

Bordeline Cultural Practices in Modern Society: the Anthro-creating Function

Ludmila K. Nefedova (a), Amina Sh. Rudi (b) & Olga M. Kordas (c)

(a) Omsk State Pedagogical University. Omsk, Russia. Email: konstans50[at]yandex.ru

(b) Omsk State Transport University. Omsk, Russia. Email: amina_rudi[at]mail.ru

(c) Dostoevsky Omsk State University. Omsk, Russia. Email: kordasom[at]yandex.ru

Received: 25 July 2022 | Revised: 5 October 2022 | Accepted: 24 October 2022

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to examine borderline cultural practices that aid in the development of a modern person. We focus on the practices of consumption and childhood, which take shape at the frontier of global and local cultures, to explore their anthro-creating function. We have identified two groups of cultural practices: socializing and individualizing, and we have synthesized subjective characteristics of cultural practices that best fulfill the function of creating a person. The article also presents a mechanism for developing consumer behavioral strategies that are not determined solely by the logic of the historical process of the existence of local cultures. It highlights the inclusive potential of global culture, which recognizes significant differences among peoples in their ideas about the world, value systems, and diverse trends and outcomes of historical development. Parenting practices also implement the principle of inclusiveness.

Keywords

Transitivity of Culture; Globalization; Cultural Practices; Inclusiveness; Boundaries of Subjectivity; Childhood Practices; Consumer Practices; Socialization; Juvenile Justice



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons "Attribution" 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



Пограничные культурные практики в современном социуме: антропосозидающая функция

Нефёдова Людмила Константиновна (а), Руди Амина Шамильевна (б), Кордас Ольга Михайловна (с)

(а) Омский государственный педагогический университет. Омск, Россия.

Email: konstans50@yandex.ru

(б) Омский государственный университет путей сообщения. Омск, Россия.

Email: amina_rudi@mail.ru

(с) Омский государственный университет им. Ф.М. Достоевского. Омск, Россия.

Email: kordasom@yandex.ru

Рукопись получена: 25 июля 2022 | Пересмотрена: 5 октября 2022 | Принята: 24 октября 2022

Аннотация

Целью статьи служит рассмотрение пограничных культурных практик, в процессе которых происходит становление современного человека. На примере практик потребления и детства, складывающихся на фронтире глобальной и локальной культур, осмысливается их антропосозидающая функция. Выявлены две группы культурных практик: социализирующие и индивидуализирующие, а также выделены синтезирующие субъектные характеристики культурных практик, наиболее полно реализующие функцию созидания человека. Представлен механизм выработки потребительских поведенческих стратегий, не обусловленных логикой исторического процесса существования локальных культур. Отмечен инклюзивный потенциал глобальной культуры, включающей в свое пространство народы, существенно отличающиеся друг от друга представлениями о картине мира, системах ценностей, направленностью и результатом исторического развития. Принцип инклюзивности культурных практик реализуется также в практиках воспитания детей.

Ключевые слова

транзитивность культуры; глобализация; культурные практики; инклюзивность; границы субъектности; практики детства; потребительские практики; социализация; ювенальная юстиция



Это произведение доступно по [лицензии Creative Commons "Attribution" \(«Атрибуция»\) 4.0 Всемирная](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

The Borderline Existence of Modern Man

One of the urgent problems of the contemporary cultural situation around the world is the need to develop and master new cultural practices that take shape on the border of the global and the local, the traditional and the modern, the dominant and the subcultural. Here, cultural practices are understood as underlying value system that structures the fundamental spheres of everyday life which is unconsciously shared by individuals and is crucial for individual and group identity (Serto, 2013). Need to master new cultural practices is associated with the formation of a planetary space of cultural interaction between people which is one of the main directions of globalization. It is in the context of a global culture that “at a time of progressive acceleration of social processes, “borders” have moved into the spotlight” (Ulrich & Troitskiy, 2019, p. 236). Modern man, in the course of one’s life, is constantly dealing with the demarcation and integration of various socio-cultural spaces.

The period of the pandemic and lockdowns experienced in the recent past has given rise to new standards for regular interaction in the field of consumption, education, and communication. Peoples whose cultural practices traditionally presuppose communicative openness and density of contacts in informal communication, have had to abide by the general rules of wearing a face mask and social distancing. Closing faces, refusal of handshakes and hugs, frequent sanitizing of hands and surfaces of objects – these everyday cultural practices, unexpectedly for mankind with the level of technology development achieved by it, brought all inhabitants of the planet to a common biological denominator, and raised the question of universal security in the face of uncontrolled natural processes and possibility of anthropic catastrophe (Mironov, 2020). At the same time, the blurring of borders is opposed by the reverse process which consists in “the emergence of cultural gaps between groups that differ in their attitude to the pandemic, to restrictive measures, to its cultural consequences.” Cultural gaps are the result of “a mismatch of intersubjective meanings that determine the difference in behavior in the same situation of representatives of different groups” (Voronov, 2021, p. 24). Thus the variability and fluidity of cultural reality is fixed not as a kind of homogeneous integrity, but as a complex of multi-vector, multi-scenario responses to the challenges of the era, among which the pandemic is just one of the latest examples of a number of long-existing problems. This example is indicative of perceiving our global reality as mosaic and hard to predict.

