

**VIKTOR SHCHERBYNA,**

*Doctor of Sciences in Sociology, Head of the Department of Humanities and Fundamental Disciplines, Kyiv Institute of Business and Technology (1/5, Zoranyi Lane, Kyiv, 04078)*

*Svn6414@gmail.com*

*<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3399-8535>*

## **Sociocultural aspects of spatial development**

### *Introduction*

One of the acquisitions of social transformations of the last quarter of the twentieth century was the trend of globalization (Modelski, Devezas, & Thompson, 2008). Globalization meant an increase in the homogeneity of the economic world order, the likely result of which in the distant future was to be the transformation of the world economy into a system with uniform economic conditions. In the process of theoretical reflections on globalization as a historical phenomenon, various conceptual approaches have been developed (Scheuerman, 2023).

Economists (Ambrosius, 2018) have focused on the formation of global markets, supranational financial and economic institutions, the free movement of capital and labor outside national borders. Sociologists have associated the emergence of globalization with the emergence and evolution of capitalism and its immanent processes of modernization (Harvey, 1989); they have also drawn attention to other aspects of this process (Giddens, 1990).

Political scientists have described globalization as a process of qualitative change in the nature of international relations, world politics, where, along with nation-states, new subjects of interaction have emerged. At the same time, in general, the process called globalization has formed a sense of a new community of space in which humanity lives. Along with the image of a common physical space familiar to the mass consciousness for several centuries, images of the same common economic, political and cultural spaces arose.

This period lasted for over 30 years and ended in a crisis in the mid-twenties — we see how the previously created structures of inter- and intranational communication are disintegrating, many countries are locked in their own agendas for further development, the opportunities for free travel and change of residence are curtailed for the masses. Globalization of the second half to the end of the 20th century is beginning to be interpreted as a passed stage, after which the prospect of a “new autarkization” arose. For example, experts at the Davos Forum in 2022 assessed the current state of

---

*Цитування:* Shcherbyna, V. (2023). Sociocultural aspects of spatial development. *Соціологія: теорія, методи, маркетинг*, 3, 152–165, <https://doi.org/10.15407/sociology2023.03.152>.

affairs as a period of crisis for the traditional driving forces of globalization and the beginning of a new phase of the structural reset of the global system.

They presented four scenarios for the further development of globalization: a) Globalization 5.0: Reconnection; b) Analogue Networks: Virtual Nationalism; c) Digital Dominance: Agile Platforms; d) Autarkic World: Systemic Fragmentation (World Economic Forum, 2022: p. 4). Each of these scenarios involves changes in the social space. The international division of labor and globalized trade made it possible to produce the livelihoods of the planet's growing population — although even in these conditions, hunger and poverty were still recognized as global problems. The prospect of the collapse of global value chains and their closure on the human and natural resource base of national and bloc communities led to a decrease in the level of productivity and related shocks. At the same time, the coronavirus pandemic became a catalyst for these processes and very quickly showed that the path to the “pre-global” state of closed societies is the path of decline.

The crisis of spatial development lies in the fact that the trends of its change, which are taking shape both at the international and national levels, contradict the objectively existing needs of the spatial interaction of countries and people, which were formed in conditions of the development achieved in the second half of the 20th century (e.g. international division of labor) and kept the quality of life based on its level of productivity.

The notion of a common fate in a common civilizational space is being critically rethought. In the practices of public life, a request for a vision of the further existence (new security) and development (new economy) of present-day societies objectively arises (Arezki, 2022).

All this, in particular, actualizes the problem of the spatial development of societies in the new sociohistorical conditions. What approaches can be taken to understand the already ongoing transformations of the social space and on what theoretical basis to develop policies for the development of societies in connection with this?

The emerging disintegration of the global space is leading to a crisis of all local societies in the form in which they have developed, since their effectiveness was determined to a large extent by the participation of the most demanded clusters of national economies in the system of international division of labor historically established by the end of the 20th century. However, it was on this basis that the changes generated by the stage of globalization in the world economy brought about different ways of life, as well as different communication environments and technologies. As before in history, the new system gave birth to a new reality, which became the basis for its transformation.

It is in the context of *globalization* that the world's population has reached eight billion people (United Nations, s.a.), and it is becoming increasingly difficult to meet their diverse needs within the framework of the previous model of the world order. Since 2008, we have been witnessing the unfolding of the economic, political, military phases of the crisis of this model of the world order. At the same time, the deepening of the phases of the crisis gives rise in some minds to the idea of the possibility of solving at the former local, country level, many of those problems that have not been solved at the global level. In turn, as a reaction to this statement, there is another

idea — that the state as a form of social organization should become a thing of the past and a new world of united humanity should also develop. All this significantly affects the ideological landscape of modernity.

