely associated with seminal works by Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton and writings of their numerous followers, this sociological perspective, however, started to lose its “dominance” a few decades ago, eventually becoming just a chapter in the history of modern sociological thought. Still, one should not overlook the merits of structural functionalism – for example, its role in the emergence of neofunctionalism in the 1980s.

As for alternatives to structural functionalism, conflict theory was one of them (and the main) for many years. If these two perspectives were set in a broader context, implying the opposition between consensus and conflict theories, one could notice that consensus theory attaches primary importance to collective (shared) norms and values, considering them fundamental to society. This theory “highly regards” the social order, which is based on implicit agreements, and believes that social change occurs slowly and naturally. Conflict theory, in contrast, draws attention to control exerted by certain social groups over others. Proponents of this approach hold the view that social order is reliant upon manipulation and control carried out by dominant groups. Social change, in turn, occurs quickly and chaotically – when the dominant groups are “dethroned” by their subordinates.

However, not only the differences but also commonalities between structural functionalism and conflict theory should be highlighted. They are both macro-level theories focusing on major social institutions and structures, and they belong to the same sociological paradigm [Ritzer, 2002: p. 115].

T. Parsons' analysis of a social system covered not only statuses and roles but also its structural components [Parsons, 1961]. Besides, he showed an interest in large components of social system, such as collectivity, norms and values [Calhoun, Gerteis, Moody, Pfaff, & Virk, 2007: p. 428]. Yet, Parsons examined the so-

cial system from both a structuralist and a functionalist perspective: he described a number of functional prerequisites of the social system. First, this system should be structured in a way that allows it to function smoothly together with other systems. Second, in order to survive, the social system requires support from other systems. Third, the social system ought to meet most of its actors' needs. Fourth, this system should enable and encourage adequate participation of its members. Fifth, the social system should be able to take (at least the minimum) control over potentially destructive behaviour. Sixth, if a conflict is becoming destructive, it also must be controlled. Finally, the social system needs a common language to survive [Parsons, as cited in Ritzer, 2002: p. 123].

Parsons also gave attention to the issue of relationships between actors and social structures. He considered the integration of value patterns and need-dispositions to be the “fundamental dynamic theorem of sociology” [Parsons, as cited in Ritzer, 2002: p. 124]. The scholar put emphasis on two processes: internalisation and socialisation; in other words, he was keen to know how the norms and values of a particular social system are transmitted to the actors. From Parsons' standpoint, successful socialisation means that these norms and values are being internalised by an actor and becoming part of his/her “conscience”. As a result, the actors, while pursuing their own interests, actually serve the interests of the system as a whole.

Whilst Talcott Parsons is famous for building a theoretical framework of structural functionalism, Robert Merton is credited with the introduction of the most important concepts to this theory. Although R. Merton criticised some aspects of structural functionalism, he put forth new conceptual “visions”, which helped to preserve the “relevance” of this approach.

In the context of the topic being discussed in this research paper, it should be noted that structural functionalism is believed to have a conservative bias: first, because this perspective does not take changes (e. g. the history of a conflict) into account; second, because it predominantly centres around culture, norms and values. In this regard, David Lockwood assumed a critical stance towards Parsons by pointing out that the latter was mainly concentrating on the “normative elements of social structure and process” [Lockwood, 1956: p. 134]. From Percy Cohen's point of view, structural functionalists did focus on the normative elements, but this is not characteristic of the approach itself [Ritzer, 2002: pp. 138–139].

The role of a specific agent (which is considered passive) contributes to the “interest” of structural functionalism in social and cultural factors, but at the same time leads to its conservative orientation. As structural functionalists see it, humans are held in check by social and cultural forces. A dynamic, creative understanding of a person is what the adherents of this theory apparently lack. Alvin Gouldner, who was rather critical of structural functionalism, remarked that human beings are not mere “social products”, they are “as much engaged in using social systems as in being used by them” [Gouldner, 1970: p. 220].

Advocates of ethnomethodology criticise conventional sociologists for imposing their own understanding of social reality on the social world. From ethnomethodologists' standpoint, sociology ought to be more “respectful” to everyday practices and see them as a basic source of sociological knowledge. Taking a slightly different approach, Don Zimmerman and Melvin Pollner argued that “conventional sociology confounds topic and resource: it studies the social world

but at the same time relies on it for essential resources in doing this” [Zimmerman & Pollner, as cited in Ritzer, 2002: p. 309].

