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Consent in what culture it was not and it is not till today. At deeper consideration of question a yet greater variety is revealed only. Model in that behalf it is possible to count the book of Kreber and Klackhon «Culture: critical review of conceptions and determinations». Considering more than 150 determinations of culture, authors analyzed the great number of different ways of conceptions of this term. In final analysis they came to next determination: "Culture consists of implicit models of conduct, acquired and transferrable by means of symbols, making distinctive achievement of human groups, including them embodiment in embodiments; the core of culture consists of traditional ideas and, especially, from the valued values added to them; system cultures can be examined, from one side, as derivatives from activity, and from other - as elements, stipulating further activity"[1] But "today only not many from modern anthropologists allude to this determination. It went out from a fashion, as it seems to too wide (and that is why, probably, too uncomfortable), used in research aims". The known cultural researcher Harry Triantis writes: «Culture is one of those determinations which always are in work of social researchers, but which are determined by such amount of different ways, that a consensus is not foreseen» The same position remains to date. "One conception which prevails in a modern social idea is conception of culture. Cultural anthropologists and sociologists agree on the whole, that a human culture is acquired by a man as member of society and she widely transforms by means of symbolism of language. However there is a consent in that, how to determine a culture and what functions to add" her.[4] In the classic review of determinations of culture of Kreber and Klackhon cultures, meeting in anthropological literature, distinguish five classes of determinations:

1. Descriptive determinations, when aim to describe everything or some aspects of human life and activity.

2. Historical determinations which do an accent on tradition of the pasts.

3. Normative determinations do an accent on rules which manage activity of group of people. In a difference from descriptive and historical definitions which imply obvious expression of cultural life, normative determinations require, that we scrutinized in that activity which we can look after and made an effort open, that stands after her.

4. Psychological determinations underline multiplicity of psychological aspects, including such concepts as adaptation, permission of problems, teaching, habits. For example, a culture allows a group to adapt to the permanent (repetitive) problems, a culture is learned and the result of it teaching is establishment in this group of certain habits. This determination is more wide and includes on implicit (for example, adaptation) and looked (after for example, habits) are the cultural phenomena.

5. Structural determinations underline a model or organization of culture. This look is related to the first (descriptive) category in that does an accent on integrity, totality of picture.[5] Modern cultural researchers add to another this list, sixth point: "Structural determinations are required from us, that we glanced for the visible cultural phenomena, to open as a culture is arranged. A culture is not the list of customs, and is a computer-integrated model of associate lines. Genetic determinations underline a source or genesis of culture. Thus a culture consists of adaptation, social co-operation and creative process, which is distinctive description of human family".[6] However in the modern theories of culture of such points counted considerably anymore.

We will consider a few separate, but authoritative today utterances or reasoning about the concept of "culture".

1. Reasoning of Roy of Dandrad

«One of the oldest terminology disputes in anthropology is a dispute about a term «culture». Some problems, seems, and caused by a circumstance that this term has two senses: culture as process (that is passed, to be studied by subsequent generations) and culture as the special class of the phenomena (id est the organized cognition). It is possible to think that these two aspects of term can coexist, if a process undertakes for determination of maintenance. In such determination a culture there will be all that is passed to the subsequent generations through a study. Difficulty in this determination consists of that many things are passed and not all their anthropologists wish to examine as a culture. For example, Adipow a complex is trained and widely widespread, but his most anthropologists usually do not examine him as a culture, so this complex is indirect, unintentional, unrealized investigation of teaching to other things. The second strategy is determination of culture as ideas of the special maintenance. Problem with this determination in that different births of maintenance are - what from them to consider a culture».

