Removal of risky behavior and psycho-educational conditions of its prevention as the conference central question resounds with the today realities which are characterized, first, by need of the concept reconsideration; secondly, sharply increased processes of transformation of behavior social regulation structure in various political-cultural and ideological systems; thirdly, disbalance of values structure conservative and liberal interpretations; fourthly; an aggravation of the confrontations caused by distinctions in socially important priorities. The above caused designated problem authors reflections within the developed sociocultural-interdeterminist dialogical approach metatheoretical conceptualisation which foundations were formulated for the last years299.

The theoretical analysis of any perspective begins with positioning in basic constructs and theoretical bases. Complexity of such positioning in the problem field of risky behavior prevention is caused, on the one hand, by its social importance determined by the fact that risky behavior causes those problem situations against which society directly comes up. On the other hand, the changes happening in social and technogenic context lead to emergence new and new forms and kinds of risky behavior. Without setting as an object carrying out the detailed analysis of all this variety, I will refer to address researches in which the risky

behavior is analyzed in various contexts: child-parental relations\textsuperscript{300}, online environments\textsuperscript{301}, gender\textsuperscript{302}, peer environments\textsuperscript{303}, prevention programs\textsuperscript{304}, and the infinity of others which are multiplied in civilization development process.

It is necessary to emphasize that the risky behavior is dichotomic on the nature, including also socially approved and disapproved behavior. The dichotomicty is shown that on the one hand society is interested in development of risky behavior, for example, in business, the cognitive activity connected with search of innovative solutions, and, on the other hand, faces the risky behavior negative consequences leading to destructive consequences both for the individual and for society in general. Anyway concern of society is connected with destructive consequences in the sphere of behavior value-normative regulation.

The general assessment of problem area can be reduced to ascertaining of an infinite set of private aspects researches, microtheories and prevention technologies at obvious deficiency of accumulated knowledge integration. In psychological aspect it is about separate studying of various aspects which are come down to personal and situational determination of risky behavior giving very little information for phenomena’s understanding and explanation of transformations, caused by modern changes in social and technogenic spheres.

**Methodological and philosophical background**

Complexity of risky behavior phenomenology research must mention the aspect of behavior value-normative regulation sociocultural-historically caused dynamics. Interest in finding of understanding of its nature stimulated attempt


\textsuperscript{304} H. Susson, G. Mesh, Gender Differences in Factors Explaining Risky Behavior, "Journal of Youth and Adolescence" 45(5), 2016.

\textsuperscript{305} I. Jozeghi Ooo, H. Lampkin, M. A. Andresen, Peer-engagement and its role in reducing the risky behavior among crack and methamphetamine smokers of the Downtown Eastside community of Vancouver, Canada, "Harm Reduction Journal", 2016.

for deep analysis of mankind worldview evolution which integral component is value-normative regulation in particular. For tracing of this evolution was introduced the construct "cultural-scientific tradition", defined as a complex of philosophical, epistemological, scientific-theoretical and emotional-esthetic representations, multiple-valued and dynamically mobile depending on a historical, social and national context... the characteristic of a certain mentality, specific manner of worldview, attitude and assessment both informative opportunities of the person, and his place and role in the world around. Application of this construct allowed to track the various worldview traditions dynamics (cultural syncretism, theocentrism, anthropocentrism, modernism, postmodernism), having added to them the multivoiced dialogism tradition representing highest embodiment in dialogue as a condition, mechanism and driver of culture and science in the conditions of existing diversity.

Figure 1. The evolution of cultural-scientific traditions, research philosophies and reality types

In the presented Figure 1 is visually shown the dynamic of the changes in worldview happening over mankind history, progress from the fragmentary, fetishized worldview caused by extreme deficiency of the knowledge about nature and essence observed, leading to an animation and an idolization of the objects aro-

305 V. Yanchuk, op. cit., Minsk 2005, p. 34.
306 Ibidem, p. 35.
and the world to more system knowledge. In each of traditions certain regulatives concerning of cultural community member’s behavior who come into contradiction with civilization development requirements are developed, constraining innovations and reaching peculiar compromise between known and approved and unknown, but promoting development. The general dynamics – from spontaneous fetishization, through divine outline and compliance of scientific rationality, to postmodern polyphony as resource of any system applying for the status of universality restrictions overcoming.