The idea that culture, society and a person are going through a transitional period today has become a reality of human existence. In everyday life, a person making cross-border movements between different socio-cultural spaces, endangers his/her usual norms of life, blurring his/her usual identity and forming a new one. As a result, this process does not have a logical conclusion in the dynamics of social variability, as if there is no stable identity; it is a borderline, incomplete,



in-the-making. The human ontological security which is inextricably linked with a clear understanding of who a person is, is undermined: “there is an identity crisis that indicates reaching of a critical stage of one’s development and requiring cultural transformation” (Khlyshcheva, 2018, p. 62).

The problem of transition is also being actively analyzed in the context of both – political processes observed now (Troitskiy, 2022) and multicultural interaction (Bagdasaryan, 2019) in society.

The culture of the transitive period, like culture as a whole, includes the subject of culture. Globalization has changed the pace of life of mankind, human perception of space and time – the key parameters of the organization of social and individual life (Bauman, 2020). In this “fluid”, transitive modernity, according to Z. Bauman,

“there is a lack of just such patterns, codes and rules that can be obeyed, which can be chosen as stable guidelines and which can subsequently be guided by” (Bauman, 2008, p. 13).

Spontaneously formed cultural practices become the desired patterns that allow people to carry out life activities at the current moment without a clear understanding of transcendental meanings. “Being in a state of chaos in life, a person simply needs “tools” that will help him find the foundation of being. The organization of life is just one of these “tools” that help a person to keep his being best, and follow it” (Ermakov, Ermakova & Kashina, 2022, p. 17). The organization of life is understood not as a set of uniform rules created by a single center, but as individual routine daily practices which, according to the concept of E. Giddens, provide a person with a sense of existential security (Giddens, 1984) and are able to maintain the integrity of the individual even in extreme situations described, for example, in the conceptual work of V. Frankl “Say yes to life!": A psychologist in a concentration camp (Frankl, 2009).

The concept of transitivity, “fluidity” of modern globalized reality (according to Bauman) served as the methodological basis for the philosophical understanding of cultural practices and identification of anthropological meanings in them.

Being original, differing from nature and correlating with society, culture is spiritual and material human practices that are in origin, development, formation and disappearance, while leaving a trail in the form of artifacts. In its essence culture is a complex multi-structural system that is always dynamic and is in self-development. In a multifactorial cultural environment a person needs the possibility of implementing multifaceted cultural practices. The transitivity of modern culture is especially noticeable due to the rapid changes in cultural practices in technology, science, in the practices of creating and consuming spiritual and material goods, which in one way or another has an impact on the practices of childhood, in which the anthropo-creating function is represented most definitely.

Anthropological meanings of cultural practices

The concept of cultural practices is introduced into the scientific lexicon in the second half of the twentieth century in the works on the study of social reality by P. Bourdieu (Bourdeiu, 1993; Bourdeiu & Boltanski, 2008), E. Giddens (Giddens, 1984), M. Moss (Mauss, 2011), M. Foucault (Foucault, 1969; Foucault, 1984) and etc. It is quite well-established in interdisciplinary research, but is revealed in different ways, acquiring conceptuality depending on the scope of application. In anthropological and sociological studies, cultural practices are understood as background daily forms of activity, which are often unconscious in nature, supporting and reproducing social reality.

The concept of cultural practices has been actively used in the last decade in domestic pedagogical literature in order to determine the methods and forms of a child's activity in mastering reality, as well as his behavior in order to satisfy a variety of cognitive and pragmatic needs. The pedagogical goal of cultural practice is identification, self-identification and self-realization of a growing person through communication and interaction with people around him (Kashima et al., 2015). In other words, cultural practice directly fulfills an anthro-creating function.

In studies of culturological and pedagogical orientation, cultural practices are considered as the direct activities of various subjects in the field of culture, both at the professional and at the everyday level – creative, leisure activities, activities for the development of cultural heritage, implemented through social institutions (museums, theaters, libraries, schools of arts, media, etc.). Researchers especially emphasize the role of actors of socialization, for example, teachers of social disciplines in educational institutions, in the transmission and maintenance of cultural norms of the community (Martell & Stevens, 2019). Thus, the understanding of the philosophical and anthropological meaning of the significance of cultural practices is taken as a basis in private social humanitarian discourses. Further philosophical construction of their understanding presupposes, on the one hand, speculative reflection from the standpoint of discovering their essential characteristics, on the other hand, observation of the empiricism of modern cultural practices.