In the context of growing contradictions, new solutions are needed — answers to how, after a period of decline in the global space, the crisis of the structures of global social (economic, political, cultural) communications created in the 20th century, societies can continue to exist and develop, the needs and productive forces of which were formed in conditions of the former globalization. In particular, this implies re-thinking of the previous ideas, as well as the development of new theories about spatial development and the creation of spatial development practices on their basis.

In the given article, we will consider some aspects of understanding spatial development, a possible approach to its study and the formation of appropriate policies based on the author's concept of cultural patterns.

### ***How to understand spatial development?***

The standard and quality of human life that are possible in a society depend on what kind of processes of joint activity the people that form it are able to provide. Societies differ in the historical character of culture and lifestyles formed in them; quality of management; human potential, which they are able to consolidate due to their structure; in the natural resources to which they create access in order to satisfy the vital needs of the people who form them.

All these components have a spatial definition of society — a social space that can be studied and changed through the implementation of appropriate policies.

Spatial development is one of the factors in the formation of society — the more developed its space, the more attractive it is for life and the more stable it is. Specific natural conditions “contain” society in themselves — since it arises from nature and exists in it as its component. Humankind, in the course of its progress, has become one of the forces that create nature; it does not exist in our time outside of its activity. This position is perceived by us as a paradox — society contains nature which contains society. Going formally beyond this paradox, we find ourselves in an insurmountable situation — it is impossible to connect what is initially understood as separate. The way out of this paradox is to look at society and nature procedurally, as at different sides of the same process of historical development of the practices of human life. The universal categories of space and time simultaneously characterize both nature and society in their development — just as there is no “space” outside of society, so society does not exist outside of its specific space either.

Policies of conscious spatial development are the most important component of social development, transitions to new political, technological and sociocultural forms of life. When we talk about the “development of society”, we mean the development (qualitative change) of social space — that special kind of reality in which an individual becomes a person that socializes and lives, realizes him/herself in this capacity. This reality is always changing, because the processes of interaction between people that form it change too. This interaction includes everything that does not belong to human nature, which has a socionatural character. The practical question is what are

the boundaries, direction and effectiveness of these changes, as well as how exactly people act on them according to the needs of their lives.

### ***How to study spatial development?***

In sociology, there are several typological approaches to the concept of “spatial development” — it is understood as a characteristic of the system, the processes of structuring activities, and also as a characteristic of interaction flows.

Considering the development of the concept of spatial sociology, Martin G. Fuller and Martina Löw point out that it is “broad in scope and usefulness but specific as a relational approach to space” (Fuller & Löw, 2017: p. 469). According to the authors, “spatial sociology provides a category and lens for researchers in their pursuits to understand and explain inequality, class, labor, gender, urbanism and other key interests of sociological enquiry” (Fuller & Löw, 2017: p. 486).

The idea of the possibility and necessity to represent the whole variety of processes and phenomena occurring in society placed in a special, social space was first expressed in the 1920s by Pitirim Sorokin (Sorokin, 2000). From his point of view, the peculiarity of this space is that it is fundamentally different from the geometric one. This space is a set of social relations (connections) that any individual enters into with other individuals, groups and society as a whole. The social coordinates of such a space are set by social groups and nothing else, and the social position is revealed through the totality of social ties with all groups; it reflects the population, not statuses. In the work “Social stratification and mobility” Sorokin defines space as “the population of the Earth”, but another definition in the context of the idea of social space is more important: connections with “all population groups, within each of these groups, i.e. with its members” (Sorokin, 1992: p. 232). In this case, we are talking about space as an order of social positions. It is relatively stable in time, hierarchical and can be graphically depicted. Each individual can be defined as a point having a certain distance from another individual in this diagram. Representatives of the Chicago School approach the study of space with a traditional emphasis on empirical research for this school. In the spatial distribution of the population (primarily urban), they see a material expression, an indicator of social trends, structures, and relationships. Regularities and interrelations of changes in the spatial and social characteristics of human settlements are being studied. The dramaturgical approach by Erving Goffman (Goffman, 2000), which is closely related to the structuring of the space of social practices with the allocation of the proscenium and the backstage zone of interaction, has become widely known. Pierre Bourdieu uses this concept to designate an abstract space that is created by an ensemble of subspaces or fields that arise in the processes of structuring the unequal distribution of certain types of capital. From this standpoint, the space (including the physical one) in which we live is socially designated and constructed, it is a social structure in an objectified state, an objectification of past and present social relations. Geographical and social spaces never completely coincide; however, as the scholar notes, the effects characteristic of the former, for example, the allocation of the center and the periphery, can indeed be called distance in social space since this is due to the difference in the distribution of various types of capital. In addition, Bourdieu