This point can be illustrated in different ways. For example, Roy Turner [Turner, 1970] observed that sociologists regard everyday language as a resource for studying the so-called latent reality (norms, values, attitudes, etc.), rather than as subject matter *per se*. However, everyday language can also be viewed as a form of manifestation of social life, that is as subject matter by itself. For instance, if sociologists study childhood socialisation, they do not analyse the process itself. Instead, they focus on a set of abstract “stages” obtained through generalisation of parts of this process. Since socialisation, according to Matthew Speier, is a process of acquiring interaction skills, an ethnomethodologist is supposed to research how these skills are acquired and applied to real-life situations [Ritzer, 2002: pp. 309–310].

In the 1960s, Western societies were witnessing a noteworthy phenomenon, which Ronald Inglehart later called “the Silent Revolution” [Inglehart, 1977]. Different age groups started expressing markedly different value priorities: the older generation adhered to materialist values (which had been dominant by then), whereas young adults were ready to embrace postmaterialism. Such a significant change in values was a result of the socio-economic conditions under which the young people had grown up. Present-day societies also experience a distinct shift in value orientations — the younger generation prefer to be post-materialist, and this is illustrated by the data of annual nationwide surveys [Volianskaia, Pilipenko, & Sapelkina, 2004: p. 139].

R. Inglehart’s explanations lead to the conclusion that as early as the 1960s parents and children had different (maybe even opposing) world views, and that was the reason why they failed to understand each other. A change in the nature of socialisation and social control started becoming evident back then, but it took about two decades before this change was realised; however, it began to be perceived as a serious problem. For instance, in the mid-1950s T. Parsons only observed that the role of family in socialisation started to decrease [Parsons, 1956], whereas in the 1980s the problem of family breakdown was being widely discussed in the USA and rather pessimistic statements about the demise of the family as a social institution were being made. At that time, the importance of family to young people was steadily declining while peer influence was rising and age segregation was growing. The role of school in socialisation was declining as well, but the “street” was becoming increasingly significant.

The analysis of childhood socialisation undertaken by Robert Mackay is a clear example of criticism aimed at traditional sociology for confounding topic and resource [Mackay, 1974: p. 183]. The scholar contrasted a “normative” approach, which was preferred by conventional sociologists, with an interpretive one, popular with ethnomethodologists. According to the former, socialisation is just teaching social rules to “imperfect” children by “perfect” adults. But such an approach is misleading because it ignores the interaction between children and adults. Children are not passive creatures, neither are they empty “amphorae” that need to be filled. On the contrary, children are active participants in socialisation because they have the ability to think, reflect, invent and acquire knowledge. Socialisation is a two-way process. Mackay believed that ethnomethodo-

logical orientation could restore the significance of adult-child interaction based on interpretation skills, viewing interpretation as a research topic.

The above-mentioned D. Zimmerman and M. Pollner give another example of confounding topic and resource. They noticed that sociologists usually explain bureaucratic practices by referring to the rules, norms and values of a specific organisation. However, if sociologists regarded the organisation as a research topic they would realise that it is the actors who, due to their actions, give the impression that these actions are based on certain rules. Actually, what ought to be researched is how these rules are used by the actors, rather than the rules themselves [Zimmerman & Pollner, as cited in Ritzer, 2002: p. 310].

Rational choice theory (RCT), which is going to be discussed next, has its roots mainly in neoclassical economics and game theory. RCT concerns itself with individuals, regarding them as being goal-oriented (or having the capacity to act intentionally). To put it another way, they are rational actors that have a goal and take actions to achieve their goal. RCT also assumes that actors have personal preferences (with a “utility” function), or “values”. This theory does not analyse the preferences themselves, nor does it focus on their sources. Of importance is what an actor does to achieve his/her goal(s) according to the hierarchy of preferences. Although rational choice theory lays stress on the actor’s goals and/or intentions, it does not rule out the possibility that someone’s actions will be limited. These limitations are caused, first, by lack of resources. Different actors have different resources they can use; moreover, they have different access to other reserves. Those who possess abundant (or at least sufficient) resources can achieve their goals quite easily unlike those whose resources are limited (or who does not have any resources at all).

Lack of resources is associated with the concept of opportunity cost. This is the value of what someone has to give up in order to choose something else, or more precisely, the loss that actors (according to their estimates) will suffer if they forgo the next best action while pursuing their goal. The actors may voluntarily decide not to pursue the most valuable goal for the following reasons: if they do not have enough resources, if they have little chance of success or may not achieve the next most important goal. Here the actors are regarded as individuals who seek to maximise their utility; thus, when setting a goal they estimate how likely it is to be achieved and how much the outcome of this action will affect the probability of achieving the next most important goal.