Being a topical subject of study, cultural practices are typified by researchers in different ways: everyday and non-everyday cultural practices (Bolshakov, 2016); communicative (or adaptive) ones, professional, collective, spontaneous, cultural and spiritual practices (Bakumenko, 2012), etc. Without pretending within the framework of this article to the completeness of disclosing all the essential characteristics of cultural practices, we note those that seem to us especially significant in terms of their anthro-creating function. We consider as such two groups of cultural practices:

- socializing;
- individualizing.



Socializing cultural practices realize anthropo-creating function of culture in the space of formation of social reality. Any cultural creation necessarily presupposes the compatibility and repetition of actions; institutionalization; connection with actual social needs and values; realization not only in immediate reality, but also in symbolic-sign space. The optimality of cultural practices is based on the principles of conventionality and regularity for their result to be both the acquisition of a new individual experience and the transformation of social reality. The specified characteristics reveal the procedural side of the practices. The social vector is aimed at the process of interaction between the subject and the system of social relations, leading to a change in both the personality and society. Such practices are given from the outside, and they underpin social, institutionalized aspects of the development and functioning of the individual. These include the practice of mastering the subject empirical reality (cognitive and educational), the practice of mastering the norms of behavior and building social reality (social adaptation).

The second group of key characteristics of cultural practices – namely, individualizing – takes into account the ambivalent nature of human culture and nature and allows us to single out the social and spiritual vectors of cultural practices, which seems appropriate, since a person has both internal and external horizons in one's development (Jaspers, 1999). Individualizing spiritual vector is aimed at discovering one's own Self as a projection of one's individuality in cultural and symbolic activity. Such practices are based on the desire of a person to be not only what he is, but also what he would like to become, overcoming the limitations of his existence. Individualizing, spiritual practices include self-improvement, self-transformation, creativity and play, the search for spiritual religious experience (Hesychasm, Yoga, Sufism).

Both types of practices are united by a distinct subjective character. In both cases individual ascends to universal social experience becomes a personality, self-actualizes and realizes oneself. This characteristic is responsible for the implementation of the anthropo-creating function, since in fact practices are the foundation of anthroposociogenesis and formation of culture, realizing the mechanism of "sociocultural inheritance". The subjective characteristics of cultural practices remove (in Hegel's sense) contradiction between socializing and individualizing vectors of cultural practices.

The proposed typology carries on with the classic Neo-Kantian concept of applicability of ideographic and nomothetic patterns for explanation of sociocultural processes (Rikkert, 1998; Windelband, 1995).

In many cultural practices of global era which have both socializing and individualizing orientation, their inclusive nature is clearly visible: communities of different cultures and geographic locations are included in a single field of life, regardless of the specifics of historical development and the presence of an immaterially formed social need in certain cultural practices. At the same time,

the complete destruction of cultural diversity due to the processes of globalization seems unlikely (Tanatova & Yudina, 2020). Despite globalization, people living in different cultural regions cannot unify so much as to have exclusively common values and the same cultural landmarks: within any local culture there is still anxiety about the loss of national or religious identity, clearly articulated in the 20th century (Robertson & Khondker, 1998). The paradox is that conflicts and cultural misunderstanding “provide dynamics in the perspective of cultural development, and also indicate the conflict aspects of cultural communication which, on the one hand, exacerbate the dialogue, and on the other hand, awaken the creative potential of the carriers of this culture, because it is precisely the painful points of misunderstanding we must construct our own cultural space at” (Kordas, 2021, p. 33). Since culture is a way of human existence and survival in the environment through the adaptation mechanism of mankind, insofar as the historical dynamics expressed in the disappearance of some forms of culture and the emergence of others, is natural and objective, thanks to it, mankind develops actual forms of life, rejecting forms that have outlived their potential (Kagan, 1994).

In our opinion, the cultural practices of our time create a common social and procedural space of human life and form in this space a completely specific type of contemporary person, the qualification of the essential characteristics of which is the subject of a special article. Here, we note the adaptability of such a person to global changes in one’s existence (Rudi, 2021). This quality is clearly manifested in the practices of consumption and in the practices of childhood.