speaks of space as a status structure, emphasizing that any society is inevitably hierarchical, which leads to reflection in physical space: “Social space is not physical space, but it tends to be realized in it more or less completely and accurately” (Bourdieu, 2007: p. 35).

Manuel Castells proceeds from the fact that in the process of development of society, “places” have changed their meaning in sociality. He analyzes the “space of flows” as a combination of three layers of material support: 1) a chain of electronic impulses that form the material basis of communication, creating opportunities for flows, exchanges; 2) nodes and communication centers; 3) the spatial organization of the dominant elites that perform managerial functions around which an organized space is built (Castells, 2010).

Relational spatial theory claims that “[a]n event or a thing at a point in space cannot be understood by appeal to what exists only at that point” (Harvey, 2006: p. 34), that space is “the product of interrelations ... always under construction” (Massey, 2005: p. 9), and that differentiated spaces “have intricate relations. They co-exist” (Mol & Law, 1994: p. 663). In other words, elements within space, the space itself and multiple spaces are relational.

“A deeply spatial sociology is one of specialists and non-specialists alike, those at the forefront of theory building and those for whom a spatial sociological imagination enables them to get on with their research, uncovering new insights that were in the shadows until the lens of spatial sociology was applied to shed light upon them” (Fuller & Löw, 2017: p. 486).

The spatial turn in the social sciences was facilitated by the “new mobilities paradigm” developed by Mimi Sheller and John Urry (Sheller & Urry, 2006). M. Sheller believes that “Urry’s work advanced a sociology of space though his focus is on mobile spatializations and relational space. This included the distribution of agency between people, places, and material assemblages of connectivity; a broader shift in the spatial imagination of mobilities towards ‘non-representational’ social theory; the emergence of new methodologies that were more eclectic, experimental, creative, and linked to arts, design, and public policy; and lastly a renewed interest in geo-ecologies, the political economy of resource flows, and the global mobilities of energy, capital, and material objects as constitutive of spatial complexity ... Urry’s work advanced a sociology of space though his radical emphasis is on mobile spatializations and relational space, which he first referred to as ‘mobile’ sociology” (Sheller, 2017: pp. 623–624).

In the context of our study, the position of Tim Richardson and Ole B. Jensen, who consider the sociology of space in the analysis of spatial policy, is also of particular interest. These researchers write that “our approach follows the path emerging within planning research focusing on the relations between rationality and power, making use of discourse analytics and cultural theoretical approaches to articulate a cultural sociology of space. We draw on a variety of theoretical sources from critical geography to sociology to argue for a practice- and culture-oriented understanding of the spatiality of social life” (Richardson & Jensen, 2003: p. 7). This approach, according to the authors, hinges on the dialectical relation between material practices and the symbolic meanings that social agents attach to their spatial environment. Sociospatial relations are conceptualized in terms of their practical ‘workings’ and their symbolic

‘meaning’, played out at spatial scales from the body to the global — thus giving notion to an analysis of the ‘politics of scale’.

Society as a developing socionatural unity historically develops and updates the regulators of relations that correspond to these qualitative aspects of reality in the form of culture — values, ideas, norms, organizational practices. This complex is acquired by a separate person (individual — “indivisible”), who is in the specific conditions of his/her life, in the course of life and to some extent changes — where such a change is possible and necessary. (This process is commonly referred to as socialization.) Changing the social space as one of the aspects of life is the subject of activity of many people. This activity can be different in content, it can be organized in various forms and ranges, aimed at pursuing goals that are perceived in a certain way.

According to this criterion, it is possible to distinguish between “developed” societies, capable of purposefully shaping their own space, and “undeveloped” ones, capable only of adapting to the spontaneous changes that occur within their spaces. This is a relative characteristic since all social systems change spatially — only in different ways and with different results for the people who form them. The boundaries and content of changes in the social space are determined by many factors — natural processes, the objective nature of the era (the problems that are solved in it) and its subjective “spirit” (the existing culture and ideology). This space can expand and contract depending on the processes of social life, which lead to qualitative changes in it. The activity of people aiming to reproduce or change the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of society is directly organized under the influence of political institutions and finds expression in the policies of spatial development. In different eras, these policies were different, but any organized society developed them and the people supported or opposed these policies.

