

**SCIENTIFIC
COLLECTION
INTERCONF+**



No 52
April, 2021

THE ISSUE CONTAINS:

Proceedings of the 1st
International Scientific
and Practical Conference

**INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION:
PROBLEMS, TASKS AND PROSPECTS**



BRIGHTON, GREAT BRITAIN

21-22.04.2021



InterConf
Scientific Publishing Center

SCIENTIFIC COLLECTION «INTERCONF»

No 52 | April, 2021

THE ISSUE CONTAINS:

Proceedings of the 1st International Scientific and Practical Conference

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION: PROBLEMS, TASKS AND PROSPECTS

BRIGHTON, GREAT BRITAIN

21-22.04.2021

BRIGHTON
2021

UDC 001.1

S 40 *Scientific Collection «InterConf», (52): with the Proceedings of the 1st International Scientific and Practical Conference «International Scientific Discussion: Problems, Tasks and Prospects» (April 21-22, 2021). Brighton, Great Britain: A.C.M. Webb Publishing Co Ltd., 2021. 488 p.*

ISBN 978-0-86189-342-3

DOI 10.51582/interconf.21-22.04.2021

EDITOR COORDINATOR


Anna Svoboda 

Doctoral student
University of Economics, Czech Republic
annasvobodaprague@yahoo.com

Mariia Granko 

Coordination Director in Ukraine
Scientific Publishing Center InterConf
info@interconf.top

EDITORIAL BOARD


Temur Narbaev  (PhD)

Tashkent Pediatric Medical Institute,
Republic of Uzbekistan;
temur1972@inbox.ru

Dan Goltsman (Doctoral student)
Riga Stradiņš University, Republic of Latvia;

Katherine Richard (DSc in Law),
Hasselt University, Kingdom of Belgium
katherine.richard@protonmail.com;

Richard Brouillet (LL.B.),
University of Ottawa, Canada;

Stanyslav Novak  (DSc in Engineering)
University of Warsaw, Poland
novaks657@gmail.com;

Mark Alexandr Wagner (DSc. in Psychology)
University of Vienna, Austria
mw6002832@gmail.com;

Elise Bant (LL.D.),
The University of Sydney, Australia;

Alexander Schieler (PhD in Sociology),
Transilvania University of Brasov, Romania


Dmytro Marchenko  (PhD in Engineering)

Mykolayiv National Agrarian University
(MNAU), Ukraine;

Rakhmonov Aziz Bositovich (PhD in Pedagogy)
Uzbek State University of World Languages,
Republic of Uzbekistan;

Dr. Albena Yaneva (DSc. in Sociology and Antropology),
Manchester School of Architecture, UK;

Vera Gorak (PhD in Economics)
Karlovarská Krajská Nemocnice, Czech Republic
veragorak.assist@gmail.com;

Polina Vuitsik  (PhD in Economics)
Jagiellonian University, Poland
p.vuitsik.prof@gmail.com;

Kanako Tanaka (PhD in Engineering),
Japan Science and Technology Agency, Japan;

George McGrown (PhD in Finance)
University of Florida, USA
mcgrown.geor@gmail.com;

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact a coordinator Mariia Granko.

The recommended styles of citation:

1. Surname N. (2021). Title of article or abstract. *Scientific Collection «InterConf», (52): with the Proceedings of the 1st International Scientific and Practical Conference «International Scientific Discussion: Problems, Tasks and Prospects» (April 21-22, 2021) at Brighton, Great Britain; pp. 21-27.* Available at: [https://interconf.top/...](https://interconf.top/)
2. Surname N. (2021). Title of article or abstract. *InterConf, (52), 21-27.* Retrieved from [https://interconf.top/...](https://interconf.top/)

This issue of Scientific Collection «InterConf» contains the International Scientific and Practical Conference. The conference provides an interdisciplinary forum for researchers, practitioners and scholars to present and discuss the most recent innovations and developments in modern science. The aim of conference is to enable academics, researchers, practitioners and college students to publish their research findings, ideas, developments, and innovations.

