

Stepanov Viktor

Doctor of Sciences in Public Administration, Full Professor

Kharkiv State Academy of Culture

ORCID: 0000-0001-5892-4239

TOURISM SPHERE IN THE LIFE OF SOCIETY

Summary. *The article reveals the meaning of the concept of "tourism sphere" in the life of society. The author provides an interpretation of the concept of "sphere" used in the socio-philosophical and sociological analysis of specific phenomena and processes in various spheres of public life. In addition, the main trends in the study of the processes of differentiation and self-manifestation of "spheres of public life" are considered. It is concluded that the sphere of tourism can be distinguished into the independent systemic object of society. At the same time, the object has its own patterns of development, institutional features and organizational structure.*

Key words: *sphere, tourism, society, social system, social life, social relations.*

Introduction. In world practice, the concept of "tourism" is based on the concept of individual activity to meet the needs of recreation, cultural communication, realization of cognitive and business interests, etc. As an object of theoretical analysis, the sphere of tourism emerges from independent elements of life. This level considers the relationship of tourism with the main subsystems of society. They combine the main types of social relations. In addition, the conditions and factors of their differentiation by specific areas are formed and the basic principles of inter-institutional interaction are laid. At the

same time, tourism is not reduced to the rank of one of the subsystems of society, but is perceived as a specific area of social reality. In particular, the phenomena and processes of tourism have their functional manifestation in various fields: economy, politics, cultural and spiritual life.

Statement of the problem. In order to understand the social processes taking place in the field of tourism activity, to consider the structure and content of the concept of "tourism sphere" in the life of society.

Results. To understand the social processes taking place in the specific and separate, by object and subject characteristics, field of tourist interactions, consider the structure and content of the concept of "tourism". Let us turn to the interpretation of the concept of "sphere", which is used in the socio-philosophical and sociological analysis of specific phenomena and processes in various spheres of public life. For this purpose, we will use the following categorical order [5; 6]:

- social reality can be presented as the most general concept of the totality of social phenomena and processes that determine social existence, forms of their concretization in the form of personal sociotypes, social groups and communities, social ties, actions and relations, structural formations, social institutions, organizations, values, goals, etc;

- society can be regarded as a stable and integral social aggregate, which has historically developed forms and principles of relations and interactions between its social subject carriers, the purpose of which is to meet various needs;

- social system can be presented as an ordered at the structural level integrity of interactions of its constituent elements, which include social individuals, groups and communities, as well as social values, norms, institutions, organizations, etc.;

- the sphere can be represented as an interaction between each other at the intra-organizational level, a branch of separation of functional properties and

features, which has its own element base, structure, value-normative and institutional basis, specific social-subjective environment, as well as unified principles of external relations for all its elements [6].

In addition, the methodological basis for understanding the concepts can be found both in the structural-functional analysis of American sociologists T. Parsons [9] and R. Merton [11], and in the system-sociological approach of German sociologists J. Habermas [13] and N. Luhmann [4]. Without going into a detailed analysis of these scientific paradigms, we note their theoretical orientation to the study of the integrity of system interactions and differentiation of system elements. In particular, T. Parsons defined society as a system of relations between people based on norms and values that form a culture [8; 10].

In the philosophical and sociological tradition, there is a sufficient methodological basis for the analysis of the most stable subsystems of society. In the middle of the twentieth century, there was an idea of systemic unity and functional differentiation of spheres of public life [1]. It is based on the generality of manifestation of such system components as activities, relations, subjects and their roles. In particular, the specifics of their implementation in accordance with the nature of social values, needs and interests.

Now we can identify the following main trends in the study of the processes of differentiation and self-manifestation of "spheres of public life", namely:

- development of qualitative criteria for assessing the state of the main subsystems of society with further differentiation into intra-system elements, for example, in the economy - the sphere of social and labour relations, in politics - the sphere of social policy, etc.;

- the formation of theoretical approaches and methodological tools for analysing the specifics of phenomena and processes in the areas of their concentration, which are actualized, for example, in the social sphere [7];

– studying the problems of subordination and conditionality of the development of system elements of different levels of differentiation to priorities and goals, especially in terms of integration into global processes and transition to sustainable development.