Social space is associated with specific activities — in one respect it can be developed, in another cannot. The development of the social space of a particular society is its characteristic in terms of the possibility of realizing a certain type of civilizational development in it. An “undeveloped” society in one respect may look like a “developed” society in another, and vice versa.

In the political sense, the task of spatial development is to create, through a complex impact on society, stable systemic integral formations of joint life activity. In the modern world, these formations should comply with the logic of the implementation of national projects for the development of human capital, a comfortable environment for life and economic growth, linking the country into a single whole sociocultural space, where the historically formed civilizational foundations of the life of the people are realized. Accordingly, “undeveloped” space is understood as one where the conditions for the full life support of a person belonging to a certain civilizational whole have not been formed. The policy of spatial development thus outlines the horizon of possible social practices — their qualitative and quantitative characteristics.

The task of spatial development is solved simultaneously in two paradigms: as the creation of new socionatural complexes of life support and as the redevelopment of the former ones in new historical conditions. Accordingly, various goals are also formed — from gaining access to new resources to updating the system resources available to people for arranging life.

In addition, two strategies can be used in spatial development — revolutionary (to go “through” creating new socio-natural environments) and evolutionary, socio-ecological (to connect all historically formed components at a new level of complexity by introducing a new technological, organizational and cultural basis for life). The first path yields quick results, but it is traumatic, in the long run it produces the energy of the opposite effect; this is the path of tactical decisions. The second path is strategic, it is aimed at cultivating a new socio-natural space capable of sustainable self-reproduction in accordance with the characteristics of a new level of socio-natural development.

In all cases of development, there are natural, technological, social, and cultural components that must be studied and changed in accordance with the logic and objectives of deploying spatial development projects in a particular area. To do this, it is necessary to proceed from the nature and scale of the project — in their physical and human qualitative and quantitative dimensions.

### ***Problems of spatial development in the paradigm of culturally multiple structure***

In order for the tasks of spatial development not to be empty dreams (or a cover for corruption) but to be practically realizable, it is important to take into account the characteristics of the existing sociocultural environments that are the object of the projects. On this basis, it is possible to develop operational approaches to seeing how these environments (created by people in their activities) correlate with the tasks of territorial development projects — which existing components should be developed and supported, which ones should be amended and supplemented.

For example, the concept of “support frame” is relevant in solving the problem of rational use of the economic potential of large cities. In this case, the mechanism for regulating the growth of a large center can have different options: the formation of agglomerations; directed development; priority development of the “second” city; development of selected (limited number) cities — “balances”; development of subdistrict centers; activation of small and medium-sized cities outside the agglomeration (Higano & Shibusawa, 1999; OECD, s.a.; Uchida & Nelson, 2010). However, this approach does not take into consideration the structure of the sociocultural space. To take into consideration this essential aspect of development, an appropriate conceptual and instrumental base is needed for conducting research on social processes and phenomena. These tools should be sensitive to various sociocultural aspects of the social environments of spatial development. The knowledge obtained in this way can serve as one of the bases for the development and implementation of cultural policies at the regional level, taking account of how exactly the population understands spatial development.

This will create additional potential for legitimation and energy to support projects in the mass consciousness of the inhabitants of a particular region. Without this, any project will generate rejection and potential for political tension in society.

Along with existing approaches, the concept of the cultural diversity of society can be used as a tool for analyzing sociocultural environments (Shcherbyna, s.a.). This approach involves the study of the sociocultural environment in a particular territory

as a unique composition of social practices, historically self-reproducing on the basis of typological cultural patterns — traditional, modern, communicative, etc. Each society and its spatial characteristics have dimensions within the horizons of these cultural structures, contain the practices of social communication corresponding to them.

From this perspective, social spaces are historically emerging dynamic constructs that are characterized by a certain composition of features of various cultural patterns in the physical, socio-organizational and spiritual-practical dimensions.

