

12th International youth conference

“Perspectives of science and education”

27 September 2019

**New York
2019**

The 12th International youth conference “Perspectives of science and education” (September 27, 2019)
SLOVO\WORD, New York, USA. 2019. 650 p.

ISBN 978-1-77192-403-0

The recommended citation for this publication is:

Busch P. (Ed.) (2019). Humanitarian approaches to the Periodic Law // Perspectives of science and education. Proceedings of the 12th International youth conference. SLOVO\WORD, New York, USA. 2019. Pp. 12–17.

Editor	Lucas Koenig, Austria	Morozova Natalay Ivanovna, Russia
Editorial board	Abdulkasimov Ali, Uzbekistan	Moskvin Victor Anatolevich, Russia
	Adieva Aynura Abduzhalalovna, Kyrgyzstan	Nagiyev Polad Yusif, Azerbaijan
	Arabaev Cholponkul Isaevich, Kyrgyzstan	Naletova Natalia Yurevna, Russia
	Zagir V. Atayev, Russia	Novikov Alexei, Russia
	Akhmedova Raziya Abdullayevna	Salaev Sanatbek Komiljanovich, Uzbekistan
	Balabiev Kairat Rahimovich, Kazakhstan	Shadiev Rizamat Davranovich, Uzbekistan
	Barlybaeva Saule Hatiyatovna, Kazakhstan	Shahutova Zarema Zorievna, Russia
	Bestugin Alexander Roaldovich, Russia	Soltanova Nazilya Bagir, Azerbaijan
	Boselin S.R. Prabhu, India	Spasennikov Boris Aristarkhovich, Russia
	Bondarenko Natalia Grigorievna, Russia	Spasennikov Boris Aristarkhovich, Russia
	Bogolib Tatiana Maksimovna, Ukraine	Suleymanov Suleyman Fayzullaevich, Uzbekistan
	Bulatbaeva Aygul Abdimazhitovna, Kazakhstan	Suleymanova Rima, Russia
	Chiladze George Bidzinovich, Georgia	Tereschenko-Kaidan Liliya Vladimirovna, Ukraine
	Dalibor M. Elezović, Serbia	Tsersvadze Mzia Giglaevna, Georgia
	Gurov Valeriy Nikolaevich, Russia	Vijaykumar Muley, India
	Hajiyev Mahammad Shahbaz oglu, Azerbaijan	Yurova Kseniya Igorevna, Russia
	Ibragimova Liliya Ahmatyanovna, Russia	Zhaplova Tatiana Mikhaylovna, Russia
	Blahun Ivan Semenovich, Ukraine	Zhdanovich Alexey Igorevich, Ukraine
	Ivannikov Ivan Andreevich, Russia	Proofreading Andrey Simakov
	Jansarayeva Rima, Kazakhstan	Cover design Andreas Vogel
	Khubaev Georgy Nikolaevich	
	Khurtsidze Tamila Shalvovna, Georgia	
	Khoutyz Zaur, Russia	
	Khoutyz Irina, Russia	
	Korzh Marina Vladimirovna, Russia	
	Kocherbaeva Aynura Anatolevna, Kyrgyzstan	
	Kushaliyev Kaiser Zhalitovich, Kazakhstan	
	Lekerova Gulsim, Kazakhstan	
	Melnichuk Marina Vladimirovna, Russia	
	Meymanov Bakyt Kattoevich, Kyrgyzstan	
	Moldabek Kulakhmet, Kazakhstan	

Material disclaimer

The opinions expressed in the conference proceedings do not necessarily reflect those of the CSR «Solution», SLOVO\WORD, Accent Graphics Communications & Publishing or Premier Publishing s.r.o., the editor, the editorial board, or the organization to which the authors are affiliated.

The CSR «Solution», SLOVO\WORD, Accent Graphics Communications is not responsible for the stylistic content of the article. The responsibility for the stylistic content lies on an author of an article.

Included to the open access repositories:

eLIBRARY.RU

© Центр наукових досліджень «Solution»

© SLOVO\WORD

© Accent Graphics Communications & Publishing

All rights reserved; no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Publisher.

Typeset in Berling by Ziegler Buchdruckerei, Linz, Austria.

Printed by Premier Publishing s.r.o., Vienna, Austria on acid-free paper.

INFLUENCE OF INNER FAMILY FACTORS ON THE FORMATION OF INDIVIDUALITY

SYROVA G.O.

doctor of pharmaceutical sciences, professor

the head of the department of medical and bioorganic chemistry

KOZUB S.N.

PhD, assistant professor of the department of medical and bioorganic chemistry

LUKIANOVA L.V.

PhD, assistant professor of the department of medical and bioorganic chemistry

Kharkov National Medical University

Kharkov, Ukraine

The mental development of man in modern society, passing from the era of the "masses" to the era of individuals, is largely determined by knowledge of the fundamental laws of the integrity of the properties of a person as a subject of mental activity. In the modern world, the existing diversity of individuals is analyzed as the invaluable wealth of society.

Intensive knowledge of the laws of personality formation began in recent years in connection with the demands of practice. An individual approach to training and education, issues of career guidance, professional selection of personnel, labor efficiency, problems of psychosomatics are related to the individual characteristics of a person in their integrity.

The attention of foreign psychologists is mainly concentrated on the search for connections between parents and children in terms of certain abilities and on the search for correlations between the levels of development of abilities in children and various environmental elements (level of education and professional qualifications of parents, degree of complexity of the father's profession, socio-economic family

status, etc.) Most of these studies state that such factors are important for the formation of not only the absolute level of abilities, but also their individual characteristics.