Polyphony of the modern postmodernist world in which it is equal mutually antithetical values and norms coexist, inevitably is reflected in a condition of society and leads to finding by value-normative regulation not of stable and virtual character. At the same time the fact that values and norms can perform the regulatory function only at rather steady standard character is not considered. What is more the discordance and polyexplanativeness, on the one hand, lead to values and norms all-regulatory function loss, and on the other hand, to disorientation of cultural community. Moreover, the choice of valuable and normative reference point is most often unconscious owing to their rootedness in world outlook installations. In particular, this circumstance formed the basis for allocation B. Fischhoff two types of paradigms – “paradigms of the articulated values” and a paradigm of “fundamental values”. This differentiation is caused by ascertaining of that feature which gained special prevalence exactly today not expressing the private opinion in case of uncertainty of receiving approval from social environment to which the person feels mistrust.

The similar situation stimulates finding solutions in this not simple situation. This search is carried out in two directions – globalist and dialogical. For the globalism which is characterized by search of the fundamental principles of the general “free market space” construction without borders, there are no cultural national, religious and other restrictions disturbing interrelations of societies, economies and cultures the universal solutions finding is peculiar. Discussing this problem A. Rosenmann, G. Reese and J.E. Cameron are speaking about articulated by globalists identity deterritorization, its release from traditional attachments based on cosmopolitanism formation as a peculiar mankind standard which is not burdened with roots. Authors critically treat this idea, emphasizing its orientation against interests of egoism and inter-generational heredity, offering as an alternative a construct of inclusive global identity in which search of overall balance and group unique, etic and emic is carried out. As emphasizes Y. Kashima,

culture and identity are flexible and dynamic, being under the influence of the changing circumstances and forming their joint efforts.  

**DIALOGICAL-INTERDETERMINIST PERSPECTIVE OF THE RISKY BEHAVIOR PREVENTION**

Complexity of this task solution is connected also with lack of the psychological knowledge integration complex methodological bases, in particular, concerning of risky behavior prevention perspective. The author’s version of such meta-methodological basis is offered by the sociocultural-interdeterminist dialogical metatheory of psychological knowledge integration developed for the last years.

Value-normative regulation is the integral element and a product of culture which acts as the backbone basis of multidimensional and heterogeneous phenomenon of the person behavior internally external interdetermination integration. After L.S. Vygotsky it is defined as specifically human product lying in the base of mankind achievements, since possession of the outside world objects sign representation ability in consciousness and attach them culturally conditioned meanings the person finds possibility of the world possession.

Throughout told as one of the cultural psychology leading representative J. Valsiner notes, culture, “when viewed as the process of semiotic mediation of human living, is thus a tool for the flexibility of the human psyche to encounter a wide variety of settings... constructing of something new, reaching new frontiers of understanding and being”. It is the socially inherited body of past accomplishments that serve as resources for the current life of a social group.

In substantial deployment it appears as learned configuration of categories, images, assumptions, beliefs, values, norms, and other symbolic elements widely shared among members of a given society or social group which functions as an orientational and normative framework for behavior, and as a communicational matrix through which behavior is interpreted, integrated, coordinated, and sanctioned (R. Priest).

---


Representing extremely difficult education, the culture includes not only externally observable, but also hidden, represented in author's modification of the scheme J. Moule\textsuperscript{13} represented in Fig. 2.

![Image of an iceberg concept of culture]

**Figure 2. Iceberg concept of culture**

Finding of answers to these fundamental questions assumes finding of opportunities of an exit for frameworks of traditional consideration of culture as being out of the person, placing “psychology in the head, and culture to the world”\textsuperscript{14}.

The decision seems in the offer H, Marcus, noting that “psychological processes – perception, cognition, emotion, motivation – are intrinsically linked to the social worlds we inhabit. Psychology exists both in the head and in the world, and is most productively analyzed at this intersection”\textsuperscript{15}.

A common strategy for dealing with this problem has been to combine the “culture is in the world/material” and the “culture is in the mind/mental” definitions. This strategy is implemented in various ways. For example, Shweder and colleagues\textsuperscript{16} defined human culture as having both a symbolic and a behavioral component:


The symbolic inheritance of a cultural community consists of its received ideas and understandings about persons, society, nature, and the metaphysical realm of the divines. [At the same time] the behavioral inheritance of a cultural community consists of its routine or institutionalized family life, social, economic, and political practices. In the same way the culture is embodied in the values and norms which are in common created by cultural community concerning in the acceptable and unacceptable forms of its members behavior, at the same time, defining what its forms are risky and what are not. The question of internalization of these regulators and the subsequent externalization is central at means of the social regulation corresponding mechanisms. They also act as the most significant object in relation of risky behavior prevention.