The cultural patterns (structure) in this concept can be described as a historically developed stable type of the organization and implementation of social activities, the content of the normative-value constructs inherent in social groups and individuals in the process of ensuring their life. Sociology can use this concept as an ideal type that allows one to study the specific features that influence the ways in which individuals master the elements of the living environment and how they construct social space. All this is understood and perceived differently in the optics of different ways, although objectively individuals are in a single process of social life. Various types of social activity imply a “generalizing” orientation of the individual towards one or another cultural structure; however, this realization in life practices does not always occur, which leads to contradictions, misunderstandings and even conflicts.

The traditional cultural way is characterized by a distinct system of value ideas, which is isolated in the array of culture as a special out-of-position component. This system is presented in the form of “external” mythological constructs containing the structure of the subjective determination of social interactions in an abstract personal and group form. Society is understood as a self-existent, eternal, special reality — an order of relations between people created by an external force in relation to a person, a “cathedral of unity” of all people. The social system and processes of social interaction are understood as existing independently and originating outside of man — in God, in the cosmos, in the laws of nature. The system of normative-value regulators, formed within the framework of the traditional way of life, makes it possible to effectively streamline social communication within the framework of communities on tribal and communal scale and ensure quality of life.

The modern (industrial) cultural structure is characterized by social interaction mediated by joint production activities, including the rational production of generally significant value constructs and joint rulemaking. Society is understood here as a unifying situation of joint activity, as a necessary means produced by people themselves in the context of satisfying their needs and realizing their essential properties. To do this, they need to change the natural and social conditions of life, including spatial ones. The social system is understood as developing historically in this context. The system of normative-value regulators, formed within the framework of the traditional way of life, makes it possible to effectively streamline social communication within the framework of communities on a generic nation-state scale and ensure quality of life.

The communicative cultural structure is characterized by social interaction based on open communication (creation of common spaces) in a network form, by the absence of an institutionalized system of value-normative regulation, by self-referential



communities formed on the basis of individualized symbolic self-identification. Culture and society are understood in this optics as a space of interpersonal communication, the purpose and meaning of which is the self-realization of the individual in the process of communication as a game.

Social institutions are seen within the framework of this mode as forms of communication flows formed by people, and the content of social life is game interaction in which individuals actualize and realize themselves in the context of the emerging “games of life creation”. The system of normative-value regulators, formed within the framework of the traditional way of life, makes it possible to effectively streamline social communication within communities on a transnational, global scale and ensure quality of life.

Cultural patterns are interconnected and interdependent, in their unity they represent a specific historically formed society; their specific combinations determine the emerging types of personality, social roles, the nature and boundaries of social interaction, including spatial.

Individuals socialize in different environments where one or another cultural mode dominates, “reading” and mastering all social ideas and components of the social conditions of their lives in a manner appropriate to this mode.

On this basis, in society, groups and strata can be distinguished that are focused on social activity in accordance with the specifics of various ways; therefore, they perceive the same cultural phenomena and processes in different senses and on different scales. According to these meanings and scales, social attitudes, social activities of various individuals united into groups, as well as expectations of them are formed.

Depending on the various tasks of spatial development, in a particular case, either a monopoly implementation in the system of organizing the social environment, the creation of a social environment with the dominance of one mode, or their harmonious combination can be assumed. This is a view from the standpoint of the task — in reality, all modes are always present; the only question is in what specific combination they exist.

According to the ways of social practices based on these modes, they suggest various subjectively understood ways (modalities) of perceiving space, operating and interacting with it.

Each cultural structure creates opportunities for the realization of a certain type of social integrity — both in qualitative and quantitative aspects. Thus, the forms of association that exist within a dominant traditional way of life are significantly inferior in terms of quantitative (population) and qualitative (types of activity) characteristics to the forms of association based on the modern way of life. Policies of spatial development, formed within the horizons of the traditional way of life, where the basic structure of social life is understood as a tribal and local settlement community, contradict the processes of life support for the number of population corresponding to the scale of the nation-state formation; nepotism and corruption flourish on the basis of community ties. In turn, the absence of a policy of spatial development of the modern type, where the industrial and production community acts as the basic structure, sets restrictions on the scale of the association and the set of activities possible in it, the economy degrades qualitatively and quantitatively, archaic types of economic activity

arise and become associated with sociopolitical interests; besides, there is a technological decline in the life support environment.

By studying the modalities of understanding and perception of space inherent in different cultural patterns, as well as the meanings and methods of its development associated with them, it is possible to form sociocultural policies for influencing the process of adoption by the population of development programs so that spatial development will be the most sustainable and holistic.

Along with purposeful processes, the development of social space also has dynamics that does not depend on the needs and efforts of a person — socionatural processes are historical, associated with circumstances that are objective for the current generation of people, independent of their desires and intentions. Under these circumstances, there is the dynamics of changes in the phases of the development of social space.