George Homans’ social exchange theory assumes that a person may become very sensitive to stimuli, especially if they are of great value to him/her. Besides, he/she, “until corrected by failure”, may respond to irrelevant stimuli as well. These processes are largely influenced by “alertness (or attentiveness) to stimuli” [Homans, 1974: p. 23]. In Homans’ view, “the more valuable to a person is the result” of his/her action, “the more likely” he/she is “to perform the action” [Homans, 1974: p. 25]. In other words, if the value of a potential benefit is high, a person will feel more inclined to repeat the action (e. g. a desirable behaviour) than if the benefit were of low or no value.

G. Homans proposed the concept of rewards and punishments. The former are the actions that have positive value and therefore are sought out, whereas the latter have the opposite characteristics. A person is less likely to behave in a socially undesirable manner if they know that they will be penalised (or have al-

ready been penalised). Still, Homans did not consider punishment effective enough to make someone mend their ways because this act may produce an undesirable response — it is more advisable not to reward inappropriate behaviour. The scholar also underscored that his theory should not be interpreted as being built on purely hedonistic principles or concerned only with materialistic values: rewards come in many forms and thus may well be altruistic.

In Homans' opinion, "the more often in the recent past a person has received a particular reward, the less valuable any further unit of that reward becomes" for him/her [Homans, 1974: p. 29]. If the actors reward each other for giving and receiving help too often, the rewards will eventually cease to be valuable for them. In this case, time plays a significant role. If the reward is spread over a long period, a person is less likely to get satiated.

According to Homans' aggression-approval proposition, "when a person's action does not receive the reward he expected, or receives punishment he did not expect, he will be angry; he becomes more likely to perform aggressive behaviour, and the results of such behaviour become more valuable to him" [Homans, 1974: p. 37]. On the other hand, "when a person's action receives reward he expected, especially a greater reward than he expected, or does not receive punishment he expected, he will be pleased; he becomes more likely to perform approving behaviour, and the results of such behaviour become more valuable to him" [Homans, 1974: p. 39]. As the rationality proposition says, "in choosing between alternative actions, a person will choose that one for which, as perceived by him at the time, the value of the result, multiplied by the probability of getting the result, is the greater" [Homans, 1974: p. 43].

A close look at the aggression-approval proposition makes it possible to analyse aggression in the context of norms and values of a social system. The latter, in Parsons' view, is the core of the general system of action as it is formed by interactions of human individuals, and each of them acts as an organism, a personality and a bearer of a distinctive culture at the same time. As the scholar himself put it, "a social system consists in a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors who are motivated in terms of a tendency to the 'optimisation of gratification' and whose relation to their situations, including each other, is defined and mediated in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols" [Parsons, 1951, pp. 5–6].

Basically, the above-described system of interaction is an analytical aspect abstracted from the general process of actions performed by participants. Parsons moves from the explanation of individual choice and general conception of action to the analysis of action system, which limits and, to some degree, determines this choice. Pursuing this line, the scholar introduces the concept of institutionalisation, which is understood as the reinforcement of relationships between action participants in the course of time. As a result of this process, the participants' behaviour remains unchanged regardless of who specifically takes part in the interaction. It is implied that each participant seeks to maximise gratification, which is obtained from both performing the action itself and its results. If this is achieved through the interaction with another actor, the former will seek to continue the action. Thus, each person comes to expect certain actions from others according to the situation. These expectations underlie social rules (norms) and

commonly accepted values whose “task” is to guarantee the appropriate responses [Volianskaia, Pilipenko, & Sapelkina, 2004: pp. 110–111].

All this is a grid of positions, or, as Parsons characterised them, “status-role bundles” [Parsons, 1951: p. 25]. Each “bundle” is here “matched” with a set of expected behaviour patterns. Therefore, the status-role of an active individual may be understood as a basic unit of the social system. Similarly, a standardised interaction between individuals in a particular situation may be seen as a basic relationship within this system. During the process of interaction, each participant focuses on the others as much as they focus on him/her.