In Vygotskian tradition, every artifact is an aspect of the material world that has been modified over the history of its incorporation in goal directed human action. By virtue of the changes wrought in their material character in the process of their creation and use, artifacts are simultaneously ideal (conceptual) and material. In this important sense, artifacts are semiotic objects, essential to the process of meaning-making central to all cultural practices. In this approach, the mediation of human activity through such ideal/material semiotic forms of social inheritance is the central mechanism of distinctly human ontogenesis. Special complexity is represented by finding of these forms interaction optimum balance in creation of regulators not only ideal, but also material property.

The special aspect of a problem is represented by internalization and an externalization of culture in consciousness, and also a possibility of its research. The leading role in his understanding belongs to the cultural practices representing "actions that are repeated, shared with others in a social group, and invested with normative expectations and with meanings or significances that go beyond the immediate goals of the action." Special complexity is represented by finding of these forms interaction optimum balance in creation of regulators not only ideal, but also material property.

Production of effective cultural practices is a main objective of any programs of risky behavior prevention. "Cultural practices organize the interactions of persons with their social and material surroundings. These interactions are the locus of interpsychological processes. Culturally constituted inter-psychological processes change through historical time. They are also targets for internalization.

---


as intra-psychological processes. Shweder argue that whatever universal characteristics humans share as members of the same species, these characteristics “only gain character, substance, definition, and motivational force . . . as they are translated and transformed into and through the concrete actualities of some particular practice, activity setting, or way of life.

Consideration of culture in the context of risky behavior prevention problem induced me to creation of the construct of “non-risky behavior culture” for the purpose of attention emphasis on aspect of risky behavior prevention formation conditions in the context of cultural development and application of purposeful efforts on its formalization as an effective interpersonal relationship regulative. The main idea is articulated in following postulate – in many cases the risky behavior is conditioned by absence of non-risky behavior culture, assuming priority of socially significant values, norms, activities in life situations diversity demanding the adequate cultural practices meeting social expectations.

The possession of non-risky behavior culture allows to resolve problem situations by non-risky, socially acceptable methods by means of dialogue. Non-risky behavior culture is a learned configuration of categories, images, assumptions, beliefs, values, norms, and other symbolic elements and also cultural practices in general widely shared among members of a given society or social group which functions as an orientational and normative framework for behavior, and as a communicational and activity matrix through which behavior is interpreted, integrated, coordinated, and sanctioned, allowing to build socially accepted relationship between people through dialog.

Finding mutually acceptable decisions in the conditions of the existing diversity is extremely complex task which solution is possible only in process and by means of dialogue. According to sociocultural-interdeterminist metatheory consideration of non-risky behavior culture formation has to be carried out in the integrated space of psychological knowledge, accumulated in different systems of paradigm coordinates. In this context it is about three four-dimensional spaces allocated on the basis of criteria of nature’s heteroqualitativity, psychic spheres and research areas. However, these spaces do not exist as autonomous, self-sufficient entities but as complementary and mutually expanding opportunities and analysed phenomena’s comprehension depth. As combined they describe human psychological specificity in its bio-psycho-social essences in spheres of the conscious-unconscious-existential, comprehended in personality, environment and activity aspects, is extremely important finding of the general basis which is intentionally present at each of the presented components of the discussed triad, and cau-

sing their originality in ethic-emic foreshortenings. In a complete mood these spaces are presented in the form of pyramid represented in Fig. 3.

![Figure 3. Pyramid of psychological phenomenology integration spaces](image)

**Where:** $A$ – activity, $P$ – personality, $E$ – environment, $B_{Bio}$ – biological; $P_{Psy}$ – psychic; $S_{Sym}$ – symbolic; $C_{Con}$ – conscious; $U_{Uncon}$ – unconscious; $E_{Exc}$ – existential; $C_{Cult}$ – cultural-historic context.