We hypothesize that this dynamics has a dual character. Formally, it represents a change of four phases, in which different cultural structures dominate in the life of society — the phase of holding space forms, the phase of their destruction, the phase of the emergence of new ones, the phase of their total development, followed again by the phase of holding forms. In terms of content, it represents a change in the processes of social (socionatural) life support of various types, based on the dominance of a certain way of life.

Accordingly, in the phase of retention of forms, the traditional way of life dominates while in the phase of breaking — communicative, in the phases of emergence and development — modern.

Within the framework of the traditional way of life, spatial development is understood as an expansion of physical space containing various kinds of resources — natural and human. The category of “social space” in the classical sociological theory is taken as close as possible to the physical meaning — as the location of social groups and socially significant events (Durkheim, 1995). Therefore, spatial development as the goal of social development is understood here in the form of territorial expansion, control and retention of space in its “physical”, natural sense. Here space is a place of stay, the attitude towards this place is the protection of one’s territory from strangers. By means of sociology, it is possible, by defining this group, to study what kind of territory those oriented towards this way of life regard as their own, who are strangers (social distances, the image of an “alien” — a non-Christian, a citizen of another country, a representative of another generation, etc.), what exactly is seen as the means and effectiveness of such protection (administrative arrangements, borders, etc.).

Within the framework of the modern way of life, space is a prospect for the development of certain types of life activity, changes in living conditions in accordance with changing needs. The concept of social space is associated with the sociopolitical characteristics of society. The development of space is understood as a transition to such a social organization that allows more people to interact with a greater qualitative diversity of their life activity. Sociology can study what objects and resources are perceived in a given society as a means of development, what are the ideas about the horizons and qualitative measurement of development results for the population of a given territory.

Within the framework of the communicative way of life, space is seen as a conditional, situationally determined characteristic of significant choices that influence the outcome of social interaction with open ambiguous results. The development of space here is conceived of as a process of expanding the possibilities of choice. The space here is a matrix of alternative values in which the player feels the opportunity to make a choice, and this choice influences the outcome of the game. It is the space of possible alternatives that have meaning. In order to create a choice, you need to create an alternative that also has a value.

The communicative mode dominates in the transitional phases of social systems, in the transitions from one era to another; because of this, its dominance has a dual direction. On the one hand, spatial development is conceived of as new options for using the existing potential — playing around with new options for the same thing, “playing with the past”. On the other hand, it is thought of as a search for qualitatively new socionatural foundations — “playing with the future”. Within the framework of this way of life, there is a denial of past forms of organization of public space. This is not a “pure negation”, but a negation of a certain content and it bears its imprint — therefore, it does not have a creative character. Actually, the creativity of the new begins at the next stage, when the modern way of life dominates.

The disintegration of social space is a reaction to unsolvable problems; it does not in itself solve the problems that give rise to it. However, new integration and spatial development require their own positive object, they cannot occur on the basis of reaction. Spatial development policies do not require approaches for “removing restrictions” but approaches to the formation of new life support resources — technological, organizational, spiritual and moral.

### *Conclusions*

1. Spatial development is one of the urgent tasks of the formation of a modern sustainable and productive society. It emerged in the process of the unfolding crisis of the global world order and requires a new agenda for the further development of societies changed by globalization. The practical complexity of spatial development policies lies in the necessity of creating conditions for the simultaneous satisfaction of different types of needs associated with differences in ideas about spatial development that are formed within different cultural patterns. Spatial development strategies focused exclusively on one cultural pattern lead to the fact that part of the population starts to perceive the policy of implementing spatial development programs as alien to them. This increases the tensions arising in the process of changes in the social structure, thereby impeding the implementation of necessary programs.

2. In the process of deploying spatial development projects, one should take into account their qualitative sociocultural characteristics. For this, along with economic studies on the characteristics of social space, it is also necessary to study the cultural patterns that are inherent in the people who form this space. The type of social space produced determines the quality of social connections possible in it, thus, the quality of life and standard of living in a particular society and, ultimately, the attractiveness of the social order.

3. Harmonization of social practices that are formed on the basis of and within the framework of various cultural patterns is one of the tasks of the policy of spatial development and a factor in the sustainability of society. In this vein, the tasks of cultural policy can be formed in the direction of creating by the state a comprehensive support for the development processes in society containing elements of traditional, modern and communicative cultural patterns on the basis of a political platform for the dialogue of cultures.