©2021 A.C.M. Webb Publishing Co Ltd.
©2021 Authors of the abstracts
©2021 Scientific Publishing Center «InterConf»

contact e-mail: info@interconf.top webpage: www.interconf.top

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION: PROBLEMS, TASKS AND PROSPECTS

Григорьева В.Б. Белгородская Е.Е. Недошитко О.М.		ОСОБЕННОСТИ ВЫПОЛНЕНИЯ БЫСТРОГО НАБРОСКА-СКЕТЧА В ТЕХНИКЕ АКВАРЕЛИ	161
Дубовик В.В.		ВИКОРИСТАННЯ СЕРЕДОВИЩА GEOGEBRA НА ПРАКТИЧНИХ ЗАНЯТТЯХ З ЛІНІЙНОЇ АЛГЕБРИ ПІД ЧАС НАВЧАННЯ СТУДЕНТІВ ПЕДАГОГІЧНИХ УНІВЕРСИТЕТІВ	167
Кондрацька Г.Д.		МОДЕЛІ ПІДГОТОВКИ ФАХІВЦІВ ЗА ОСВІТНЬО-ПРОФЕСІЙНИМИ ПРОГРАМАМИ, ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ТА ВИКЛИКИ	174
Радченко М.Р.		САМОПІЗНАННЯ ЯК МЕХАНІЗМ ЗАПУСКУ САМОВДОСКОНАЛЕННЯ ТА САМОПРЕЗЕНТАЦІЇ	184
Стратан-Артишкова Т.Б. Шевцова О.Б.		РОЗВИТОК ТВОРЧОЇ ОСОБИСТОСТІ У ПРОСТОРІ МИСТЕЦЬКОЇ ОСВІТИ	191
Сяська Н.А. Кіндрат П.В. Кіндрат В.К.		ФОРМУВАННЯ ІНФОРМАЦІЙНИХ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТЕЙ УЧНІВ ПІД ЧАС РОЗВ'ЯЗУВАННЯ РІВНЯНЬ З ПАРАМЕТРАМИ	198
Форостовська Т.О.		ПРОФЕСІЙНЕ САМОВИЗНАЧЕННЯ МАЙБУТНІХ УЧИТЕЛІВ ХІМІЇ В УМОВАХ ВИКОРИСТАННЯ АКТИВНИХ МЕТОДІВ НАВЧАННЯ	206
PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY			
Orap M. Kalba Y.		SUBJECTIVE WELL – BEING IN UKRAINIAN STUDENTS DURING THE COVID-2019 QUARANTINE	214
PHILOLOGY AND LINGUISTIC			
Stepanova I.S. Nykyropets S.S.		THE INTERNET AND LINGUISTICS: INTERACTION AND NEW PROSPECTS OF CORPUS RESEARCH	220
Дрогомирецька М.М.		ЛІНГВОКРАЇНОЗНАВЧИЙ АСПЕКТ У ВИКЛАДАННІ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ ЯК ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ЯК ВАЖЛИВИЙ ЧИННИК ФОРМУВАННЯ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМПЕТЕНЦІЇ СТУДЕНТІВ	226
Курмамбаева Ж.Б. Бекен А.А.		ИКТ КАК СРЕДСТВО ОБУЧЕНИЯ ИНОСТРАННОМУ ЯЗЫКУ	232
Черевко І.В.		МИХАЙЛО ХУДАШ У МОВОЗНАВЧІЙ НАУЦІ	246
Щербина А.І. Ілясов О.О.		МОЖЛИВОСТІ ВИКОРИСТАННЯ МЕТОДІВ ЕЙДЕТИКИ У ПРОЦЕСІ НАВЧАННЯ МОЛОДШИХ ШКОЛЯРІВ	254
LAW AND INTERNATIONAL LAW			
Băieșu A.		RECOVERY OF DAMAGE CAUSED BY LATE PERFORMANCE OF OBLIGATIONS RESULTING FROM INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL CONTRACTS	262
ARTS, CULTURAL STUDIES AND ETHNOGRAPHY			
Liu Haotian		BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIALS AND TECHNIQUES IN CLASSICAL OIL PAINTING	272
Мельничук Ю.С.		ТЕОРЕТИЧНА СПАДЩИНА ЛЕСЯ КУРБАСА: СТАНОВЛЕННЯ ТВОРЧОЇ ОСОБИСТОСТІ	278
PART II			
MEDICINE AND PHARMACY			
Bobrov A. Borysenko O. Mischanchuk N. Papp A.		RESULTS OF STUDY OF THE HYPOGLOSSAL NERVE FUNCTIONS IN PATIENTS AFTER HYPOGLOSSAL-FACIAL ANASTOMOSIS	285

PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHIATRY

DOI 10.51582/interconf.21-22.04.2021.024

Orap Maryna

Doctor of Psychological Sciences (Ph. D. in Sciences), Professor,
Professor at the Department of Psychology,
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

Kalba Yaroslava

Candidate of Psychological Sciences (Ph. D.),
Associate Professor at the Department of Psychology,
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

SUBJECTIVE WELL – BEING IN UKRAINIAN STUDENTS DURING THE COVID-2019 QUARANTINE

***Abstract.** The global pandemic COVID-19 and introduced quarantine affect not only the people's health, but their psychological well-being in general. Decrease the subjective well-being at the beginning of quarantine was associated with limited communication, fear for health and limited mobility. In a year the situation has changed, there has been manifested the increasing levels of anxiety during quarantine due to awareness of the difficulties of quarantine life that associated with distance education and limited mobility, financial difficulties and uncertainty about the future. But we studied that during the first year of quarantine the level of subjective well-being has not changed significantly.*

***Keywords:** subjective well-being, COVID-19, quarantine, students.*

For the first time in world history, the global pandemic and introduced quarantine provides completely new social conditions that affect the mental health of people. Psychologists understand that the main accompanying emotional states of people in a pandemic are fear, panic, anxiety, apathy, stress and depression [1]. This is definitely international problem that is actual and common for all people [2]. Current publications focused on the first psychological aid and support to people in

stress situation [2, 3]. Psychologists underlined that separation from loved ones, the loss of freedom and uncertainty over disease status during quarantine cause of raising the level of anxiety that can create dramatic effects [4]. That's why we needed theoretical and research the main factors of anxiety in a current situation and practical recommendation to improve mental health and subjective well-being during epidemics and quarantine [5].

Bradburn was one of the first who in 1969 introduced the term “psychological well-being” and identified it with a personal sense of happiness and life satisfaction. Bradburn's theoretical model of psychological well-being is about the balance which is achieved by the interaction of two types of affect – positive and negative. Bradburn reports that positive and negative affect vary independently, rather than being bipolar opposites on the same affect spectrum [6]. This suggested that positive and negative affect are produced by different processes and exhibit different degrees of relationship with other variables.

However, other researchers have continued to report a strong, inverse correlation between positive and negative affect. For example, Green et al. (1993) found the correlation between positive and negative affect to be strongly negative, controlling for random measurement error using structural equation modelling [7]. This has helped to identify another scientific paradigm for the study of subjective well-being. Scholars in this area emphasize that subjective well-being is a positive cognitive-evaluative attitude of a person to the world in general and to himself/herself as a subject of life, to others as partners in communication and interaction and experience on this basis a sense of self-satisfaction. Diener developed a tripartite model of subjective well-being, which describes how people experience the quality of their lives and includes both emotional reactions and cognitive judgments. Subjective well-being (SWB) therefore encompasses moods and emotions as well as evaluations of one's satisfaction with general and specific areas of one's life. Diener's idea is that a high level of subjective well-being is possible when a person generally experiences satisfaction with life and only at certain moments experiences negative emotions. On the contrary, a low level of subjective well-being implies frequent experiences of negative emotions [7].