The allocation of any element as a separate one according to objective indicators of systemic differentiation and integration of the sphere of life must meet the following requirements: functional specificity; targeted unification of connections and relations; activity orientation; satisfaction of certain interests and needs. To this should be added structural feasibility and consistency, social and subjective content, the ability of institutional development and inter-institutional interaction.

The above makes it possible to move on to the sociological interpretation of the concept of "tourism sphere" and its place in the modern social system as a branch of the implementation of institutional processes in tourism [5]. It should be noted that traditionally there is an idea of tourism as an object of economic reality. At the same time, various social aspects of tourism were considered as components of more general problems of social policy and differentiation in relation to specific areas [2; 6].

The overwhelming majority of the economic approach has shifted the focus towards the study of tourism services as a market segment and the tourism industry as a significant sector of the economy. However, the reality shows that the development of tourism cannot be strictly focused. In particular, the ontological, social and existential sources of this process are diverse and have a multi-subject structure. It is represented at the personal and social group levels by a set of values, goals, needs, interests, etc. [3]. For example, social tourism and religious tourism, although they are direct objects of tourism activities of tourism industry entities, have very specific economic criteria for their effectiveness.

In the first case, these are indicators of the effectiveness of the state social policy. In the second case, it is the result of religious and institutional norms for pilgrimage purposes. This shows that economic interests can always directly influence the development of tourism. That is, the sphere of tourism should be considered in the broader social context.

An expanded understanding of the tourism sphere makes it possible to highlight the methodological basis for both its sociological analysis and determine its levels. In this case, the sphere of tourism is not reduced to the rank of one of the subsystems of society [2]. It is considered as a specific branch of social reality, which has its functional manifestation in various fields - economy, politics, cultural and spiritual life [6].

Thus, the expansion of the subject area of tourism research, the inclusion of the wide range of social relations and interactions makes it possible to distinguish the sphere of tourism as an independent systemic object of society. At the same time, the object has its own patterns of development, institutional features and organizational structure. From this point of view, according to O. P. Osaulenko, the sphere of tourism in the life of society can be considered as a certain sphere of concentration of various types and forms of social relations, which are based on the orientation towards tourism goals and values, which is a relevant topic for further research.

References

1. Bilous A. Political and legal systems: the world and Ukraine K., 1997.
2. Dusenko S. V. Sociology of tourism: socio-cultural aspect. Service PLUS. 2011. No. 4. P. 18-26.
3. Kifiak V. F. Organization of tourism. Chernivtsi : Books-XXI, 2008. 344 c.
4. Luhmann N. Social systems. An Essay on the General Theory / Trans. from Germ. I.D. Gazieva ; Ed. N.A. Golovina. St. Petersburg : Nauka, 2007. 641 p.

5. Malska M. P., Antoniuk N. V., Hanych N. M. International tourism and services sector. K. : Znannya, 2008. 661 p.
6. Osaulenko A. P. Tourism: social and institutional framework for development. Dalnauka, 2002.
7. Osadchaya G. I. Social sphere of society: theory and methodology of sociological analysis. Soyuz, 1996.
8. Parsons T. Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs (NJ) : Prentice-Hall, 1966. P. 5–29.
9. Parsons T. The social system (1951), P. 319-320 as cited in: Paul Gingrich (2002) Functionalism and Parsons Sociology. 250. November 15-22, 2002. URL: <http://uregina.ca/gingrich/n2202.htm>
10. Parsons T. The system of modern societies. URL: <https://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/basis/5395>
11. Merton Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure (1949, 1957, 1968).
12. Fetisov E. N. Social and labour sphere; essence, aspects and forms of manifestation, 1997.
13. Habermas J. Relations between the system and the world of life in late capitalism // THESIS. 1993.