

DOI:10.31379/sed.2.5.2025.45

UDK: 658.5:004.8:330.341.1

TERNOVA Liudmyla*Candidate of Economic Sciences,**Associate Professor,**Cherkasy State Technological**University**18006, Shevchenko Boulevard, 460,**Cherkasy, Ukraine***ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3395-4025>**E-mail:** ternova21@gmail.com

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE SOCIONOMIC PROFESSION AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PERSONALITY OF A MODERN SPECIALIST

Abstract

The paper substantiates the theoretical and methodological foundations of the socionomic profession and clarifies the requirements for the personality of a modern specialist working in the “human-human” system. The relevance of the topic is determined by the growing social demand for specialists who can provide support, mediation, guidance, social protection, educational assistance, and communicative interaction in situations of uncertainty, pandemic restrictions, wartime stress, displacement, vulnerability, and social crisis. The paper systematizes approaches to the interpretation of socionomy, outlines the criteria and functions of socionomic professions, and analyzes the professional roles of a specialist as a social manager, mediator, mentor, reflective listener, and facilitator of personal development. Particular attention is paid to the personality requirements of the modern socionomic specialist: humanistic orientation, empathy, emotional stability, communicative competence, responsibility, tolerance for uncertainty, reflexivity, moral maturity, and readiness for continuous professional-personal development. The study concludes that the effectiveness of socionomic activity depends not only on formal knowledge and professional technologies, but primarily on the individual properties of the specialist’s personality and the maturity of their ethical position.

Keywords: socionomic profession; helping professions; human-human interaction; empathy; professional-personal development; social work; moral maturity.

JEL Classification: I23, J24, D91

Received: 27/08/2025

Accepted: 19/09/2025

Published: 26/09/2025

© Copyright 2025 by the author(s)



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of [the Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

ТЕРНОВА Людмила
Кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
Черкаський державний
технологічний університет
18006, бульвар Шевченка, 460,
м. Черкаси, Україна
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3395-4025>
E-mail: ternova21@gmail.com

ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ЗАСАДИ СОЦІОНОМІЧНОЇ ПРОФЕСІЇ ТА ВИМОГИ ДО ОСОБИСТОСТІ СУЧАСНОГО ФАХІВЦЯ

Анотація

У статті обґрунтовано теоретико-методологічні засади соціономічної професії та визначено вимоги до особистості сучасного фахівця, діяльність якого здійснюється у системі «людина-людина». Актуальність теми зумовлена зростанням суспільного попиту на фахівців, здатних надавати підтримку, здійснювати медіацію, соціальний супровід, консультування, освітньо-виховну та комунікативну взаємодію в умовах невизначеності, пандемічних обмежень, війни, переміщення населення, вразливості та соціальних криз. У статті систематизовано підходи до тлумачення поняття «соціономія», визначено критерії та функції соціономічних професій, проаналізовано професійні ролі фахівця як соціального менеджера, медіатора, ментора, рефлексивного слухача та фасилітатора особистісного розвитку. Особливу увагу приділено гуманістичній спрямованості, емпатії, емоційній стійкості, комунікативній компетентності, відповідальності, толерантності до невизначеності, рефлексивності, моральній зрілості та готовності до професійно-особистісного розвитку. Зроблено висновок, що результативність соціономічної діяльності залежить не лише від професійних знань і технологій, а передусім від індивідуальних властивостей особистості фахівця та зрілості його етичної позиції.

Ключові слова: соціономічна професія; допомагаючі професії; взаємодія «людина-людина»; емпатія; професійно-особистісний розвиток; соціальна робота; моральна зрілість.

JEL Classification: I23, J24, D91

Подано: 18/08/2025
Прийнято: 19/09/2025
Опубліковано: 26/09/2025

© Copyright 2025 by the author(s)



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of [the Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Introduction

The contemporary social environment has intensified the need to reconsider the nature, functions, and personal foundations of the socio-economic profession. Over recent years, the working conditions of specialists whose professional activity is directly connected with people have changed significantly. The COVID-19 pandemic, quarantine restrictions, limitations on mobility and live communication, and, since 2022, the security situation caused by the full-scale war in Ukraine have transformed the conditions under which

DOI: 10.31379/sed.2.5.2025.45

social, educational, psychological, consultative, and protective services are provided. These circumstances have increased not only the amount of social need, but also the complexity of the situations in which people seek help. In periods of panic, constant stress, social disorientation, forced displacement, loss of work, traumatic experience, and uncertainty, specialists of the socio-economic sphere become a crucial resource for preserving human dignity and social cohesion.

The term “socioeconomy” is interpreted in scholarly discourse as originating from the Latin words *societas*, meaning society, and *norma*, meaning rule. In this literal sense, socioeconomy can be understood as a doctrine of society and social regulation (Moreno, 1951). At the same time, scholarly discussion emphasizes that the term still lacks a single universally accepted definition in pedagogical and psychological dictionaries. This absence of a fixed definition is methodologically important: it demonstrates that socioeconomy is not merely a narrow professional label, but a developing interdisciplinary field that unites social work, pedagogy, psychology, sociology, management, communication, mediation, and related forms of human support.