Title homogeneity and heterogeneity of contemporary cultural practices

Modernity demonstrates some unification in certain cultural practices, providing opportunities for effective interaction between representatives of local cultures, different countries and legal realities. For example, in legal practice, including juvenile (the world standards of which are set by the declarations of the rights of man and the child of 1948 and 1959, respectively). In addition, the daily routine of digital technologies and fashion trends forms a commonality of consumer cultural practices. In the 20th century, the question of reducing the volume of consumption, which is provided mainly by Western civilization, was sharply raised. This issue is, first of all, connected with the load on the planetary ecosystem, with the limited resources quickly spent, in particular, natural resources, deposits of which have been forming for millions of years. In addition, as philosophers have diagnosed, the consumer culture of our time generates a world of simulacra: between “to have” and “to be” the “one-dimensional man” chooses the former, with far-reaching consequences for culture and civilization threatening an anthropic catastrophe. The 21st century reveals new trends in consumer practices covering all social strata of the global world: from the ruling elites to marginalized migrants



in refugee camps. While the heads of states and the world's largest energy companies are engaged in dialogues on the development of carbon-neutral fuels, ordinary people in everyday life, both consciously and intuitively, are developing new consumption strategies related not so much to the level of income, but to value orientations of a psychological and environmental nature.

The social and spiritual orientation of cultural practices contradict each other only partly; more often they act as a united front in defense of the future of man, nature, and society. For example, businesses often turn to marketing scenarios that guide customers towards responsible consumption and environmental behavior.

Consumer practices of the global era are characterized by the tendency to reject excessive consumption, postulated by a number of communities with a developed culture of consumption. But standards of environmental behavior and conscientious consumption are spreading in individual cultural communities even before the latter reach high standards of consumption and quality of life. The grounds for this statement are set by paradoxes of the following order: in countries where the authorities have not actually shown interest in protecting the environment, where large industries use vital resources inadvertently, polluting nature on an industrial scale and poisoning the population, the population itself is able to demonstrate a high level of environmental awareness. An example is the emerging household practice of sorting waste, although at the state level the system for further disposal and processing of sorted waste has not been established. The mass consumer realizes the need to abandon plastic, to minimize the consumption of fresh water and the amount of clothing purchased, breathing air of unacceptable quality in everyday life. The legal reality of underdeveloped countries does not include responsibility for the ecology of consumption. However, being included in global economic ties gives people the opportunity to get acquainted with the practices of environmental behavior and cultural consumption in more developed countries. International FMCG manufacturers transmit environmental values by cultivating an appropriate consumer culture in those national economic systems that they were able to enter. For example, IKEA accompanies products with a description of their cycle of production, developing various tools for sustainable household management, and H&M offers clothing made from recycled materials. All representatives of the global automotive industry today produce cars equipped with special systems for neutralizing exhaust gases. Further engineering developments of internal combustion engines were abandoned by Volkswagen, focusing on mechanisms that not only improve the functional qualities of the vehicle, but rather ensure the environmental safety of its use.

With an increase in the density of interaction between bearers of different cultural values, the problem of normalizing the implementation of the diversity of cultural practices in the coordinates of a common social space becomes more relevant. This problem refers researchers to the phenomenon of new ethics, understood in an extremely contradictory way in the current conditions of unfinished and

poorly predictable social, political, and legal processes. The very term of the new ethics fixes the need to abandon the outdated old ethical standards. Moreover, it implies the absence of a real opportunity to form a single moral order that satisfies the nature of all cultural phenomena now observed in one geographical location rather than the transition to a moral order that meets the demands of our time. The adoption of moral norms by an individual that are alien to his conscience and threatening his personal values can be considered in the perspective of the formation of specific legal norms or etiquette rules.

It is important that the cultural practices of modernity should make it easier for the individual to accept the fact that all kinds of cultural patterns that contradict his own identity are now included in his living space. Due to modern cultural practices, it is reasonable to expect the creation of a person who painlessly coexists with subjects of sociocultural activity that are different from him. But it would be naive to assume that the behavioral expression of tolerance for the other required by etiquette and law, can become a truly ethical agreement with the other. The boundaries of personal ethical guidelines can be recognized, expanded, and overcome, but the fact of the existence of these boundaries cannot be denied.

Another difficult problem of philosophical reflection is the way the etiquette and legal regulation of the borderline existence of a person in a mosaic cultural reality can be possible without threats to the very principles of humanism, without resorting totalitarian mechanisms. The radical turn towards the protection of various socio-cultural minorities observed today in the Western world has given rise to cancel culture with intimidating intolerance and withering discrimination against representatives of previously dominant culture suspected of being “unethical”. The researchers note that “the contradictions contained within the “new ethics” are destructive, they turn ethics into anti-ethics. This is facilitated by such a social phenomenon as the institutionalization of ethics, which takes the unusual functions of monitoring moral behavior and the functions of punishing violations of moral norms” (Karpova, 2021, p. 18). It is curious that the phenomenon of the controversial struggle for the rights of disadvantaged social groups and gender, racial and other minorities, is in the focus of attention of the Western world, while theoretical discussions around the concept and the problems of the “new ethics” are unfolding in the Russian-speaking public space.