By continuums of psychological phenomena’s interdeterminants spaces is understood the whole complex of internal-external reasons, interaction and mutual influence which determines the uniqueness of behavior. The heteroqualitative, multidimensional and multiparadigm psychological knowledge is represented in the form of the following four-dimensional continuums: by criteria of nature’s heteroqualitativity: biological – psychic – social – culturally conditioned; by criteria of psychic spheres: conscious – unconscious – existential – culturally conditioned; by criteria of research areas: personality – environment – activity – culturally conditioned. Dedicated spaces are analyzed in the context of their cultural conditioning, serving as a common universal interdeterminants.

In relation to non-risky behavior culture formation the offered model focuses attention to need of complex studying not only traditionally personal characteristics, but also their conditionality of the environment features in which they are formed, and also activities on internalization and an externalisation in external behavior. It should be noted that if on the first component rather extensive massif of knowledge is saved up, then on two others it is minimum. It caused the increasing interest in research of the environment (situation) influence on the
personality. At the same time the risky behavior formation environment significantly changed in recent years: it became globalized, with the developed electronic communication network, with sharply increased migration processes and much many other, other than even decennial prescription. Development mass media and Internet spaces led to emergence of a possibility of virtual movement worldwide and on infinity of Internet resources. Acceleration of information streams led to emergence of reality simulacration and simulation possibility (Baudrillard, 1981). Sharp increase of the simulacra creation opportunities (the objects which are torn off from the referent or not having the real embodiments) constitute special danger to formation of risky behavior, since responsibility for deeds and its consequences also become virtual. Interruption of traditional system of inter-generational transmission of socially approved cultural practices, also leads to their virtualization, imposing from mass media, often solving its own manipulative tasks. Use of modern information technologies leads to sharp increase of manipulations with individual and public opinion, etc. Same concerns also an activity role in formation of non-risky culture. If it is not formed in direct reality by means of real (not virtual) actions for socially approved cultural practices internalization, then it loses its regulatory function. The subject ceases to estimate the offered maintenance in axiologically and, as a result, loses responsibility for deeds. Loss of responsibility leads to formation of irresponsibility and the consumer relation to the events. Formation of non-risky culture presupposes formation of the environment supporting socially important values and norms, including by an example of the self-help groups which gained special distribution today in connection with awareness of impossibility of the decision individual problems independently without supporting others. It also caused introduction by me in psychological use of constructs the eco-cultural dialogical environment and non-violence culture. In last case it is about purposeful formation of relationship regulation by nonviolent methods ability.

Relations virtualization leads to existential crisis of loneliness and loss of communication with surroundings that, besides, effects on events life experience. Forming value-oriented culture we should not forget that the most part of estimated decisions happens is automated, i.e. unconsciously. And if automatism is not created, then and you should not expect its actualisation. Non-risky culture should be generalized, and this generalization does not happen


in vacuum, society interested in formation of socially approved cultural practices has to make efforts for this process actualisation, using at all possible resources and means. Including through media and other contents social censorship.

The special question represents relationship of the offered structure allocated elements. The most known attempts of this problem solution are connected with names of outstanding metaphors – K. Lewin and A. Bandura.

In his Field Theory K. Lewin describes behavior as function from the personality and an external environment \( B=f(P,E) \). Characterizing K. Lewin’s approach as unidirectional A. Bandura offered partly directional transformation of its formula \( B=f(P,E) \), articulated in the principle of reciprocal determinism representing the following formalized relationship of this elements displayed in Fig. 4.

**Undirectional (K. Lewin, 1936)**

\[ B=f(P,E) \]

**Partly directional (A. Bandura, 1978)**

\[ B=f(P \oplus E) \]

**Reciprocal**

\[ (S_{Sym}) (E_{Ex}) E \]

**Biosis \( B_{Bios} \) \( U_{Unce} \) \( P \)**

**Where:**

\( P \) – personality;

\( E \) – external environment (situation);

\( B \) – behavior

**4D-directional (V. Yanchuk, 2014)**

\[ \text{C}_{\text{cult}} \]

\[ A (P_{Psy}) (C_{Exc}) \]

**Where:**

\( A \) – activity;

\( P \) – personality;

\( E \) – environment;

\( B_{Bios} \) – biological;

\( P_{Psy} \) – psychic;

\( S_{Sym} \) – symbolic;

\( U_{Unce} \) – unconscious;

\( E_{Ex} \) – existential;

\( C_{Exc} \) – cultural-historic context.