“Collectivities” (in Parsons’ terminology) are higher-order units of the social system. They can be described as well-organised action systems where each individual performs their specific role. The role of an individual is distinct from that of the collectivity because the individual and the collectivity are different as units. A distinction is also drawn between the value and the norm because they represent different levels of social relationships. Values are the main connecting element between the society’s cultural system and the social sphere while norms, for the most part, belong to the social system. Values serve to maintain the pattern according to which the society is functioning at a given time; norms are essential to integration by which Parsons understands “the need to coordinate, adjust, and regulate relationships among various actors or units within the system” [Wallace & Wolf, 1995: pp. 39–40]. Apart from being the means of regulating social processes and relationships, norms embody the “principles” that can be applied beyond the social system.

The fact that in a civilised society the legitimisation of aggression mostly takes place in the media and entertainment industry (and aimed at rationalising affects) may indicate that transformation of aggression (irrespective of what an aggressive act has been triggered by) in a creative manner is necessitated by the complexity of modern society. Still, direct displays of aggression are normally not tolerated. This means that any change in a particular society entails changes in the system of norms and values, or cultural transformation. The reverse is also true: changes in the society’s cultural system are accompanied by a shift in the social sphere. The so-called cultural “evolution” of aggressive behaviour, which is reflected both in the extended “repertoire” of aggression patterns and in the widened range of motives (coupled with the hierarchy of needs), would hardly be possible without changes in the social system. These changes, in turn, result from the growing complexity of social structure due to the differentiation of its elements and subsystems. The latter leads to a broader range of social roles, differentiation of norms and “tailoring” of common behaviour patterns to a particular situation. “A plurality of roles” (in Parsons’ terminology) makes both individuals and collectivities boost their adaptive capacity, as well as build a culture of trust and openness. In this context, each role should be “matched” with a set of norms and values in relation to the expected behaviours.

Figuratively speaking, a social system is “squeezed” into the space between the cultural status of values and their significance for a person’s social integration. Therefore, instrumental aggression (as a means of satisfying the need to protect personal space) assumes, at the level of social system, the status of institutionalised value. This process is closely linked to the emergence of institutions fulfilling the function of social control. Due to the emergence of these institu-

tions, the person acquires a certain role along with the relevant norms and value patterns.

Aggression assumes the status of value-rational action (i. e. rational in relation to a specific value) in a range of roles linked to the functions of instrumental aggression within society. In this regard, it should be noted that purpose-rational aggression usually originates from “lower” levels of the hierarchical structure of human action¹. These levels are represented by basic needs of an individual as a biological organism and his/her some more advanced (psychological) needs. In contrast, value-rational aggression comes from “higher” levels. It means that tone is set by the society’s cultural system, which then “permeates” the social system.

Through the process of socialisation, a person internalises a set of normative standards and roles, which are elements of the social system, but at the same time they are related to and mediated by culture-specific value patterns — in order to be considered legitimate and meaningful.

In 1962, T. Parsons published an article on youth subcultures as an illustration of how his theory “interprets” various social phenomena (including those related to the research problem). If the reader did not know where and when the article was written, they might well think that the author has highlighted the challenges faced by young people at the turn of the 21st century and today. This is mostly because Parsons analysed youth’s behaviour in the light of the anomie concept. Anomie, in turn, is described as a state of society when the established norms and values are no longer able to serve as a clear indicator of “required” behaviours as they have lost their significance. In Parsons’ view, such a situation results from the paradox of American value system which primarily focuses on personal accomplishments, thereby contributing to the structural differentiation of society and diluting the lower-order values. Furthermore, the growing differentiation and complexity limits an individual’s ability to achieve success through cooperation and specialisation.

Something quite similar is happening nowadays to Ukrainian value system. The old set of values based on equality and collectivism and shared by several generations in a row has been completely reassessed: present-day teenagers prioritise prestige, material well-being and personal success. This phenomenon goes hand in hand with the division of society into the rich and the poor, which engenders numerous problems for youth. Education and training are becoming more expensive and, consequently, less affordable. The current economic downturn makes young people, especially college and university graduates, always be in job-search mode. Besides, the profound transformation affects the other spheres of Ukrainian society along with its institutions, which creates a political and ideological vacuum.

The way T. Parsons sees it, youth subcultures play both a progressive and a destructive role. Of course, these subcultures knock traditional value systems off their “pedestal”, but on the other hand, they serve to transform the old value system and thus make it keep up with the times. Youth subcultures create new values, help them get established in society and, in a sense, they support an individ-

¹ It was Max Weber who distinguished between a value-rational (*wert-rational*) and a purpose-rational (*zweck-rational*) action.

ual over a long period in his/her life – from the moment when he/she has “dropped out” of the value system followed by their parents up to the moment when they start developing their own “list of values”. Yet, the opposing functions performed by youth subcultures often lead to internal and external conflicts in youngsters’ lives.