Anthropo-creative function of cultural practices of childhood

Appeal to the theory and empiricism of cultural practices becomes extremely topical when it comes to children and childhood. Childhood is the period of beginning of a person, and any beginning, according to Plato, requires particularly careful attitude. Indeed it is the anthropo-creative function of cultural practices which becomes clearer than ever precisely in the results of cultural practices of childhood that is in the system of upbringing and educational influence on a child in the direc-



tions of its socialization and enculturation in accordance with the challenges of culture and society. Cultural and social influence in identity formation of the child at all times was carried out in the aspect of ontology of stability-variability, which determined the configuration of the diversity of cultural conflicts of its development, which found a specific expression from the universality of the opposition of tradition-innovation in culture to the trivial conflict of fathers and children. It is natural to believe that stability-variability in their categorical pairing is objectified in the corresponding cultural practices which should be classified with sufficient caution as practices of destruction or creation. The possible danger of a viral infection which changes both the distances of everyday tactile communication and the order of performing a religious ritual is certainly one of the strokes indicating natural foundations of cultural practices that are subject to variability like culture as a whole. However, the whole of culture is far from being the whole of the world which includes nature, culture, society, and man in their special modes of being. It is worth noting that today more and more often we are talking about another category which in our opinion fits to this syncretism of the interaction of modes of being, namely the category of civilization. In our appeal to the modes of being, what matters is their intention to change culture, and consequently to change the social order for a person who will live in a certain natural and cultural social environment, suggesting and even requiring the actualization of one's essential anthropological characteristics.

Variability of culture implies reality of loss of traditional mechanisms of inheritance, cultural gaps, and disappearance of some meaningful life values and discovery of new meanings. Any changes and especially abrupt transits of culture as noted above can lead to an anthropic catastrophe. In order inevitable transits of culture not to lead to tragic consequences for society and man, the practices that determine socialization and enculturation of A child must be carried out not only from the standpoint of the theory of education and fulfillment of social order which is accordingly formed in the social mode of being, but based on philosophical and anthropological grounds which take into account not only requirements of society, but nature of man and culture in their objective (for everyone) and subjective (for each of them) being.

Appeal to philosophical and anthropological foundations involves deepening of ontological meaningful understanding of practice but not only pragmatic operating with its quite effective tools, including subject of practice, his activity, the subject to which it is directed, means of influencing the subject and the result of activity (Ogurtsov, 2001).

It would seem that methodological potential of practice in this instrumental structure is quite obvious, which allows us to construct any cultural practice of childhood, rejecting excessive philosophical reflection, reminding us that practice is an activity, a cultural and social continuum of human existence, a criterion of truth. At the same time it is not superfluous to recall that pedagogy actualizes practice of

education, meaningful life goal of which is preservation of humanity as a species and not just fulfillment of a specific social order – the “wheel and screw” of the social organism: in one case, this is a self-made-man, in the other, a cultural consumer. In each historical period, a certain type of personality and its characteristic principle of action are created, reflecting the syncretism of social and cultural. We emphasize that we are talking, first of all, about the inheritance of a system of values, and not about the preservation of established social institutions. Any human community is engaged in creative activity, creates a spiritual and material body of culture based on sacred ideals. The sacred core is a fairly strong, stable intentional part of the system of social life. The intention of the sacred core is aimed at self-preservation, which is expressed in the need to inherit cultural practices.

This is the essence of cultural practices of childhood, mainly determined by the archetypal relationship between an adult and a child. The meanings of child-adult opposition in different cultures in different historical epochs can be different: from recognition in the child of an ontologically and socially equivalent adult subject to the dominance and imperative dictates of one of the opposition poles. In any case in the opposition child-adult, possible variations of meanings allow a child and an adult to observe a measure of freedom and necessity in the processes of socialization and enculturation. Nevertheless, the inheritance of the sacralized ideal of culture by a child is possible only if this ideal is revealed to him by adults as a hidden truth. This seemingly obvious thing is forgotten in the fascination with the practices of gender formation, political correctness, consumer culture in isolation from the culture of creation and inheritance.

Modern philosophical anthropology believes that a child is no less a full-fledged subject of culture than an adult. He constantly expands the boundaries of knowledge of all modes of being: nature, society, culture, man. The child is in complex relationship with culture, being on the one hand its product, and on the other, an active heir. He has a powerful potential for influencing culture, both in terms of preserving tradition and in terms of establishing innovative trends that postulate the expansion of the boundaries of the child's subjectivity.