«Presently there are three basic looks to nature of culture. First is determination of culture as cognitions, as accumulations of information. According to this look, a culture accumulates and does not need that, to be divided, if distribution of cognition is such, that the own incorporated cognition is supported. Information content in the cultural pool of cognition is very great - even in simple societies. According to this look, a culture is not highly computer-integrated, cognitions about that, how to treat illnesses unconnected with cognition necessary for building of house. According to the second look - a culture consists of conceptual structures which create central reality of people, so that he "lives in the that world which imagines to itself» or according to determination of Shneydor, a culture consists of «elements which are certain and разделяемы in concrete society as presenting reality - not simply social reality, and integral reality of life in which human creatures live and operate». According to this approach, a culture is not simply divided, she subjectively is divided, so that everybody supposes that other see the same things which he sees. In this approach a culture is not especially accumulated, no more, than grammar is accumulated. The third look to nature of culture stands between positions "culture as cognition" and "culture as the constructed reality". This approach interprets a culture and society almost as consoling realities, something, consisting of institutes, such as family, market, economy, church, the country etc., id est systems of norms, qualificatory roles, related to different statuses. For Neydla, for example, an accumulation takes place, but relatively poorly; the volume of information which must be trained is very wide, the degree of integration is important, but problematic. Distinction between these looks consists of accenting of different functions of values : directive function for approach centered on "cognition", potential of the systems of values for approach cantered on "constructing of reality". Although there is differentiation between symbols and values - some seem foremost presenting, some - foremost by a directive, some - foremost constructing reality. These distinctions are indistinct and at times exist only in conceptual scopes.

2. Reasoning of М. Segall

In obedience to Segall, a culture is the factor of high order, which cannot have status of independent variation; he is too difficult, to measure him. Rather a culture must be divided into separate contextual factors. They include social institutes, such as school, language, governed, qualificatory interpersonally relations, features of physical surroundings. General for cultural researchers is that that they push off from important distinctions in a conduct and aim to find preceding distinctions which can explain these distinctions. We must find the phenomena which are important and interesting and only then to search explanation to them. Look to the culture as on the knot of terms has two investigations. The first consists of that determination of culture is no more, than general label and cannot have status of theoretical conception. Talked not about a culture on the whole, and only about specific variations which explain specific cultural distinctions. The second investigation consists of that psychological laws and conceptions on determination must be universal. If certain theoretical statements have warrants in one culture, but does not have in other, these statements are false and a theory must be rejected. In this approach an accent is done on cultural relations in their different aspects into a group. A culture appears as the organized unit. The study of the isolated variations, taken from an integral complex by the representatives of this direction, is examined as very doubtful practice. A culture is perceived as a system, in which a cultural context is inseparable from a that method which psychological lines and functions are organized. The systems as such cannot be compared, compared there can be only parts and properties of the systems. Gustavo Jagod preferred going near a culture as to the system, but asserted that cultural psychology did not have a method to transform this conception of culture so that she was suitable for empiric researches. We also consider so. Till to define the object of cultural researches, we must decide, what from determinations of culture more acceptable to us. The complete falling short of between a culture (in objective sense) and conduct is created difficulty in application to researches of any of three analyzed approaches. A «culture plugs in itself the part of surroundings» produced by a man.

3. Reasoning of Robert Levin

«In anthropology concept a culture means the and different forms of human adaptation, and different ways which humanity organizes the life on earth. People have the system of adaptive aims, many of which have animals, but people has unique ability to arrive at them by means of the acquired descriptions of conduct (models of culture), which can be widely varied from one culture to other. At this level of дискурса a culture is often determined in relation to foundation of physical and biological surroundings, to which humanity must adapt oneself to survive. But a culture can be also certain as creating surroundings for the members of society. Individuals in a human aggregate do not adapt oneself straight and simply to physical and biological surroundings, but to surroundings cultural, which contains facilities of their individual survival and conducts their adaptation on the already set channels. I use a term culture for denotation of the organized complex of rules on the basis of which individuals in society must contact with each other, to think of to itself and about the surroundings and to behave in relation to by a friend and to the objects of the surroundings. These rules are not universal and not always it is obeyed them, but they are acknowledged by all and they limit the number of variations of models of communication usually, beliefs, values and social conduct in society.. Other forms of communication are usually limited to the external or internal rules, as well as models of co-operation between individuals and belief in relation to the world of external and internal experience».

4. Reasoning of Harry Triadic

A «important aspect of culture is that she has a structure and that she as unity of partners. Instruments, houses, laws, values and options, are usually associate, often by such difficult character, that they form some sort of the constrained integrity».

5. Reasoning of Michael Koul

A «culture can be understood as an integral aggregate of artifacts, accumulated by task force during her historical development. In the aggregate артефакты accumulated by a group is a culture - can be examined as a specific for form's sake (for a man) mean of distinction. It is «history in nowadays». Ability to develop in this environment and provide her reproduction in subsequent generations makes the distinctive environment of our kind.. The analysis of psychical functions of man must be based on his everyday activity… The Historical accumulation of artifacts and their plugging in activity supposes social nature of human thought. As asserted in 1929. L. Vigotskiy, formulating the «general act of human development», all facilities of cultural conduct (on my terminology are артефакты) are on the essence social. They are social also on the origin and development. Vigotskiy writes, that every function in cultural development of child appears on the stage twice, in two plans, at first - in social, then - in psychological, at first between people, as a category of interpsychical, after into a child, as a category of intrapsychical... but, certainly, a transition from outside inward transforms a process, changes his structure and functions.