4. The qualitative aspect of development of social space determines the possibility of including communities of various scales and types of activity, different depths of the division of labor in a single process of social life. Regulators of the traditional way of life ensure social communication and exchange of activities on the scale of familial, tribal and communal integrity while modern regulators act on the scale of nation-state, communicative — on the scale of global communities. All these types of communication are necessary for the self-reproduction of society as an integral and original system of people's lives. Deterioration in the quality of social space leads to the inability of the system to provide communication related to vital needs, thus resulting in degradation of the integrity of the social system.

### References

- Ambrosius, G. (2018). *Globalisierung: Geschichte der internationalen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Gabler.
- Arezki, R. (2022, September 5). What will happen to the economy in the new era of national security. [In Russian]. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: [https://forbes.kz//life/opinion/ekonomika\\_v\\_novuyu\\_epohu\\_natsionalnoy\\_bezопасnosti](https://forbes.kz//life/opinion/ekonomika_v_novuyu_epohu_natsionalnoy_bezопасnosti) [=Арезки 2022]
- Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Sociologie de l'espace social*. [In Russian]. Moscow, Russian Federation: Institute of Experimental Psychology; Saint Petersburg, RF: Aleteia Press. [= Бурдьё 2007]
- Castells, M. (2010). *The information age: economy, society and culture, Vol. 1: The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *Sociology: its subject, method, and purpose*. [In Russian]. Moscow, RF: Kanon (Canon) Press. [= Дюркгейм 1995]
- Fuller, M.G., & Löw, M. (2017). Introduction: an invitation to spatial sociology. *Current Sociology*, 65(4), 469-491. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011392117697461>
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (2000). *The presentation of self in everyday life* [In Russian]. Moscow: KANON-Press-C. [= Гофман 2000].
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of global capitalism: towards a theory of uneven geographical development*. London, England: Verso.
- Higano, Y., & Shibusawa, H. (1999). Agglomeration diseconomies of traffic congestion and agglomeration economies of interaction in the information-oriented city. *Journal of Regional Science*, 39(1), 21-49. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9787.00122>
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Modelska, G., Devezas, T., & Thompson, W.R. (Eds.). (2008). *Globalization as evolutionary process: modeling global change*. Abingdon-on-Thames, England: Routledge.
- Mol, A., & Law, J. (1994). Regions, networks and fluids: anaemia and social topology. *Social Studies of Science*, 24(4), 641-671. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/030631279402400402>
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (s.a.). *OECD Territorial Reviews* [A series of reports]. Retrieved from: [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/urban-rural-and-regional-development/oecd-territorial-reviews\\_19900759](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/urban-rural-and-regional-development/oecd-territorial-reviews_19900759)

Richardson, T., & Jensen, O.B. (2003). Linking discourse and space: towards a cultural sociology of space in analyzing spatial policy discourses. *Urban Studies*, 40(1), 7-22. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00420980220080131>

Shcherbyna, V. (s.a.). *Multiculturalism or cultural diversity?* [In Russian]. *Strategic Group Sofia*. Retrieved from: <http://sg-sofia.com.ua/multikulturalizm-ili-kultur-mnogoukladnost> [= Щербина s.a.]

Scheuerman, W. (2023). Globalization. In E.N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2023/entries/globalization>

Sheller, M. (2017). From spatial turn to mobilities turn. *Current Sociology*, 65(4), 623-639. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011392117697463>

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 38(2), 207-226. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1068/a37268>

Sorokin, P.A. (1992). Social stratification and mobility. [In Russian]. In: P.A. Sorokin, *Human Civilization. Society* (pp. 230-332). Moscow, RF: Politizdat (Publishing House of Political Literature). [= Сорокин 1992]

Sorokin, P.A. (2000). *Social and cultural dynamics: a study of change in major systems of art, truth, ethics, law and social relationships*. [In Russian]. St. Petersburg, RF: Russian Christian Institute for the Humanities [= Сорокин 2000]

Uchida, H., & Nelson, A. (2010). *Agglomeration index: towards a new measure of urban concentration* (Working paper No. 2010/29). Retrieved from the United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research website: <https://www.wider.unu.edu/sites/default/files/wp2010-29.pdf>

United Nations. (s.a.). *Day of eight billion*. Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/en/dayof8billion>

World Economic Forum. (2022). *Four futures for economic globalization: scenarios and their implications* (White paper). Retrieved from: [https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_Four\\_Futures\\_for\\_Economic\\_Globalization\\_2022.pdf](https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Four_Futures_for_Economic_Globalization_2022.pdf)

Received 05.04.2023

## ВИКТОР ЩЕРБИНА

### Соціокультурні аспекти просторового розвитку

Просторовий розвиток є одним із чинників формування суспільства, а політика свідомого просторового розвитку є найважливішим складником переходу до нових технологічних і соціокультурних способів життя. У статті розглянуто проблему теоретичного осмислення просторового розвитку, а також викладено авторську концепцію його вивчення та підхід до формування відповідної політики.