Is it always useful to push these boundaries? For example, the trend of juvenile justice seemingly aimed at protecting the rights of A child, threatens the very essence of childhood – a period that *a priori* requires attention, love, care of adults, which presupposes a nuance of the anthropological meanings of the child-adult opposition which does not allow formal identification and equalization; on the contrary, it actualizes guardianship. In turn guardianship requires from an adult not an indifferent presence as a spy in the course of growing and development of a child, but an active, purposeful participation in these processes. That is, an adult carries out together with a child a cultural practice aimed at a certain life-meaning result. And here the objectification of another ontological opposition already arises – freedom and necessity. The freedom of natural growth and development come into conflict with the need for cultural formation. The contradiction



is quite rigid, which was understood by the German classics. Thus, Kant saw need for discipline in the upbringing of a child, while Hegel considered it necessary to break the child's self-will. Today cultural and anthropological value of A child, early disclosure of its capabilities, is topical, hence probably distortions in understanding of its subjective status in the aspects of law, gender, creativity and in various forms of social and cultural activity are derived.

Passion for the practices of juvenile justice, the transformation of certain types of adult sports into children's, the participation of children in the modeling and show business, the design of children's art competitions by analogy with competitions for adults – all this is fraught with a disdainful attitude towards the psychophysical and social nature of a child, overconsumption of the potential of children's future, its unjustified waste that provide culture and society with a smooth transit from one cultural paradigm to another (Nefedova, 2021).

The child is the Other, the other subject in relation to the adult. It is practically in its pure form – the embodiment of the archetype of selfhood, the one that an adult, after the loss of the paradise of childhood, has to form in himself with labor and diligence. But this self is in an implicit state, and it should be explicated very carefully, without forgetting the ancient wisdom about the identity of victory and defeat.

Conclusion

Modern cultural reality constantly requires individuals to overcome boundaries between cultural systems. The pace of modern life allows us to observe a constant change of cultural practices that organize the life of the individual and society. The plurality of identities that emerges in the conditions of an increasingly complex and rapidly changing reality calls into question the ontological security of a person who is forced to abandon previous forms of selfhood adapting to an unpredictable, not always favorable cultural environment. The search for a stable social identity by a person is historically justified through the generic essence of national, folk identity, whose qualitative certainty is guaranteed by the accomplished past and the solidarizing collective memory of its history. This traditional identity is characterized by a desire for archaism, which in turn hinders the cultural variability of social actors and their adaptation to a changing reality.

Cultural practices ensure preservation and development of the community in the unity of two vectors: 1) socialization and enculturation of individuals 2) individualization, creation of a person in social space formed by cultural practices. Both vectors provide self-realization of a person ascending to common cultural meanings. Traditionally, social and humanitarian knowledge explained the observed local cultural practices by historical patterns and specific living conditions of a particular community. Today, among the many social processes, the formation of

universal cultural practices in the life of various communities, including those peoples the course of historical development of which does not imply detectable social patterns, is especially noticeable. Examples of frontier cultural practices in a globalized world can be: 1) behavioral practices of observing uniform sanitary safety standards that have developed in the world in connection with the covid pandemic, 2) consumption practices that have developed due to the inclusion of diverse communities in a single global economic space, 3) cultural practices of childhood, relevant in connection with the importance of the primary socialization of a person and the inclusion of communities in the legal reality of global interaction.

Cultural practices demonstrate multi-scenario with not always consistent responses to the challenges of the era. Different social groups reacted differently to the pandemic restrictions that were the same all over the world. The practices of conscientious consumption are spreading in individual cultural communities even before the latter reach high standards of consumption and quality of life.

Additionally, we note that practices-simulacra, such as juvenile justice and show business, should be analyzed as they are transferred to the subculture of childhood from the adult sphere of life. These practices aim to overcome the boundaries between these two sociocultural worlds and largely define the meanings and values of modern culture.

References

- Bakumenko, D. A. (2012). *Transformation of Cultural Practices in the System of Social Communications of Modern Russia* (p. 168) [Ph.D. thesis]. Russian Academy of National Economy and State Service under the President of the Russian Federation. (In Russian).
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Globalization. The Human Consequences*. Columbia University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2008). *Current contemporaneity*. Piter. (In Russian).
- Bolshakov, V. P. (2016). Cultural practices in the processes of formation of culture. *Vestnik St. Petersburg State University of Culture and Arts*, 2, 16-22. (In Russian).
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question* (Vol. 18). Sage.
- Bourdieu, P., & Boltanski, L. (2008). *La production de l'idéologie dominante* [The production of the dominant ideology]. Demopolis. (In French).
- Certeau, M. (2013). *The Invention of Everyday Life. Book 1*. Publishing house of the European University in St. Petersburg. (In Russian).
- Ermakov, S. A., Ermakova, E. V., & Kashina, O. P. (2022). The Order of Life as a Necessary Condition for a Prosperous Human Existence. *Review of Omsk State Pedagogical University. Humanitarian research*, 34, 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2022-34-14-20> (In Russian).
- Foucault, M. (1969). *L'archéologie du savoir* [The archaeology of knowledge] (Vol. 1). Gallimard Paris.