6. Reasoning of Gustavo Jagod

«Values which we add, for example, to the houses which we live in, self-existence of houses in a culture, introduces something in a that method which people think of other aspects of their life. Nomads or not having houses will have other system of values, touching the events of their everyday life. Disputes in relation to that, whether produce human artifacts values which are important in a culture, or a culture creates artifacts, which present the types of value, which she gives to the events, remind about other long спорах in psychology. For example, question about relative importance of surroundings and heredity in determining of conduct hot and comes into question infinitely. In final analysis, such disputes are not solvable, because they offer as resisting reasons factors which in principle are case bound. For our aims the major aspect of culture is that a culture is relatively the organized system of the divided values».

7. Reasoning R. Rohner

R. Rohner examines a culture as organized system of values, which members of this culture are attributes for personalities and objects which create a culture. This determination implies that the concept of culture it is not necessary to limit to that is meant by things for the group of people. We are necessary to distinguish between the concepts of culture and frame of society. He determines a culture on the basis of conducts, discovered in a culture. It conflicts with his determination of culture on the basis of the divided values, which are given to the events. Social psychologists discovered repeatedly, that the conducts of individuals not always comported with the options supported by them, and distinction of Rohner is the parallel of these opening. However, in practice not easily to conduct a clear line between a culture and frame of society, thus determined. Seeming incompatibility it is often possible to explain between options and conduct, because a few different options, accepted by an individual simultaneously, all are relevant to the certain conduct. In like manner it is possible to explain and seeming disparity between the frame of society and culture which she is built into. For example Christmas walking, which take place in some crestless countries, most, probably, explainable rather the attractiveness of the "modern" commercial systems of exchange by gifts, what by a religious value, given to them by Christians.[17] Rohner determines society as territorial limited unity of centuries-old humanity, filled up mainly due to sexual reproduction, and frame of society organized round a general culture and general. The concept of society, thus, reflects interlacing of culture and frame of society. [18] Does a culture can legally examined as reason of social conduct? Determinations of culture, frame of society and societies which we discuss lean against the analysis of persuasions and actions of their members. Consequently, our statement, that a culture can explain a conduct, is tautology; we assert here, that something can be explained to by itself. However, if we assert, that individualism or some other specific values can explain some aspect of social conduct, at that rate we become on more hard soil. We abstracted that we examine as a key element of culture was supposed, that it can explain other aspects of culture.

8. Reasoning of Ken Richardson

Culture, in sense of forms of production, instruments and mechanisms, social agreements, symbols, music, dances and other, there is the remotest, tangible expression of general models to reality. Confession explains it near likeness between social constructivism’s and cultural anthropologists. Vigotskiy, no doubt, talked about child's development as about cultural development. In obedience to his theory a fundamental engine of development is a reiteration of "collisions" between the model of reality constructed by a child and that is implicit general in task force which a child belongs to. The structure of social context of this transmission is examined as a key to understanding of mental structures which are a result.

9. Reasoning of Denyse Jenkins

«I take a culture in the context of the symbols and values which personality’s dynamically create or create again on your own in the process of development known more or less. A culture, thus, is the orientation of methods of sensation, thought, and life in the world is their unrealized mean of experience, interpretation and action. Context culture there is that, through what every human experience and action - including emotions - must be interpreted. This look to the culture tries to see her as something shown, contested and temporal, living space is whereby opened for theorizing about individual and family changeability, and opinions are eliminated of culture as about something static, homogeneous and it is necessary divided or even coherent. I would say that such conception of culture was решающе important for the comparative study of psychical pathology. She plugs in itself determination experience and subjectivities, which simultaneously darkened by limitation of the discussed aspects of problem and taking of her to the general line from which individuals and groups can deviate and deviate» often.