Автор пропонує розрізняти «розвинені» суспільства, здатні цілеспрямовано формувати власний простір, і «нерозвинені», здатні лише пристосовуватися до стихійних змін у власному просторі. У політичному аспекті завдання просторового розвитку полягає у формуванні через комплексний вплив на суспільство стійких системних цілісних утворень спільної життєдіяльності.

У статті висвітлено дві стратегії просторового розвитку — революційну та еволюційну. Водночас автор пропонує використовувати поняття культурного розмаїття суспільства як інструмент аналізу соціокультурних середовищ. Згідно з авторським підходом, потрібно вивчати соціокультурне середовище на певній території як унікальну композицію соціальних практик, історично самовідтворюваних на засадах типологічних культурних укладів — традиційного, модерного, комунікативного.

Автор доходить висновку, що стратегії просторового розвитку, зорієнтовані тільки на один із культурних укладів, призводять до того, що частина населення сприймає політику реалізації програм просторового розвитку як чужу для себе, а це створює додаткове напруження в

процесах трансформації суспільств. Тому в разі розгортання проєктів просторового розвитку поряд з економічними дослідженнями особливостей соціального простору потрібно проводити дослідження культурних укладів, притаманних людям, що його формують.

Автор вважає, що гармонізація соціальних практик, які формуються на підставі й у межах різних культурних укладів, є одним із завдань політики просторового розвитку і чинником сталості суспільства. Тому культурна політика має передбачати всебічну підтримку розвитку всіх культурних зразків на засадах діалогу культур. Регулятори з різних режимів забезпечують соціальну комунікацію та обмін у масштабах сімейної, племінної, обцинної цілісності, національної держави та в масштабах глобальних спільнот. Отже, підтримка їх необхідна для відтворення суспільства в сучасних умовах.

**Ключові слова:** соціологічна теорія; просторовий розвиток; культура; культурні закономірності; глобалізація; кризові явища

## VIKTOR SHCHERBYNA

### Sociocultural aspects of spatial development

*Spatial development is one of the factors in the formation of society, and the policy of conscious spatial development is the most important component of transitions to new technological and sociocultural ways of life. The article deals with the problem of theoretical understanding of spatial development, as well as the author's concept of its study and approach to the formation of relevant policies.*

*The author proposes distinguishing between “developed” societies, capable of purposefully shaping their own space, and “undeveloped” ones, capable only of adapting to spontaneous changes in their own space. In the political sense, the task of spatial development is to form, through a complex impact on society, stable systemic integral formations of joint life activity.*

*The article highlights two strategies for spatial development — revolutionary and evolutionary. Along with them, the author proposes using the concept of the cultural diversity of society as a tool for analyzing sociocultural environments. According to the author's approach, it is necessary to study the sociocultural environment in a particular territory as a unique composition of social practices, historically self-reproducing on the basis of typological cultural patterns — traditional, modern, and communicative.*

*The author comes to the conclusion that spatial development strategies focused only on one cultural pattern lead to the fact that part of the population starts to perceive the policy of implementing spatial development programs as alien to them, and this creates additional tension in the processes of transformation of societies. Therefore, in the process of deploying spatial development projects, along with economic studies on the characteristics of social space, it is necessary to conduct studies of the cultural patterns that are inherent in the people who form it.*

*The author believes that the harmonization of social practices that are formed on the basis of and within the framework of various cultural patterns is one of the tasks of the policy of spatial development and a factor in the sustainability of society. Therefore, cultural policy should imply comprehensive support for the development of all cultural patterns on the basis of a dialogue of cultures. Regulators from different modes of life provide social communication and exchange on the scale of familial, tribal, communal integrity, as well as on the scale of nation-state and global communities. Therefore, their support is necessary for the reproduction of society in present-day conditions.*

**Keywords:** sociological theory; spatial development; culture; cultural patterns; globalization; crisis phenomena