- Foucault, M. (1984). *Histoire de la sexualité [History of sexuality]: Vol. II: L'usage des plaisirs [The use of pleasures]*. Gallimard. (In French).
- Frankl, V. (2009). *Saying "Yes to Life!": A Psychologist in a Concentration Camp*. Alpina Non-Fiction. (In Russian).
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Polity Press.
- Jaspers, K. (1999). *Die geistige Situation der Zeit.[The Spiritual Situation of the Time]*. Walter de Gruyter. (In German). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805666>
- Kagan, M. S. (1994). *Mensch, Kultur, Kunst [Man, Culture, Art]*. Systemanalytische Untersuchung. (In German).
- Karpova, L. M. (2021). "New Ethics" in the Context of Modern Russian Culture: Pro Et Contra. *Review of Omsk State Pedagogical University. Humanitarian research*, 32, 14–19. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2021-32-14-19> (In Russian).
- Kashima, Y., Laham, S. M., Dix, J., Levis, B., Wong, D., & Wheeler, M. (2015). Social transmission of cultural practices and implicit attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 129, 113–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.05.005>
- Khlyshcheva, E. V. (2018). The Frontier of Identities: The Problem of Cultural Borders. *Journal of Frontier Studies*, 2, 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.24411/2500-0225-2018-00009> (In Russian).
- Kordas, O. M. (2021). Incomprehension in Hermeneutic Experience. *Review of Omsk State Pedagogical University. Humanitarian research*, 33, 30–34. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2021-33-30-34> (In Russian).
- Martell, C. C., & Stevens, K. M. (2019). Culturally sustaining social studies teachers: Understanding models of practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102897>
- Mironov, V. V. (2020). After the Pandemic: Vectors for Future Development. *Scientific Works of the Free Economic Society of Russia*, 223(3), 522–529. <https://doi.org/10.38197/2072-2060-2020-223-3-522-529> (In Russian).
- Moss, M. (2011). *Society. Exchange. Personality. Proceedings of social anthropology*. KDU. (In Russian).
- Nadezhda, B. G. (2019). Polycultural environment: Challenges and risks to social stability. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 52(25), 355–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2019.12.549>
- Nefedova, L. K. (2020). Meanings of Childhood in Ancient Philosophy and Social and Humanitarian Knowledge. *Review of Omsk State Pedagogical University. Humanitarian research*, 27, 36–40. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2020-27-36-40> (In Russian).
- Ogurtsov, A. P. (2001). Practice. In *The New Encyclopedia of Philosophy: In 4 volumes (Vol. 3, pp. 321–325)*. Mysl. (In Russian).
- Rickert, G. (1998). *Sciences of nature and sciences of culture*. Respublika. (In Russian).
- Robertson, R., & Khondker, H. H. (1998). Discourses of Globalization: Preliminary Considerations. *International Sociology*, 13(1), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026858098013001004>
- Rudi, A. Sh. (2021). Ontological Crystallization of the Sustainable in Culture. *Review of Omsk State Pedagogical University. Humanitarian research*, 30, 33–37. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2021-30-33-37> (In Russian).

- Tanatova, D., & Yudina, T. (2020). Global Culture: Discursive and Social Practices. *Slavica*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.31034/049.2020.11> (In Russian).
- Troitskiy, S. A. (2022). It is Difficult to Remain a Scholar When The Human is Ground Into Mincemeat: Mental Boundaries and Memorial Frontiers. *Journal of Frontier Studies*, 7(2), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.46539/jfs.v7i2.398> (In Russian).
- Ulrich, P., & Troitskiy, S. (2019). The Complexity of «Borders»: Research Agendas, Terminology and Classification. *Journal of Frontier Studies*, 4.2, 234–256. <https://doi.org/10.24411/2500-0225-2019-10035> (In Russian).
- Voronov, V. M. (2021). The COVID-19 Pandemic as an Existential and Cultural Event: Groups, New Cultural Boundaries, and the Phenomenon of Mood (a Sase Study of the Russian Society). *Journal of Frontier Studies*, 6(1), 41–68. <https://doi.org/10.46539/jfs.v6i1.274> (In Russian).
- Windelband, W. (1995). Philosophy of Culture and Transcendental Idealism. In *Selected: Spirit and History* (pp. 7-19). Yurist. (In Russian).