10. Reasoning of Jerome Barkow

A «culture is an informative pool, and individual, is an active swimmer. From the point of view of evolutional psychology a culture is the reservoir of different categories of information, processed by the brain of different ways. An individual takes away informative units, "edits" them, modifies, and, most important, uses them. How does an individual use cultural information? We use a culture in свих interests, so that she developed, our инклюзивную adaptability. From here follows also, that a culture is the arena of conflict, because individuals and factions take away ideological information, corresponding to their interests, and in the same time try to convince other, that this ideology serves to all. Not implied here, that human creatures are conscious hypocrites; rather, we cheat itself (self-deceit is highly-adaptation in attempts to influence on a conduct other). Information in a cultural source can be poorly by adaptation (maladaptive). For every this individual, some socially reported information which a culture consists of serves rather to interests other, what in the own interests. Other processes can also have the result of badly by adaptation cultural information, as in those cases, when ecology changes or, when seeming adaptation strategy has negative long-term consequences (for example, fishing a network can be successful only during set time, but essentially she conduces to exhaustion of supplies of fish). That some cultural information, probably, is badly by adaptation, for some or all individuals, adjustment of such information» supposes.

11. Reasoning of Sara Harkin’s

Anthropologists and psychologists jointly participated in theoretical changes in концептах of culture and personality. The Central metaphor in actualization of conceptions of culture is the "outwardly-internal" measuring of contrast. A culture was examined as providing surroundings for thought and action of individual from one side, as a system of internal rules, managing such activity - with other. The external displays of "foods" of culture contrasted with an internal "cultural informative fund" or beliefs and values which create them. A conduct which can be directly observed contrasts with ideas; emotions and systems of value which more hidden from supervision. For many the realization was general that into the area of psychological anthropology there was moving of attention for the last twenty years from "external" to "internal" actualization of conceptions of culture. I am inclined to think that "internal" side of culture always was more central for psychological anthropologists, and that our feeling of change in that behalf is exaggerated. For example, Klayd Klakhon in an essay about "концепте of culture", which was first published in 1945, concluded that «basic стрежень of culture consisted of traditional ideas (id est historically derivative), and values" especially related to them. John Waiting also in 1960 characterized a culture as "formulation of general symbolic determinants of conduct».

«At the same time research of linguistic socialization and research of development of the emotionally-meaningful systems is related to more general theme about that, how the cultural models of self are studied. Anthropological research into a когнитивной scientific paradigm provides scopes for the study of this question. As H. Kvin and D. Holland determine, cultural models divide understanding, which "build experience, delivering interpretations of this experience and conclusion about him, and aims for an action». Research of cultural models used a discourse (taking place naturally or in the context of interview with a researcher) analysis for the production of partners of statements, that and metaphors which constitute the cultural systems of value. One striking opening which took place as a result of this research - it "thematic" of cultural models from different areas into one culture. An example is this use of the ideas of «independence» constructed in a civilized manner in the American theories of parents about a conduct and development of child. The American parents use general cultural models for development of specific models of development in babyhood, which allow adjusting obviously the negative conduct of child to in a civilized manner valuable. There is difficulty in researches of cultural models, which originates from distinction between a theory and methods. It was assumed from a theoretical side, that cultural models had motivational and emotional measuring. Nevertheless in the concentration on the "internal" variant of culture, research of cultural models is actually based exceptionally rather on a discourse analysis, than conducts. A question about that, how an idea is related to the action, is problematic and even more problematic in the context of cultural analysis, but exactly on the study of him it is needed to send future research. Other question: as do cultural models get development in the process of human development? D. Holand and Dj. Velsner compare the idea of cultural models to the idea about the «auxiliary mechanisms» of Vigotskiy suppose that «prospect of development of internal forms through social interaction Vigotskiy can be used for anthropological research of development in a civilized manner the divided concepts». Anthropological thought and research of human development suffered a change in paradigms from the oriented sphere of research of school of Wayting to more modern researches which focus on the cognition models of culture, accessible mainly through a language. I supposed that this methodological change had been by the result of change in that, how a culture and personality transform simultaneously. Especially important in that behalf there is a new prospect, developing from cognition approaches in a few areas, which examine human development as actively acquired and created knowledge that, how the world «works», and that he means for personality, above-ground in him. In the process of this pragmatic change we get some new powerful facilities for the study of culture, especially analysis of foods of language, however lose conducts in systematic supervisions, which characterize more early work in this area. It appears especially obvious in attitude toward researches which are based fully on an interview with informants, but it also truly and in regard to research in socio of linguistic tradition which systematic focuses only on the certain specified types of vocal events. One of research scopes, which include simultaneously both a cognition prospect and prospect led, there is an idea of «niche of development», offered К. Saper and S. Harknes. Niche of development - it theoretical scope for the study of the cultural adjusting of microenvironment of child, and she tries to describe this surroundings from the point of view of child in an order to understand the processes of development and acquisition of culture. Niche of development has three main subsystems, which operate jointly as more large system, and each of which operates concertedly with other properties of culture. It: (1) physical and social surroundings, a child lives in which; (2) customs of care of child and education managed in a civilized manner; and (3) psychology of educators. These three subsystems have general a function of the mediated experience of development of individuals into a large culture. Practices are in these subsystems, and also thematic succession of one stage of development determined in a civilized manner with the following, provide material from which a child extracts the social, emotional and cognitive rules of culture, as rules of grammar are extracted from practice of vocal surroundings. These scopes appeared suitable for the analysis of many aspects of development of child and life of family in a cultural context.