**Figure 4.** Interrelation of undirected, bidirectional and 4D-directed determination

A. Bandura emphasizes, “In the social learning view of interaction, which is analyzed as a process of reciprocal determinism, behavior, internal personal factors, and environmental influences all operate as interlocking determinants of each other … the process involves a triadic reciprocal interaction rather than a dyadic conjoint or a dyadic bidirectional one … From the perspective of reciprocal determinism, the common practice of searching for the ultimate environmental cause of behavior is an idle exercise because, in an interactional process, one and the same event can be a stimulus, a response, or an environmental reinforcer, depending on where in the sequence the analysis arbitrarily begins. or mediated


transactions with the environment ... A complete analysis of reciprocal determinism therefore requires investigation of how all three sets of factors—cognitive, behavioral, and environmental—interact reciprocally among themselves.\textsuperscript{327}

In development of the presented approaches I offered the principle of a dialogical interdeterminism\textsuperscript{328}. The relation of a dialogical interdetermination emphasizes an element of interinfluencing and its mutually changeable character. Any change of one of elements inevitably leads also to change in all interconnected elements. And, occurred changes lead to change of the most heterogeneous system quality receiving new growths in the form of expansion, reconsideration and re-experience of the found experience. These elements at the same time are both autonomous and mutually causing each other and the last focuses attention that each of elements does not exist as self-sufficient but only in relationship with others.

In the process of sociocultural-interdeterminist dialogue behavior, internal personal factors and the environment influences are interdependent interdeterminants of each other, conditioned by interdeterministic interactions of heteroqualitative biological, psychic, and social (symbolic) natures, and spheres of conscious, unconscious, and existential, conditioned by the context of culture in foreshortening of personality, environment, and activity. In accordance with introduced principle of dialogical interdetermination structural elements of the offered continua are in condition of interdeterminist interaction. Changes of continuum one element leads to change of the most heterogeneous system quality receiving new growths in the form of reconsideration and re-experience of the found state.

Distinctive feature of the offered approach is the articulation of dialogical nature of the interaction between elements of heterogeneous system assuming thinking dialogicity. J. Salgado and J.W. Clegg distinguish six fundamental principles of dialogical thinking: “the principles of relationality, dynamism, semiotic mediation, alterity, dialogicality, and contextuality. Together, these principles imply a notion of psyche that is neither an isolated homunculus nor a disembodied discourse, but is, rather, a temporally unique, agentive enactment that is sustained within, rather than against, the tensions between individual and social, material and psychological, multiple and unified, stable and dynamic. From their point of view the dialogical concept of psychic assumes, the first, “that dynamic relations, rather than static entities, are the proper unit of psychological study and, second, that a dialogical research epistemology must conceive of truth as a multi-voiced event, rather than as a singular representation of fact” (Ibid).

\textsuperscript{327} A. Bandura, op. cit., 1978, p. 346.
\textsuperscript{328} V. Yanchuk, op. cit., 2015, 2016.
\textsuperscript{329} J. Salgado, J.W. Clegg, Dialogism and the psyche: Bakhtin and contemporary psychology, “Culture & Psychology” 17(4), 2011, p. 421.
There is no consensual definition of dialogism but we outline 6 basic assumptions that seem to apply to most dialogical theorizing in psychology\textsuperscript{330}, for a thorough and general review of a dialogical perspective:

1. the primacy of relations over entities (relationality);
2. that relations are dynamic and developing processes (dynamism);
3. that human relations are mediated by signs (semiotic mediation);
4. that a relationship implies alterity, that is, a relationship between I and Other (alterity);
5. that human relationships are dialogical, or negotiated, relationships (dialogicality);
6. that dialogical relationships include and depend upon a socio-cultural context (contextuality).

Among these principles, “relationality” is the basic axiom – i.e., instead of classifying human experience in terms of substances or entities, dialogism focuses analysis on relations between elements in a system. Dialogism focuses on change and its regulation emphasising that dynamic relation is the essential constant in, and foundation for, existence. Extending this to the human context, in the context of Markova’s\textsuperscript{331} reasoning’s, existence implies a relationship between an Ego and an Alter. Dialogism does not dissolve the person into the social realm; it assumes, rather, that personal agency has a fundamental role in determining human thought, action, and experience. The dialogicity on its nature is interdeterministic, since assumes the interaction leading to mutual changes and mutual development, in turn leading to the new qualities finding which are not presented in initial state of the heterogeneous system interacting elements.