Modern researchers pay more attention to the separation of the structure of subjective well-being and the description of all the elements that influence this integral phenomenon. Carol Ryff and Corey Keyes created a theoretical model of psychological well-being that encompasses 6 distinct dimensions of wellness – Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, Self-Acceptance [8]. Seligman's PERMA model focus on the five domains of subjective well-being: positive emotions, engagement, relationships, meaning and accomplishment [9]. As Julie Butler & Margaret Kern says, "wellbeing can be defined and measured objectively (e.g., sufficient resources to meet basic needs, opportunities for education, lack of environmental pollutants) or subjectively; we focus here on the subjective side. In the literature, terms such as "happiness", "subjective wellbeing", "thriving", and "flourishing" are often used interchangeably, and we use these terms interchangeably here" [10]. We agree with the position of the authors, because the underlying principle that well-being does not necessarily exclude negative emotions seems scientifically sound. Julie Butler & Margaret Kern in their study focus on the five domains defined by Seligman's PERMA theory: Positive Emotion (P), Engagement (E), Relationships (R), Meaning (M), and Accomplishment (A) (Seligman, 2011). Survey, made by Sheridan examined the combined influence of six positive psychology variables (optimism, hope, self-efficacy, grit, gratitude, and subjective life satisfaction), termed covitality, in relation to buffering individuals against anxiety symptoms. In addition, the influence of self-deception was examined to test whether this construct had an influence on the reporting of these positive psychology variables [11].

Data are reported from a national probability sample of Ukrainian adolescence aged $17,52 \pm 0,39$ ($M \pm SD$) years. A total of 240 individuals (162 females and 78 males) from Ukrainian Universities took part in the study. We chose age group "adolescence" for the study because young people are considered to be one of the most highly emotionally unbalanced. So, they are more exposed to situational anxiety. The respondents' native language was Ukrainian, however, proficiency in English at B2 level was a prerequisite. The selected test methods were used in the original form, in English. The participants completed an online questionnaire which

included a battery of positive psychological measures. Participation in this study was voluntary and completion and submission of the online questionnaire was deemed to demonstrate participant consent.

To make a conclusion about well-being in Ukrainian students we measured the level of well-being at the beginning of quarantine in Ukraine (March, 2020) and compare it with the level of well-being of the same sample of respondents after a year of quarantine – in March, 2021.

The choice of diagnostic methods was due to the methodological approaches to well-being, which we outlined as a theoretical basis for our study and analyzed above. Seligman defined well-being in terms of five pillars: Positive emotion, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning and Accomplishment, or PERMA [9]. According to this understanding of subjective well-being Butler and Kern developed the PERMA-Profilier as a brief measure of PERMA [10]. The PERMA-Profilier is a validated, 23 – question survey. Each statement/question is rated on 10-point scale, ranging scores from 0 (never) to 10 (always). Butler and Kern also added to Seligman's five pillars also profiles that measures health, negative emotions, loneliness and overall well-being. So, this well-being measure allows to the fullest study of individual's well-being across multiple psychological domains. That's why we chose the PERMA-Profilier for our survey.

Table 1 displays descriptive statistics of the participants' positive emotions, engagement, relations, meanings, accomplishment, health, negative emotions, loneliness and overall subjective well-being scores, based on the participant's gender at the beginning of quarantine and after a year of quarantine. An independent *t*-test revealed that there are no significant differences between females and males scores in all profiles, $p < .005$. This means that gender does not significantly affect the subjective well-being. That's why we didn't take this indicator into account in further measures.

As shown at the table, the most significant factors of subjective well-being of Ukrainian students at the beginning of quarantine were “relationships” (7.37 ± 2.01), “positive emotions” (7.34 ± 1.52), and “engagement” (7.34 ± 1.30). After a year of

quarantine “engagement” (7.26 ± 1.29) became the most important. We can see increasing the importance of “health” in overall subjective well-being (7.22 ± 1.77).