12. Reasoning of Elisabeth Thomson

An enormous number of researches of cultural distinctions in options and beliefs is implicit legal interest to affecting of "culture" psychological variables. However, it is actually impossible to differentiate influences of "culture" from influences of functional XOR in a measuring tool. Further, seems, has large importance finding out relations between the specific aspects of culture and complexes of options/of persuasions. Sorrowfully, that a number of cultural researches, falling under this category, is such limited, and that those which are examined are characterized or by the two-bit/pl of standards or standards, not characteristic for industrial societies nowadays and future. It is possible that this area is studied not enough by reason of disciplinary gap - social organization is examined mainly in the field of sociology, and setting - in the field of psychology.

13. Reasoning of Robert Taylor

Three types of the phenomena (customs, actions or artifacts) are the empiric indicators of cultural lines, being classes personal customs which are so close similar with each other, that they are thought as a the same custom. Cultures consist exactly of them. Until now customs were determined without the detailed consideration of question about their substantial nature, and on this object anthropologists were not able to come to the consent. Some included artifacts as elements of culture, and other insisted, that артефакты are simply material results of cultures. Which an answer was not, it is useful to remember that артефакты cannot begin to exist without human actions, and that action often take place without production of artifacts. Because, at such approach, actions, as seems, are more fundamental, some insist on that a culture consists of conduct, id est, actions and utterances. However, other, minority among anthropologists, look at customs as on ideas. There is some divergence in a question, whether there are cultural lines from ideas, conduct and artifacts or only from one or two from transferred. It is entering in an error formulation of problem, because a conduct (actions of m of utterance) and artifacts are the empiric phenomena, id est, they can be directly looked after by sense-organs. Ideas, opposite, it is impossible to look after, but they must destroy from a conduct and artifacts. We do not look after an idea other. However we are forced to suppose that a conduct and artifacts are investigation of ideas or something a like by him into individuals. On this account, it seems useful to think of the looked after phenomena as about the empiric indicators of customs and to distinguish among them three main kinds - utterances, actions and artifacts. Ideas or certain internal forces always are in customs, and they can be expressed or as utterances or as actions; and sometimes action the result has artifacts. By additional reason, why interning forces can be examined as more fundamental, than empiric actions which they product, there is that last, rather, recur from time to time, what it is been permanent. However most anthropologists, seems, consider that cultural lines have some family constancy. If a custom is examined as to the interning individual, it is possible to answer on this question, saying that, essentially, a custom is constantly existent force into individuals. Constancy is provided intern.

Cultural elements are functionally coherent in that sense, that multiplicity of members of society of taken into account in minds as connection, regardless of they are conscious it or no. Connections in basis psychologies it, and, some, seems, is exceptionally only such, because there is no psychological reason for them. Presentation, existing in our culture, that a woman must carries bright clothes, necklaces and ear-rings in ears, is not caused with a necessity by some external terms. In essence, in some cultures men carry more bright clothes and decorations. One of types of the constrained lines is a theme, which can be certain as an interindividual value or orientation sometimes with emotional maintenance, sometimes without him, value, which related to substantial multiplicity of other lines of the examined culture. Maurice Opler, which offered this conception, looked at a theme as on "a postulate or position", [30] implicit or explicit, which usually controls a conduct and stimulates activity. Accordingly, seems, it is natural to think of these themes as at connections of different lines, which they control and stimulate.