The urgency of the topic is also related to the modernization of professional training. Ukrainian society requires specialists who are able to work not only with standard social problems, but also with crisis-related cases that combine psychological tension, economic vulnerability, legal uncertainty, family disruption, loss of social ties, and the need for immediate support. Consequently, the question of what kind of person can effectively perform socio-economic work becomes as important as the question of what knowledge should be included in professional education. The modern socio-economic specialist must combine professional competence with empathy, moral responsibility, reflexivity, emotional stability, communicative flexibility, tolerance for uncertainty, and a clear humanistic orientation.

Socio-economic activity is often considered through the prism of helping behavior: social, psychological, consultative, educational, and other forms of support (Rogers, 1961). At the same time, the socio-economic sphere is broader than direct assistance. It includes learning, upbringing, socialization, development, regulation of social interaction, and the formation of conditions in which a person can restore their capacity for action. This broader interpretation is especially relevant in contemporary Ukraine, where the practical tasks of social support are inseparable from the tasks of social adaptation, resilience, communication, and the preservation of humane values.

The problem is therefore not limited to the description of professional functions. It concerns the theoretical and methodological foundations of the profession itself: what makes a profession socio-economic, what distinguishes it from other types of professional activity, how helping interaction becomes a professional form of activity, and what personal qualities are necessary for such work. The answer to these questions is significant for higher education, for the professional identity of future specialists, and for the development of social policy and institutional support systems.

Literature review

The analysis of scientific sources shows that the concept of socioeconomy is approached through several interrelated theoretical perspectives (Moreno, 1951). The first perspective is sociological and is associated with J. L. Moreno, who interpreted socioeconomy as a science of social laws underlying the development of society. In this view, the social world is not a random aggregation of individual actions; it is regulated by principles, norms, values, and mechanisms of interaction that can be studied and used to understand human relations (Moreno, 1951). This interpretation is important because it places socio-economic activity within the broader context of social order, social interaction, and the regulation of collective life.

A second perspective is represented by T. Branitska, who defines socioeconomy through the observance of established laws, rules, systems of values, and public views (Branitska, 2012). In the context of social work, this interpretation links socioeconomy with specific professional activity aimed at providing social and socio-educational services (Branitska, 2012). Such an approach makes it possible to understand the socio-economic profession not only as activity “about people,” but as a regulated and value-based activity “for

people,” in which professional action is oriented toward protection, support, development, and the restoration of social functioning.

A third perspective is connected with the concept of helping relationships (Rogers, 1961). C. Rogers described helping relationships as those in which one party seeks to promote the development, personal growth, communication ability, and more comfortable existence of another person (Rogers, 1961). In the context of socio-economic professions, this idea clarifies the transition from ordinary interpersonal support to professional helping activity. Helping becomes a profession when the subject of assistance acts purposefully, uses specialized knowledge and skills, applies appropriate technologies of support, and understands the ethical responsibility of intervention in another person's life.

The literature also includes the work of S. Arkhipova, who studied the theoretical and applied aspects of helping professions (Stamatopoulou, G., 2024). According to this approach, helping activity is directed toward a person in difficult or critical life situations and aims to mobilize internal psychological resources as well as to provide informational, material, social, emotional, intellectual, legal, physical, or other necessary resources (Stamatopoulou, G., 2024). This multidimensional interpretation is valuable because it shows that the socio-economic profession cannot be reduced to a single technique or service. It is an integrated form of interaction in which the specialist helps a person restore agency and dignity under challenging circumstances.

The professional field of socio-economic work is commonly described as the “human-human” system. L. Burkova defines socio-economic professions as those that solve professional tasks related to complex social relations in society, including development, regulation, research of social patterns and tendencies, and the preservation or transformation of culturally accepted forms of interaction (Burkova, 2010). Similar emphasis is found in works that analyze the communicative nature of such professions: the person or group of people is not merely the environment of work, but its direct object and subject. The outcome of work is therefore inseparable from communication, interpretation, trust, dialogue, and the mutual activity of participants.

Researchers also emphasize that socio-economic professions have specific criteria (Hvozdi, 2016). They involve goals such as education, upbringing, management, control, assessment, service, support, and social protection. Their means include verbal and nonverbal communication, direct and mediated contact, consultation, diagnosis, reflection, and organizational influence. Their working conditions include socio-psychological, regime-hygienic, technical-economic, and institutional dimensions. Their product of labor is not rigidly standardized, because human interaction is creative, situational, and dependent on the active response of another person or group. This explains why the individual qualities of the specialist have particular importance in socio-economic activity (Burkova, 2010).

A significant group of studies focuses on the personal and professional qualities required of socio-economic specialists. G. Dubchak emphasizes that the professional activity of specialists in socio-economic professions consists in the conscious application of professional competencies during direct interaction with people who need help; its purpose is to provide physical, social, and psychological support in order to improve quality of life (Dubchak, 2015). V. Korneshchuk, in turn, stresses the role of both formalized ethical norms and informal professional expectations that operate in the professional environment (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2024). These approaches highlight the moral and normative nature of socio-economic work.