Analysing George Homans’ contribution once again, one will certainly get the impression that his approach was “shaped” by rational choice theory. This theory tells us that those who act according with the rationality proposition (i. e. rational actors) strive to maximise utility (in other words, value). The actors reflect on different alternatives (that are accessible to them) and plan their actions. They compare the rewards that could be offered for their actions and make decisions. The rewards that seem the most valuable to the actors cease to be so as soon as they appear to be impossible to get. On the other hand, less valuable rewards will be considered more valuable if they seem more accessible. Thus, there is a clear correlation between the probability of obtaining the reward and its value.

G. Homans links the rationality proposition with three others, such as the success, the stimulus and the value proposition. The rationality proposition shows that it is the probability of success that shapes people’s actions. As the scholar sees it, a person’s perception of the probability that his/her present action will be successful is determined by the similarity of the circumstances attending the action at present to those under which the action was successful in the past. Yet, this proposition does not explain why the person considers one reward more valuable than the other. In this case, one should refer to the value proposition. In fact, Homans relates the rationality proposition to those influenced by behaviourism [Ritzer, 2002: p. 327].

Peter Blau was another major contributor to social exchange theory; but, whilst G. Homans sought to understand individuals’ behaviours in face-to-face interactions, P. Blau’s interest lay in exploring the dynamics of exchange between individuals and groups, as well as institutions and organisations. The scholar adapted the “original” version of exchange theory to more complex social entities; however, he did not accept all ideas of his predecessor. For instance, Blau recognised the difference between small groups and large collectivities, whereas Homans downplayed this difference. Obviously, P. Blau did not regard behaviourism as an adequate paradigm for studying complex social structures, but he did not adhere to the social definitions paradigm either. The researcher argued that neither social interaction nor the attendant social definitions can be directly embodied in a large-scale organisation. Thus, it can be concluded that Blau aligned himself with the social facts paradigm in dealing with complex social entities [Ritzer, 2002: p. 332].

In the scholar’s opinion, the mechanisms that hold the complex social entities together are the norms and values (value consensus) which exist within society: “Commonly agreed upon values and norms serve as media of social life and as mediating links for social transactions. They make indirect social exchange possible, and they govern the processes of social integration and differentiation in complex social structures, as well as the development of social organisation and reorganisation in them” [Blau, 1964: p. 255].

The concept of norm (in P. Blau’s formulation) belongs to the level of exchange between individual and collectivity, whereas the concept of values moves

the researcher to the largest-scale societal level and to the analysis of relationships among collectivities. He believed that “common values of various types can be conceived of as media of social transactions that expand the compass of social interaction and the structure of social relations through social space and time”. As for consensus on social values, it “serves as the basis for extending the range of social transactions beyond the limits of direct social contacts and for perpetuating social structures beyond the lifespan of human beings. Value standards can be considered media of social life in two senses; the value context is the medium that moulds the form of social relationships, and common values are the mediating links for social associations and transactions on a broad scale” [Blau, 1964: pp. 263–264].

For example, particularistic values are (according to P. Blau) the media of integration of solidarity. These values are supposed to unite the members of a group around such things as patriotism or a good corporate reputation. Although particularistic values belong to the collective level, they are similar to sentiments of personal attraction that unite individuals on a face-to-face basis. Still, these values extend integrative bonds beyond mere personal attachment. Particularistic values also differentiate the in-group from the out-group, thereby enhancing their unifying function [Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2018: p. 266].

Thus, once again it is worth mentioning that P. Blau’s version of social exchange differs substantially from G. Homans’ explanations. Individuals and individual behaviour are central to Homans’ conception, whereas Blau predominantly focuses on collective actors such as social groups, organisations and societies. Furthermore, he gives particular attention to norms that “impose on social relations” [Blau, 1964: p. 18] and values, viewing “value consensus” as a crucial mediating link allowing for “integrative bonds and social solidarity among millions of people in society, most of whom have never met” [Blau, 1964: p. 24]. The scholar is also interested in analysing the mechanisms contributing to the integration or disintegration of large social entities, i. e. the issues which are traditionally studied by proponents of the social facts paradigm.

In recent years, exchange theory has begun to move in a new direction. First, more and more attention is being given to the risk and uncertainty involved in exchange relationships. Second, an interest in risk leads to a concern for trust in this type of relationship. Third, there is the related issue of reducing risk and increasing trust by establishing mutual commitments. This, in turn, is linked to the next issue — rising attention to affect and emotions, although previous studies in this field have mostly analysed actors’ self-interest. Finally, whilst a large number of works on social exchange theory have focused on structure, there is a growing interest in fleshing out the nature and the role of the actors themselves [Ritzer, 2002: pp. 341–342].