Список литературы

- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Globalization. The Human Consequences*. Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question* (Vol. 18). Sage.
- Bourdieu, P., & Boltanski, L. (2008). *La production de l'idéologie dominante* [The production of the dominant ideology]. Demopolis. (In French).
- Foucault, M. (1969). *L'archéologie du savoir* [The archaeology of knowledge] (Vol. 1). Gallimard Paris.
- Foucault, M. (1984). *Histoire de la sexualité* [History of sexuality]: Vol. II: *L'usage des plaisirs* [The use of pleasures]. Gallimard. (In French).
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Polity Press.
- Jaspers, K. (1999). *Die geistige Situation der Zeit*. [The Spiritual Situation of the Time]. Walter de Gruyter. (In German). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805666>
- Kagan, M. S. (1994). *Mensch, Kultur, Kunst* [Man, Culture, Art]. Systemanalytische Untersuchung. (In German).
- Kashima, Y., Laham, S. M., Dix, J., Levis, B., Wong, D., & Wheeler, M. (2015). Social transmission of cultural practices and implicit attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 129, 113–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.05.005>
- Martell, C. C., & Stevens, K. M. (2019). Culturally sustaining social studies teachers: Understanding models of practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102897>
- Nadezhda, B. G. (2019). Polycultural environment: Challenges and risks to social stability. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 52(25), 355–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2019.12.549>
- Robertson, R., & Khondker, H. H. (1998). Discourses of Globalization: Preliminary Considerations. *International Sociology*, 13(1), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026858098013001004>
- Бакуменко, Д. А. (2012). Трансформация культурных практик в системе социальных коммуникаций современной России (с. 168) [Автореферат диссертации кандидата социологических наук].



- наук]. Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте Российской Федерации.
- Бауман, З. (2008). *Текущая современность*. Питер.
- Большаков, В. П. (2016). Культурные практики в процессах становления культуры. *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета культуры и искусств*, 2, 16–22.
- Виндельбанд, В. (1995). Философия культуры и трансцендентальный идеализм. В *Избранное: Дух и история* (с. 7–19). Юрист.
- Воронов, В. М. (2021). Пандемия COVID-19 как экзистенциальное и культурное событие: Группы, культурные границы и феномен настроения (на примере российского общества). *Журнал Фронтирных Исследований*, 6(1), 41–68. <https://doi.org/10.46539/jfs.v6i1.274>
- Ермаков, С. А., Ермакова, Е. В., & Кашина, О. П. (2022). Порядок жизни как необходимое условие благополучного существования человека. *Вестник Омского государственного педагогического университета. Гуманитарные исследования*, 34, 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2022-34-14-20>
- Карпова, Л. М. (2021). «Новая этика» в контексте современной российской культуры: Pro et Contra. *Вестник Омского государственного педагогического университета. Гуманитарные исследования*, 32, 14–19. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2021-32-14-19>
- Кордас, О. М. (2021). Непонимание в герменевтическом опыте. *Вестник Омского государственного педагогического университета. Гуманитарные исследования*, 33, 30–34. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2021-33-30-34>
- Миронов, В. В. (2020). После пандемии: Векторы будущего развития. *Научные труды Вольного экономического общества России*, 223(3), 522–529. <https://doi.org/10.38197/2072-2060-2020-223-3-522-529>
- Мосс, М. (2011). *Общество. Обмен. Личность. Труды по социальной антропологии*. КДУ.
- Нефедова, Л. К. (2020). Смыслы детства в античной философии и социально-гуманитарном знании. *Вестник Омского государственного педагогического университета. Гуманитарные исследования*, 27, 36–40. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2020-27-36-40>
- Огурцов, А. П. (2001). Практика. В *Новая философская энциклопедия: В 4-х томах* (Т. 3, сс. 321–325). Мысль.
- Риккерт, Г. (1998). *Науки о природе и науки о культуре*. Республика.
- Руди, А. Ш. (2021). Онтологическая кристаллизация устойчивого в культуре. *Вестник Омского государственного педагогического университета. Гуманитарные исследования*, 30, 33–37. <https://doi.org/10.36809/2309-9380-2021-30-33-37>
- Серто, М. (2013). *Изобретение повседневности. Книга 1*. Издательство Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге.
- Танатова, Д., & Юдина, Т. (2020). Глобальная культура: Дискурсивные и социальные практики. *Slavica*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.31034/049.2020.11>
- Троицкий, С. А. (2022). Сложно оставаться ученым, когда человеческое перемалывается в фарш: Ментальные границы и мемориальные фронтиры. *Журнал Фронтирных Исследований*, 7(2), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.46539/jfs.v7i2.398>



Ульрих, П., & Троицкий, С. (2019). Сложность «границ»: Постановка проблемы, терминология и классификация. *Журнал Фронтирных Исследований*, 4.2, 234–256. <https://doi.org/10.24411/2500-0225-2019-10035>

Франкл, В. (2009). *Сказать жизни «Да!»: Психолог в концлагере*. Альпина Нон-фикшн.

Хлыщева, Е. В. (2018). Фронтир идентичностей: Проблема культурных границ. *Журнал Фронтирных Исследований*, 2, 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.24411/2500-0225-2018-00009>