A «culture is determined as an aggregate of complexes (sets) of individual customs which are named cultural lines (traits), and into any culture they contact with each other in whole complexes, which, in turn, are with each other in intercommunication, formulating a whole culture. Hidden customs - it such which straight are not expressed in actions, artifacts and utterances. It should be noted that there is not clear distinction between open and hidden customs, but what a cultural element is more or less open, what other custom. Explicit customs - it those, in relation to which a participant has sufficient consciousness that they can way of life expressed verbally. Implicit customs - it such in relation to which a participant does not have such consciousness. Any culture has a great number of implicit customs, and frequently in a civilized manner to find an alien observer is much easier, than native out them. Also as it took place in case with the hidden and open customs, there are different degrees of implicit and explicit among cultural lines».

A «ideal culture consists of lines, shown in utterances and written in reports of members of society about that they do, what they believe in, or that they are necessary to do or in what it is necessary to believe. They are ideal in that sense that often are in contradiction with that people really think and do. The last is that, which anthropologists named the real culture, but it sometimes conduced to the erroneous conclusion that ideal lines are something less, than the authentic cultural phenomena».

«Distinction between effective and ineffective customs rarely, if in general some time done by anthropologists, but these concepts are useful to pointing something substantial, touching nature of cultures. Considerable part of maintenance of any culture consists of knowledge of all births of things and ideas which have potential, but unrealized consequences in life of participants».

14. Reasoning of Peggy Miller

«In symbolic anthropology interest to дискурсу arose up as an attempt to get around more dynamic conceptions of culture. Brigs marks on this occasion «walking away from the analysis of culture as monolithic and static education and passing to the analysis of ways of influence of the cultural systems on the events of individual life». Like motion is caused partly by theoretical developments of contiguous disciplines, busy a study conservative practices of everyday life (Burd’e, Hoffman, Garfinkel, Vigotskiy). The trend marked in addition is related to the discussions concerning cultural interpretation. Those, who studies interpretations on co-operations of ethnographer and informant, have neither a culture nor context as given. Culture of dialogical and a context are set by discourse. Therefore conception of Girc, where a culture is text, and interpretation is description, suffices: she underestimates the direct context of co-operation: that is exactly said, how it is said and to whom. The current situation of culture" is lost.

15. Reasoning of Alexandra Jeffry

Modern achievements in cultural researches meet in their accent on the autonomy of culture from a social structure. The value of ideology or system of dogma cans not must be read from a social conduct; he must be studied as pattern in itself. Going near a culture differ in one from other description that exactly means such autonomy. Some consider, that knowledge of this independently organized cultural system suffices for understanding of reasons and value of social conduct, other, that this system must be understood as created according to sample processes which already exist in the most social system. Concrete processes for fastening of culture, social structure and action also differ undoubtedly, ranged from a religious ritual, socialization and education to the dramaturgic innovation and forming of class-consciousness. Finally, there is extraordinary disagreement regarding that topically is into the most cultural system. Is there a culture by the complex of logically associate symbols or she estimates that asserts the desired social internals? Is there she by the emotionally loaded symbols, touching sacred or sold? Each of these arguments possesses one element of truth. We cannot understand a culture without attitude toward a subjective value, and we cannot understand her without attitude toward social structural limitations. We cannot interpret a social conduct without realization that he follows кодам which it does not invent; in the same time, human ingenuity creates changing surroundings for every cultural coda. The inherited metaphysical ideas form a difficult spider web for modern social structures; however, powerful groups often succeed in transforming of cultural structures in legal facilities. Distinctions between goings near a culture must be respected, because a culture and society are difficult things. A culture cannot be studied into the scopes of separate school or even into more wide borders of separate discipline. Anthropology, history, political science, sociology, philosophy, linguistics, literary analysis - each of them did the distinctive deposit. If each of distinctions, which we examined, specifies on some measuring of reality, then distinctions together will specify on more general prospect which can bind every measuring to other. Discussing these distinctions in eksplicitno theoretical terms and organizing them round the theme of cultural autonomy, this essay made an effort define key terms which any more general prospect" can include.