So, for example, V. Weiss considers a number of works where positive correlations are found between the level of development of mental abilities and the social status of the family, between the giftedness of children and the level of complexity of the father's profession [1]. In all these works, despite the social differences in different countries and different study times, there are similarities in the following: from a third to half of all probands (prominent scientists and inventors) have fathers, whose profession can be described as highly intellectual, and, on the contrary, the percentage of fathers with a profession that does not require any qualifications, it is extremely small.

V. Weiss believes that highly capable children very rarely come from among low-skilled parents [1]. The reasons for this are not genetic, but rather socio-psychological. According to his observations, low-skilled workers may have highly capable grandchildren, but relatively rarely, highly capable children.

A special area of work is associated with the study of the influence on the development of intelligence of such factors as family size, order of birth, duration of intervals between childbirths [2, 3]. It was noted that low results for almost all types of intelligence tests accompany relatively large families, families without fathers and other unfavorable family circumstances. At the same time, the effect of the order of birth is also noted: the higher the birth number of the child, the lower his intelligence compared to the first-born.

Interaction with parents stimulates faster speech development than interaction with children. Firstborns always interact more with their parents, even when the following children appear. After this, the first-born, apparently, begin to play the role of intermediaries between parents and younger children, still more in contact with their parents. Siblings separated by a short interval of birth are similar in the situation of upbringing with twins, which affects their intellectual development negatively: it is known that if twins interact more with each other than with parents or other children,

there may be a lag in mental development. Similar explanations of the effect of the order of birth are considered the most consistent.

R. Zajonc and H. Markus proposed a model of intellectual development, according to which each family has a specific intellectual environment, an element of which is the individual experience of each family member [4]. Each family member affects the whole family, and the family affects him. From the model it follows that greater intellectual development should be expected in small families with a large difference in years between children. In this model, it is assumed that the influence of environmental factors on the child's intellectual growth is not the same at different ages. So, the appearance of a second child in the family is more significant for a child of 3 years old than for a child of 12 years old, when the child has already reached a certain level of mental maturity.

So, the effect of the order of birth can be positive, negative and zero for the same child at different ages. If at first the intellectual environment for the first-born child is much better than for the second-born one, then over time the situation gradually changes to the opposite, and the intellectual environment favors the development of the second child. R. Zajonc gives an example: the first-born of 8 years old, having 4-year-old sibling, has the following intellectual composition: two adults, as well as one with a mental age of 8 years and one with a mental age of 4 years. After 4 years, the situation will change: two adults, one – 12 years old and one – 8 years old, which is much more favorable for the second child. The model of intellectual development predicts the negative effect of the order of birth for children tested at a very young age, a positive effect for children from 4 to 9 years old, a lack of effect for children from 9 to 12 years old and then an increasing negative effect.

V. Velandia et al. found that the effect of family size is observed in well-off families and is absent at the lowest socio-economic status [5]. Other authors have the opposite effect. E. Page and G. Grandon identified that 25 % of families with the highest socio-economic level, and in this group the effect of family size was not found [6]. The same study is mentioned in his review by M. Wagner and H. Schubert [7]. They note that in the study under study, families are unequal in size: 75 % of

high-income families have 2-4 children, and the same number of children in low-income families occurs only in 44 % of cases. Therefore, “combining groups by socio-economic status, it is difficult to detect the influence of family size on mental abilities” [7].

There are also works that evaluate the relationship between the order of birth and creative abilities. M. Runko and M. Baleda write that there are three different points of view on the importance of the order of birth for creative abilities [8]:

1) first-born children are less able than middle and younger children, as they are more likely to conformism than other children in the family;

2) the first-born are more capable of middle and younger children, in particular with regard to fluency of speech;

3) the order of birth does not affect creativity.

The results showed that the only children have the highest test values, followed by the first-born, then the youngest children and, finally, the middle-order children. The number of siblings in the family matters: children who have more siblings have higher test values than children with one sibling (except for cases with single children).

At first glance, these results may seem to contradict the data of R. Zajonc. However, the authors of the study themselves note that R. Zajonc and X. Marcus studied learning abilities rather than creative abilities and, in addition, they estimated the difference in years between siblings. In this study, the intervals between births were not taken into account. Of course, further studies of the influence of family factors on the development of creative abilities are needed to determine how consistent the model of development of creative abilities with the model of intellectual development according to R. Zajonc.

References:

1. Weiss V. Psychogenetik, Humangenetic in Psychologie und Psychiatric. Beit. 12. Jena, 1982.

2. Breland H. Family configuration and intellectual development // J. of Individ. Psychol. 1977. 33(1). P. 86-96.
3. Gibbs E., Teti D., Bond R. Infant-sibling communication relationships to birth-spacing and cognitive and linguistic development // Infant Behav. and Devel. 1987. 10(3). P. 307-323.
4. Zajonc R., Markus H., Markus G. The birth order puzzle // J. of Personality and Soc. Psychol. 1979. 37(8). P. 1325-1341.
5. Velandia V., Grandon G., Page E. Family size, birth order, and intelligence in a large South American sample // Amer. Educat. Res. J. 1978. 15. P. 399-416.
6. Zajonc R. Validating the confluence model // Psychol. Bull. 1983. 93(3). P. 457-480.
7. Wagner M., Schubert H. Family size: A review // J. of Genetic Psychol. 1985. 146(1). P. 65-78.
8. Zajonc R. The decline and rise of scholastic aptitude scores // Amer. Psychol. 1986. 41(8). P. 862-867.