As we mentioned earlier, the development of exchange theory was significantly influenced by rational choice theory. However, the latter had been marginal to the mainstream sociological theory for long. It is largely through J. Coleman’s efforts that RCT became a “pressing” topic in contemporary sociology. The researcher’s rational choice orientation is clear in his basic idea that “persons act purposively toward a goal, with the goal (and thus the actions) shaped by values or preferences” [Coleman, 1990: p. 13]. But then Coleman goes on to argue that for most theoretical purposes, he will need a more precise conceptualisation of the rational actor derived from economics. According to this con-

ceptualisation, the actors choose those actions that will maximise utility, or satisfaction of their needs and wants [Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2018: p. 280].

Coleman is rather critical of most social theories for adopting a view that he labels *homo sociologicus*. This perspective emphasises the socialisation process and the close fit between the individual and society. Therefore, *homo sociologicus* is unable to deal with the freedom of individuals to act as they will in spite of the constraints placed upon them. Moreover, this perspective lacks the ability to “evaluate” the actions of the social system. In contrast, *homo economicus*, as Coleman puts it, possesses all these capacities. The scholar sharply criticises traditional social theory for doing little more than “chanting” old theoretical mantras and for being unresponsive to the changes occurring in society. In his opinion, sociological theory must have a purpose, a role in the functioning of society [Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2018: p. 285]. For this reason, Coleman is in favour of social theory that is interested not just in knowledge for the sake of knowledge but also in a search for knowledge for the reconstruction of society [Coleman, 1990: p. 651].

At this juncture, we are finishing our analysis of the major value-focused approaches in modern sociology. It can be argued that studying human values is not only a matter of necessity for today’s social scientists but also quite a “popular trend”. A number of concepts need further explanation from both a historical and a sociological perspective — for instance, the concept of postmaterialist values which was introduced in Western sociology and now is becoming a research or a discussion topic among some Ukrainian sociologists [Golovakha, 2020; Kuzmuk & Liubchuk, 2019; Pyvovarova & Khliapatura, 2015]. We cannot but be gladened by the fact that Ukrainian sociology is getting familiar with the achievements of axiology over the past few decades and making use of those ideas, thereby paving the way for the integration into the global sociological community.

References

- Alexander, J. C. (1999). The paradoxes of civil society. [In Ukrainian]. *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*, 1, 27–41. [= Александр 1999]
- Balabanova, N. V., Zhukov, V. I., & Pilipenko, V. Ye. (2002). *Social dialogue. Social partnership. Welfare state*. [In Russian]. Kyiv: Academy of Labour and Social Relations of the Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine. [= Балабанова 2002]
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1995). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. [In Russian]. Moscow, Russian Federation: Medium Press. [= Бєрєпєр 1995]
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The sociology of politics*. [In Russian]. Moscow, Russian Federation: Socio-Logos Press. [= Бурдьє 1993]
- Coleman, J. (1961). *The adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Davydov, Iu. N., & Poliakova, N. L. (Eds.). (1990). *Contemporary Western sociology: Classical traditions and the search for a new paradigm (on the occasion of the 12th World Congress of Sociology, Madrid, 1990)*. [In Russian]. Moscow: Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences (INION) of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. [= Давыдов 1990]

Dobrenkov, V. I. (Ed.). (1994). *American sociological thought: Merton R., Mead G., Parsons T., Schutz A.* [Texts]. [In Russian]. Moscow, Russian Federation: Moscow University Press. [= Добренъков 1994]

Golovakha, Ye. [Yevhen Golovakha]. (2020, May 4). How the global system of human values has changed since World War II [Video file]. [In Ukrainian]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b94QwQnk1Uc&feature=youtu.be&fbclid=IwAR3au1RDDqiftOLLrQ1uUm-3D80_LJZkOkB9uLIOizYOJga34APVjgZbdQ4&ab_channel=UKRLIFE.TV [= Головаха 2020]

Gouldner, A. W. (1970). *The coming crisis of Western sociology*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Homans, G. C. (1974). *Social behaviour: Its elementary forms* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Inglehart, R. (1977). *The Silent Revolution: Changing values and political styles among Western publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kuzmuk, O. M., & Liubchuk, V. V. (2019). Value orientations among secondary school graduates: The findings of a qualitative study. [In Ukrainian]. *Proceedings of the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute". Political Science. Sociology. Law*, 43(3), 94–98. [= Кузьмук 2019]. [https://dx.doi.org/10.20535/2308-5053.2019.3\(43\).195689](https://dx.doi.org/10.20535/2308-5053.2019.3(43).195689)

Lockwood, D. (1956). Some remarks on "The Social System". *The British Journal of Sociology*, 7(2), 134–146.