16. Reasoning of Pier Rabardel

In spite of substantial distinctions between such concepts as артефакт and instrument, most authors, however, distinguish three poles obviously (and sometimes and unobvious), plugged in the situations of the use of instrument: subject (user, operator, worker, acting person); instrument (instrument, machine, system, domestic utensil, product); object on which through an instrument an action (matter, reality, object of activity or labor, other subject) is directed. Артефакт is simultaneously an intermediate and mediator between a subject and object.. Intermediate position of instrument does him in actual fact by the neurohumor of relations between a subject and object. An instrument makes an intermediate universe main description of which consists in her double adapted - in relation to a subject and object. Adaptation is understood both in sense of material properties and in cognitive or semiotics sense, depending on the type of activity in which an instrument is included or for including, which he is intended in. Two main orientations of mediated differentiate: mediated in direction from an object to the subject, which we characterize as epistemic mediated, where an instrument is a mean, allowing to carry out cognition of object; in direction from a subject to the object - pragmatic mediated, at which an instrument is a transforming mean (including control and adjusting in wide sense), directed to the object. But as soon as it mediated is written into the real activity, him epistemic and pragmatic dimensions constantly intersect within the framework of this activity. Thus, an instrument is not only an intermediate universe but also mean of action and, more widely, to activity. Herein there is his second substantial description. Essence of these actions, naturally, is very various: transformation of material object through a hand instrument: material instrument; cognitive decision-making, for example, in the situation of management a dynamic environment: cognitive instrument; management own activity: psychological instrument; semiotics co-operating with a semiotics object or with other subject: semiotics instrument. Within the framework of action an instrument makes operant. He is operative in that sense, that undertakes implementation of part of task: he carries out work. Nature of this work and what she touches, obviously, related to the objects of activity, in this connection, very various. An instrument is the mean of concrete single action, but his value has much more general character; he wider than singleness of nowadays and is meaningful for the whole class of actions and situations. Thus, an instrument is simultaneously in regard to adaptation to the operating situation and in regard to independence from her. Through such maintenance an instrument becomes the mean of capitalization of the accumulated experience (some authors talk even about crystallization). In this sense any instrument is knowledge. It is knowledge which is entered in a development process and which is accumulated in the great number of situations and at the different variants of the use of instrument such. From this point of view, the last can be examined as one of forms of the external fixing of specific experience. This knowledge, which a subject can appropriate in adequate activity which must be unfolded by the adapted character and which can, certainly, carried out by means of other subjects (one of forms of mediated on Vigotskiy and Leontewu). It also is own knowledge of subject, characterizing forms and methods of relations of subject to the object, expressing them and, the same, being a source of possible supervisions for a psychologist. It is knowledge, accumulated simultaneously in the process of transformation of material device, making artifacts, and in the use related to him, in the methods of application. Thus, instrument as well as sign, presenting for some authors not that another, as special case of instrument, it is ambivalent, complex integrity, simultaneously артефактом and method the uses which fundamentally not разделимы.