Just as dialogism conceives of human beings as beings-in-relation-with-others, it conceptualizes ongoing experience in terms of the dynamic negotiations directed to an intersubjectivity formation that constitute such relations. In turn formation of an intersubjectivity assumes joint construction of the shared meanings. The negotiation of meaning involves a vast array of voices brought to bear in concrete languages, social norms, personal and social histories, and other forms of shared meaning. Bakhtin’s\textsuperscript{332} assertion that whenever we are using a word, this word is half given (because it is part of our social heritage), and half created (because we are appropriating and using it in an unrepeatable and personalized way that situates us in front of others). Of course, some patterns of relationship are more enduring than others and therefore, when we are born we face a previously constituted socio-cultural world that simultaneously enables and constrains the possibilities of meaningfully coordinated actions with others. Thus, as are

\textsuperscript{332} M. Bakhtin, \textit{The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin}, Austin 1981.
noting J. Salgado and J.W. Clegg, a dialogical perspective requires that we consider the socio-cultural context in which a dialogical relation is situated (principle of contextuality). This contextualization does not dissolve the personal realm; on the contrary, by employing the communication tools instituted in a given context, each person creates personal meanings by positioning her or himself in that same context. Dialogism makes the claim that the psyche and its relational, socio-cultural context are inseparable (the principles of relationality and contextuality) but non-identical (the principle of alterity).

The fundamental unit of analysis thus becomes the system of relationship, and every relationship brings to being at least two contrasting and mutually defining elements. Dialogical theories of human life, then, always include dual (or multiple) properties, each one irreducible to the other but unavoidably interdependent, and this system of relations and its dynamics constitutes the focus of dialogical analysis. The traditional dualisms thus dissolve in mutually interdependent systems. The dualism of person and culture is transformed in the assertion that each of us works as a “personal culture,” mind and body become two bounded elements in relation with the world, different but bounded in that constant relating.

The prefix “inter” shows a way by means of which we can overcome a root metaphor of psychological understanding as at the public, and scientific levels, having kept them in an initial state. Such kind metaphor represents distinction between internal/external with external space comprehension. Meaning is neither “inside” nor “outside”: it is “between.” Meanings co-construction and handling are the processes organising interaction including of psychic heteroqualitative natures and spheres. In interaction there is (or does not occur) an achievement of the peculiar mutually arranging compromise providing either the optimum, or minimum sufficient condition of coexistence allowing behaviour integration and coordination.

At the same time the concept of interaction is extremely limiting in relation to the heteroqualitative entities coexistence which are not finding the new integrated quality, keeping the initial uniqueness, but forming the new quality which is outside over forming it. The most authentic for the description of this state is the concept of dialogue in its Bakhtinian understanding. Being in dialogue, people interact by means of mutually active dynamics of discourses clarifying like in shared meanings formation also negotiating in the sphere of requirements, interests and desires, which will be reached in case of mutual agreement achievement, at the same time, keeping own uniqueness and relative autonomy.

The relation of dialogical interdetermination underlines the interinfluencing, interchanging character of heterogeneous system elements interaction. Changes of continuum one element leads to change of the most heterogeneous system quality receiving new growths in the form of reconsideration and re-experience of the found state. Moreover, changes have taken place leading to change in the quality of the most heterogeneous system, tumors receiving as an extension, and a rethinking of the acquired experience. These elements are both autonomous and mutually conditioning and last focuses on the fact that each element does not exist as a self-contained, but only in the relationship with other.

**CONCLUSION**

Summarising the above in the context of risky behavior prevention problem I will allocate the following:


2. The phenomenology of risky behaviour must be analyzed in the heterogeneous systems elements dialogical interaction context implying acquiring by it of the new quality which is not presented in the simple sum of the composing elements.

3. The dialogical interdetermination presupposes the interaction directed to the joint results elaboration which are internally accepted and shared by all concerned parties.Them are embodied in the mutually produced, agreed and accepted relationships co-construction value-normative regulators in concrete cultural community considering its potential interaction with other cultural communities and dynamic taking into account changes in inner world and external environment.