Table 1

Respondent’s PERMA-profiler scores (March, 2020; March, 2021)

	March, 2020	March, 2021	t- criteria
n	240	232	
PE (M±SD)	7.34±1.52	7.22±1.58	0.05
E (M±SD)	7.34±1.30	7.26±1.29	0.18
R (M±SD)	7.37±2.01	7.07±2.16	0.01
M (M±SD)	6.93±1.62	6.76±1.67	0.03
A (M±SD)	6.78±1.36	6.68±1.38	0.11
H (M±SD)	7.16±1.74	7.22±1.77	0.41
NE (M±SD)	4.73±1.86	4.94±1.87	0.01
L (M±SD)	4.22±2.68	4.54±2.72	0.06
WB (M±SD)	7.13±1.19	6.97±1.26	0.01

Note: Two sided T-test, $\alpha = 0.05$; $t_{critical} = 1.96$

PE - positive emotions, E - engagement, R - relationships, M - meanings, A - accomplishment, H - health, NE - negative emotions, L - loneliness, WB - overall subjective well-being.

But an independent *t*-test revealed that there are no significant differences between all profiles and the overall score of subjective well-being. This means that there were no significant changes in the level of subjective well-being during the year of quarantine, it did not become significantly lower or significantly higher and remained at the same level. We explain this by adaptation to new living conditions and the establishment of relations, by the general optimism of Ukrainian youth and with the change of life priorities during this year. Decrease the subjective well-being at the beginning of quarantine was associated with limited communication, fear for health and limited mobility. In a year the situation has changed, there has been manifested the increasing levels of anxiety during quarantine due to awareness of the difficulties of quarantine life that associated with distance education, financial difficulties and uncertainty about the future. The most important factor of subjective well-being - relationships - during the year of quarantine, of course, has changed due to limited mobility. But Ukrainian students compensated their limited physical mobility by communicating online.

Therefore, Ukrainian students concentrate on the good and they are quite optimistic. However, Ukrainian concept of well-being lacks pragmatism. Their

interpretation of well-being is based on subjective indicators of positive emotions, engagement and relationships, and is less depended on objective criteria such as health or accomplishment. Therefore, the subjective well-being for a Ukrainian is first of all to feel positive emotions and to have good relationships.

References:

1. Hawryluck L., Gold, W. L., Robinson, S., Pogorski, S., Galea, S., Styra, R. (2004). SARS control and psychological effects of quarantine, Toronto, Canada. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 10(7), 1206–1212. doi: 10.3201/eid1007.030703.
2. Fardin, M. A. (2020). COVID-19 and Anxiety: A Review of Psychological Impacts of Infectious Disease Outbreaks. *Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases*. In Press/ DOI - 10.5812/archcid.102779
3. Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C. S., et al. (2020). Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Epidemic among the general population in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(5), 17 – 29. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17051729.
4. Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L. et al. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The LANCET: Rapid Review*, 395 (10227), 912 – 920. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30460-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8)
5. Rubin, G. J., Wessely, S. (2020). The psychological effects of quarantining a city. *British Medical Journal*, 313 - 368. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m313.
6. Bradburn, N. (2016). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Chicago : Aldine.
7. Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276–302. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276
8. Ryff, C. D. & Keyes, C. L., (1995). The Structure of Psychological Well-Being Revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (4), 719 – 727.
9. Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York, NY: Free Press.
10. Butler, J., & Kern, M.L., (2016). The PERMA-Profilier: A brief multidimensional measure of flourishing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 6(3), 1-48. doi:10.5502/ijw.v6i3.526
11. Sheridan, Z., Boman, P., Mergler, A., & Furlong, M. J., (2015). Examining well-being, anxiety, and self-deception in university students. *Cogent Psychology*, Volume 2, Issue 1, 154-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2014.993850>