17. Reasoning of Howard Hardener

Certainly, present means progress in area of psychology of development in explanation that, how individuals arrive at different cognitive and communicative capabilities. We have some key concepts about by a logically by a ration thought, about a language and other symbolic systems. But empiric, problem-oriented nature of greater part of researches on psychology of development, creates difficulty for those, who to aim to affect more all-purpose, but also thinner, difficult perceptible themes, styles of value, which are also included in understanding of culture. The method of achievement of competence (for example, in a political sphere) or role (for example, roles of friend) absents in psychology of development. In the total skepticism appears concerning that, whether there are these difficult perceptible themes in principles by suitable themes for the advanced study. From this point of view anthropologists experience difficulty in that, to assert reality of culture. Really, "super-organic" makes the head stone of this discipline. However in this case resistance to determination of culture is created, as life of individual can in general absent here. Id est there is a paradox in determination of acceptance of culture. A culture is the same necessary part of surroundings of child, as air, which he breathes and as fairy-tales which he listens. There are many researches about perception of culture, done as within the framework of psychology of development, so within the framework of cultural anthropology: many of the last are executed in psychoanalytical tradition and tradition of school "Culture and Personality". But it should be noted that these most works concentrated on a question, as an individual develops as personality, but not as individuals develop as fruitful and interactive members of the examined culture. Small attention spared to the processes by means of which individuals develop a cognitive competence are those capabilities and ways of thinking, which are required by mastering of different roles in technological and economic spheres of their society. Such blank unsurprising foremost because contiguity with cognition only recently affected psychology and yet later anthropological sciences. To work out the all-purpose theory of mastering of culture comparative researches are needed. But we need not only new information about the processes of development in the different corners of the world, but we does not possess even an acceptable category chart for comparison and analysis of these researches. To attain our purpose we must do a few preliminary remarks. A culture must not be examined as single, inviolable, not differentiable integrity. Opposite, for heuristic approach it is necessary to divide a culture on a separate area, each of which can be analyzed separately. Description of area includes judgments and flexibility. An area can be in relation to wide, as a cognitive area by comparison to a social area, or very specific, as an area of algebra or nuclear physics. Fundamentally here that everybody can legally investigate the private area of achievement into a culture, to describe select the eventual state is inherent to the adult member of culture, and then to begin to determine different steps and stages on the way of achievement of this eventual state. Such "regional approach" implies that initially a young organism into society has a competence in this area. Such supposition sets much work to the social researchers, and those, who supposes, that a competence is to a great extent the genetically determined process (as Chomsky considered), and those, who supposes that achievement of competence is completely the result of teaching (as behaviorists) process, and those, who prefers approach related to instinctive co-operation (as Piage), and to many psychologists of development… In addition to this statement about existence and autonomy of different areas of competence, we developing the theory of the cultural understanding, must look at her from four different points of view. First two can be examined as diametrically opposite to one other. From one side it is a culture as unit, including the different areas, beliefs and values. Other extreme point of view is an individual, equipped by his genetic legacy, including different neurological and psychological mechanisms. The third point of view is the system of symbols, being into a culture. Fourth - modus of transmission of the cultural understanding… I consider a necessity to consider three spheres, which necessarily must be compared in the different corners of the world. It is a 1) physical world, 2) the world, artifact created by a man, 3) the social world. In every culture a man must find funds, in an order to purchase capabilities, enabling to him effectively deal with these three spheres. Moreover, an individual must develop these capabilities both at intuitional and practical level and at the level of explicit cognition. An individual must attain and «know as well as «know that» in all these spheres. Certainly, between cultural distinctions in methods which these cultural knowledge are coded, passed and realized makes a main question for philosophers, anthropologists and other social researchers. Cultures considerably differentiate in regard to methods which they determine these three spheres (and making their areas), in the gamut of more or less explicit forms cognitions which embrace every sphere and, that can be it is most important, in values which they have in every culture.

Examining an individual, as opposition to the culture, we mean biological organism, human creature which since total ignorance about the concrete culture, it must in a flow 10 - 20 years to attain a satisfactory competence, so that effectively to carry out productive work and effectively to co-operate with other individuals, leaning against the genetic legacy. The theory of understanding of culture must take into account that, that is known about the genetic legacy of man : structure of the nervous system, principles of development of brain, action of early and late experience of the neurological and psychological maturing and what role, this experience plays in understanding of culture… Foremost I will be stopped for intellectual component, which human creatures, as kind, are potentially able to grasp, id est on cognitive potential. I suppose that 7 informatively-judicial systems are at least, which a human creature, as kind, must grasp. It is a 1) Linguistic competence. 2) The Spatial competence. 3) Logic - metamatematics competence. 4) The Musical competence. 5) Corporal-motive competence. 6) Interpersonally competence. 7) Inwardly personality competence... Creation (or instrument what that was not, body of culture (related to cognition factor of А), passed to the individual together with his individual the competence (factor of B) is determined here by me as a symbolic system. It is the system of elements, sometimes physical as pictures or texts, sometimes non-material - as the outspoken words or unspoken ideas in which cognition can be overcame and passed from one individual to other. As values influence on a conduct and experience it is studied poorly. As an initial point we can suppose that a child is predisposition to perceive them, searches them, and as a result, values appear grasped in experience in an earliest period of life. Id est individuals, objects, locations etc. are for a young organism the understood values… Symbolic the system is the crystallized maintenance or cognition of culture... Point of contact between a culture, with her valued forms, and individual, with his intellectual predisposition, there is symbolic system: forms of crystallization of cognition into a culture, in which an individual conducts the early child's years which, it is possible to say, sets the system of values into this culture. The method of transmission can be varied from a simple supervision to the specialized teaching and from own family to modern electronic facilities.

So, as we see, the spectrum of determinations of culture is enormous. Ethno psychology cannot take one prepared determination, and must construct own, adequate to her aims and tasks.
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