Indirect confirmation of the offered approach efficiency is presented in research of the interdeterministic in character personality and external environments interaction in the course of purposeful psychological influence on achievements in educational activity of Afro-American students by means of the organisation of the supporting environment. In the conditions of a controlled experiment it was convincingly shown that positive collective consequences can emerge from changing the psychological processes of the individual. The intervention triggered not only a change in individuals, but also through this, a change in group atmosphere, in which the interacting classroom forces found a new quasi-stationary

---

equilibrium, one with benefits for all students regardless of whether they received the intervention\textsuperscript{338}. A similar effect was also obtained in the study of prior academic self-concept (as opposed to self-esteem) and achievement both have positive effects on subsequent self-concept and achievement based on reciprocal-effects model (REM) and a recent meta-analysis\textsuperscript{339}.

In my own research of possibilities of alcoholic’s rehabilitation overcoming alcoholic dependence presupposes not only disposal of it at the biological level (biological dimension), but also deep psychological correctional and also discussion of a problem at the narrative level (symbolic dimension). It is scrupulous work at the cognitive level (conscious dimension), over unconscious conflicts and contradictions permission (unconscious dimension), at last, permission of the existential problems connected with awareness of own deficiency and detachment from society (existential dimension). Overcoming alcoholic dependence, it is not only transformation of the personality (personality dimension), but also formation of the supporting environment like anonymous alcoholics’ communities and self-help groups (external environment dimension), but also providing activities or cultural practices coping with problem (activity dimension). Within these spaces of correctional and preventative work the dialogue interdetermination as a necessary condition of successful result is always implemented.

Summarising outlined, once again I focus attention to necessity of the vision horizons expansion of risky behaviour prevention phenomenology perspective, that invaluable role which is played in this process by the interested community, actively participating in the problems solution which it faces. Understanding that the only dialogue provides unique and sole mechanism of the existing in it and beyond its boundaries problems solution, which implementation main condition is recognition of the right for otherness. Only recognising it people begin to co-create joint decisions, to form intersubjectivity and interexistentiality, the cornerstone of mutual understanding and awareness of participation in the events around and personal responsibility for its results. Such understanding of the urgent problems solution psychological resources, including risky behaviour, resulted me in need of introduction of the construct “eco-cultural dialogical supporting environment”\textsuperscript{340}.

\textsuperscript{338} Ibidem, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{340} V. Yanchuk, Eko-kulturnaya obrazovatelnyaya sreda: formorovanie i razvitie. Chast 1: Obrazovanie, nauka i innovazii, „Adukazia i vikhavanne” 1, 6067, 2013.
**List of References**


Jozaghi, Oo J., Lampkin, H., Andresen, M. A. (2016). *Peer-engagement and its role in reducing the risky behavior among crack and methamphetamine smokers*
of the Downtown Eastside community of Vancouver, Canada., “Harm Reduction Journal”.


mennosti: 130 let organizacacji psichologicheskogo obschestva pri Moskovkom uni-


**ABSTRACT**

The problem of risky behavior prevention is analyzed in the context of authors sociocultural-interdeterminist dialogical metatheory. The simulacrazation of social-normative behavior regulation under mass media influence and virtualization of relations during an epoch of electronic communications intensive and uncontrolled development is ascertained. Is articulated necessity of risky behavior prevention multidimensional consideration in spaces of heteroqualitative natures, psychic spheres and research areas in their cultural conditionality. In accordance with introduced principle of dialogical interdetermination the process of risky beha-
vor prevention is considered in the context of interdeterministic dialogical inte-
racion. The constructs “non-risky behavior culture” and “ecocultural dialogical supportive environment” are introduced. Theoretical and empirical explanations of metatheoretical approach innovativeness are presented.

**Keywords:** cultural-scientific tradition; culture; dialogical interdetermination; dialogism; ecocultural dialogical supportive environment; four-dimensional continuums of psychological knowledge; heterogeneous system; integration; intersubjectivity; non-risky behavior culture; risky behavior prevention process; simulacra; socio-cultural-interdeterminist dialogical approach.

**STRESZCZENIE**

Problematyka zapobiegania ryzykownym zachowaniami analizowana jest w kontekście autorów socjokulturowo-interdeterministycznej dialogowej meta-
torii. Współcześnie dokonuje się symulacji zachowywania norm społeczno-
normatywnych pod wpływem mediów i wirtualizacji relacji w epoce intensywnie-
nej komunikacji elektronicznej. Na tej podstawie stwierdza się niekontrolowany
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