Mackay, R. W. (1974). Conceptions of children and models of socialisation. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Education.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Parsons, T. (1956). The American family: Its relation to personality and to the social structure. In T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, *Family, socialisation and interaction process* (pp. 3–34). London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Parsons, T. (1962). Youth in the context of American society. *Daedalus*, 91(1), 97–123.

Parsons, T. (2007). An outline of the social system [1961]. In C. Calhoun, J. Gerteis, J. Moody, S. Pfaff, & I. Virk (Eds.), *Classical sociological theory* (2nd ed.) (pp. 421–440). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Pilipenko, V. Ye., & Privalov, Yu. A. (Eds.). (1998). *Ukraine's youth and drug addiction*. [In Russian]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Stylos Press. [= Пилипенко 1998]

Pilipenko, V. Ye., Zakharuk, N. Yu., & Sorneva, N. B. (2009). *Values in regard to the sociology of health care*. [In Russian]. Donetsk, Ukraine: Yugo-Vostok Press. [= Пилипенко 2009]

Pylypenko, V. Ye. (2012). *Ukrainian sociology nowadays: Research into the main areas of the society's life*. [In Ukrainian]. Lviv, Ukraine: ZUKTs (Western Ukrainian Consulting Centre). [= Пилипенко 2012]

Ryvovarova, N. P., & Khliapatura, B. M. (2015). Ukrainian sociocultural reality: Modern or postmodern, materialism or postmaterialism? [In Ukrainian]. *Grani (Facets)*, 18(2), 97–104. [= Пивоварова 2015]

Ritzer, G. (2002). *Modern sociological theory* (5th ed.). [In Russian]. Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation: Piter Press. [= Ритцер 2002]

Ritzer, G., & Stepnisky, J. (2018). *Modern sociological theory* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ruchka, A. O., & Tancher, V. V. *A coursebook on the history of theoretical sociology*. [In Ukrainian]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Naukova Dumka Press. [= Ручка 1995]

Tancher, V. V. (Ed.). (1994). *Sociological theory today: Collected essays of American and Ukrainian social theorists*. [In Russian]. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. [= Танчер 1994]

Turner, R. (1970). Words, utterances, and activities. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.), *Understanding everyday life: Toward the reconstruction of sociological knowledge* (pp. 169–187). Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.

Volianskaia, Ye. V., Pilipenko V. Ye, & Sapelkina, Ye. V. (2004). *Sociocultural determination of adolescent aggression*. [In Russian]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Foliant Press. [= Волянская 2004]

Wallace, R. A., & Wolf, A. (1995). *Contemporary sociological theory: Continuing the classical tradition* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Weber, M. (2018). *Soziologische Grundbegriffe: Die Begriffsdefinitionen einer empirisch arbeitenden Soziologie*. Independent Publishers Group “e-artnow”.

Received 06.07.2020

ВАЛЕРИЙ ПИЛИПЕНКО, ГУЛЬБАРШИН ЧЕПУРКО

Ціннісно-орієнтовані проблеми в розвитку соціологічної теорії

У статті розглядаються підходи основних соціологічних теорій до ціннісної проблематики. При цьому аксіологічна проблематика аналізується з точки зору її актуальності для суспільств, що переживають кризові явища, коли змінюються умови суспільного життя і соціальна структура соціуму. Зазначається, що актуалізація теоретичного розроблення проблеми цінностей у соціології спричинена переглядом парадигми світового соціологічного пізнання у зв'язку з появою неklasичного, інтерпретативного й постмодерністського напрямів з їхнім інтересом до аксіології. Переосмислення парадигми зумовлене переходом світової спільноти до стану цілісності за умов глобалізації, коли нові технології змінюють всі суспільні зв'язки, ініціюючи перехід від виробництва речей до виробництва людини. Звідси така “експансія” ціннісного підходу з боку сучасних соціологічних напрямів. Одinicями більш високого порядку в соціальних системах є колективи, тобто організовані системи дії, які характеризуються виконанням певних ролей багатьма індивідами. Якщо у площині одиниць розрізняються ролі індивіда і колективу, то у площині стандарту відносин важливе розрізнення між нормою і цінністю. Цінності є первинними у плані підтримання взірця функціонування соціальної системи й розглядаються як засадові чинники зв'язку між соціальною і культурною системами. Норми, на відміну від цінностей, є переважно елементами соціальної системи і покликані здійснювати функцію інтеграції. Вони мають регулятивне значення для соціальних процесів та відносин і втілюють принципи, чинні за певної соціальної системи. Автори підкреслюють, що опанування сучасною українською соціологією досягнень світової аксіології останніх десятиліть є запорукою інтеграції у процеси, що відбуваються сьогодні у світовій соціологічній спільноті.

Ключові слова: суспільство, цінності, норми, соціологічна теорія, соціалізація, соціальна структура, соціальна система

ВАЛЕРИЙ ПИЛИПЕНКО, ГУЛЬБАРШИН ЧЕПУРКО

Ценностно-ориентированные проблемы в развитии социологической теории

В статье рассматриваются подходы основных социологических теорий к ценностной проблематике. При этом аксиологическая проблематика анализируется с точки зрения ее актуальности для обществ, переживающих кризисные явления, когда изменяются условия общественной жизни и социальная структура социума. Отмечается, что актуализация теоретической разработки проблемы ценностей в социологии вызвана пересмотром парадигмы мирового социологического познания в связи с появлением неклассического, интерпретативного и постмодернистского направлений с их интересом к аксиологии. Переосмысление парадигмы обусловлено переходом мирового сообщества к состоянию це-

лостности в рамках глобализации, когда новые технологии изменяют все общественные связи, иницируя переход от производства вещей к производству человека. Отсюда такая “экспансия” ценностного подхода со стороны современных социологических направлений. Единицами более высокого порядка в социальных системах являются коллективы, то есть организованные системы действия, которые характеризуются выполнением определенных ролей многими индивидами. Если в плоскости единиц различаются роли индивида и коллектива, то в плоскости стандарта отношений важно различие между нормой и ценностью. Ценности первичны в плане поддержания образца функционирования социальной системы и рассматриваются как главные факторы связи между социальной и культурной системами. Нормы, в отличие от ценностей, являются преимущественно элементами социальной системы и призваны осуществлять функцию интеграции. Они имеют регулятивное значение для социальных процессов и отношений и воплощают принципы, действующие в рамках определенной социальной системы. Автор подчеркивает, что освоение современной украинской социологией достижений мировой аксиологии последних десятилетий является залогом ее интеграции в процессы, происходящие сегодня в мировом социологическом сообществе.

Ключевые слова: общество, ценности, нормы, социологическая теория, социализация, социальная структура, социальная система

VALERII PYLYPENKO, GULBARSHYN CHEPURKO

Value-driven issues throughout the development of sociological theory

The paper examines and compares how the major sociological theories treat axiological issues. Value-driven topics are analysed in view of their relevance to society in times of crisis, when both societal life and the very structure of society undergo dramatic change. Nowadays, social scientists around the world are also witnessing such a change due to the emergence of alternative schools of sociological thought (non-classical, interpretive, postmodern, etc.) and, subsequently, the necessity to revise the paradigms that have been existed in sociology so far. Since the above-mentioned approaches are often used to address value-related issues, building a solid theoretical framework for these studies takes on considerable significance. Furthermore, the paradigm revision has been prompted by technological advances changing all areas of people's lives, especially social interactions. The global human community, integral in nature, is being formed, and production of human values now matters more than production of things; hence the “expansion” of value-focused perspectives in contemporary sociology. The authors give special attention to collectivities which are higher-order units of the social system. These units are described as well-organised action systems where each individual performs his/her specific role. Just as the role of an individual is distinct from that of the collectivity (because the individual and the collectivity are different as units), so too a distinction is drawn between the value and the norm — because they represent different levels of social relationships. Values are the main connecting element between the society's cultural system and the social sphere while norms, for the most part, belong to the social system. Values serve primarily to maintain the pattern according to which the society is functioning at a given time; norms are essential to social integration. Apart from being the means of regulating social processes and relationships, norms embody the “principles” that can be applied beyond a particular social system. The authors underline that it is important for Ukrainian sociology to keep abreast of the latest developments in the field of axiology and make good use of those ideas because this is a prerequisite for its successful integration into the global sociological community.

Keywords: society, values, norms, sociological theory, socialisation, social structure, social system