Communication competence is one of the central dimensions of the literature. L. Berezovska analyzes the formation of communicative-speech competence of social workers (Berezovska, 2020), while O. Korchova interprets rhetorical competence as a component of the professional training of social educators (Korchova, 2013). T. Branitska also argues that communication is both a means and an instrument of professional activity for specialists of socio-economic professions such as psychologists, social workers, and managers [(Branitska, 2012). Therefore, the ability to establish, maintain, and develop relationships with people becomes a condition of professional effectiveness rather than an additional skill.

The literature review also shows that the socio-economic specialist performs multiple professional roles. O.

Pryshliak notes that in everyday professional activity a number of socio-economic specialists act as a “wise adviser,” although the deeper professional task is to activate the creative potential of the individual (Pryshliak, 2021). A wider list of roles can be distinguished: social manager, reflective listener, friend, mediator, mentor, and animator or facilitator. In the context of this paper, the most methodologically significant roles are social manager, mediator, mentor, and reflective listener, because they reveal the combination of organizational, communicative, ethical, and developmental dimensions of socio-economic work. Finally, contemporary studies emphasize professional-personal development. V. Korneshchuk, I. Popovych, T. Tiulpa, O. Tiupia, O. Faierman, and O. Bila connect the effectiveness of socio-economic professions with readiness for self-development, psychological stability, competence, project activity, reflexivity, and the capacity to act in situations of social uncertainty (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2024; Korneshchuk, 2010; Tiulpa, 2020; Tiuptia, 1999; Faiermen, 2021; Bila, 2013). This literature supports the conclusion that the personality of the specialist is not an external condition of professional activity but one of its central instruments. In socio-economic work, the specialist’s worldview, values, emotional regulation, communicative behavior, and moral maturity directly influence the quality of professional outcomes.

Aims and Objectives

The aim of the paper is to substantiate the theoretical and methodological foundations of the socio-economic profession and to determine the requirements for the personality of a modern specialist in the context of contemporary social crises, including pandemic consequences and wartime uncertainty.

The objectives of the paper are: to systematize approaches to the definition of “socio-economy” and the socio-economic profession; to clarify the criteria and functions of socio-economic professions as activity in the “human-human” system; to analyze the professional roles of the specialist as a social manager, mediator, mentor, and reflective listener; to identify the main personal and professional qualities required for effective socio-economic work; and to formulate a theoretical conclusion about the dependence of such activity on individual personality traits and moral maturity.

Methods

The study is theoretical and analytical in nature. It synthesizes scholarly positions on the genesis of the socio-economic profession, the personality of the specialist, and professional-personal development. The paper does not introduce new statistical data and does not reinterpret empirical indicators beyond the analyzed scientific literature.

The methodological basis includes analysis, synthesis, generalization, comparison, and structural-logical interpretation. Analysis was used to identify the main theoretical positions concerning the genesis of the concept of the socio-economic profession and the nature of helping activity. Synthesis was used to connect sociological, psychological, pedagogical, communicative, and ethical approaches into a coherent understanding of the profession. Generalization made it possible to formulate criteria, functions, roles, and personality requirements. Comparison was applied to distinguish ordinary interpersonal assistance from professional helping activity. Structural-logical interpretation was used to arrange the results according to the structure required for the journal paper.

Results

The first result of the study is the clarification of the conceptual field of socio-economy (Moreno, 1951; Branitska, 2012). The analysis shows that socio-economy should be understood as an interdisciplinary field that studies social relations, social norms, human interaction, and the professional forms of assistance aimed at solving complex social problems. Its methodological specificity lies in the fact that it combines the study of society with practical activity directed toward a person or group experiencing social, psychological, educational, communicative, or material difficulties. Therefore, the socio-economic profession is not limited to one institutional sector. It includes social work, social pedagogy, psychology, education, mediation,

counseling, management, healthcare-related communication, legal support, and other activities where the main professional content is interaction with people.

The second result concerns the criteria of socio-economic professions (Burkova, 2010; Hvozdi, 2016). Such professions operate in the “human-human” system. Their object and subject of work are people who possess their own activity, motivation, expectations, evaluations, and possible resistance. This is fundamentally different from professions where the product of labor is material, technical, or strictly measurable. In socio-economic work, the “product” is often a change in the person’s condition, social situation, understanding, behavior, adaptation, motivation, or capacity for self-development. Because this result cannot be fully standardized, the professional must be capable of flexible decision-making, ethical reflection, individualized communication, and adaptation to a changing situation.

The third result is the identification of key functions (Branitska, 2012; Pryshliak, 2021; (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2024). On the basis of the analyzed literature, the functions of socio-economic professions include timely identification of urgent problems and difficult life circumstances; development of methodological and technological support for solving these problems; diagnosis of interpersonal and social difficulties; education and upbringing of children and youth; comprehensive support for socially vulnerable persons and groups; facilitation of intercultural dialogue; formation of tolerance; and support for the acquisition of cultural and social values. These functions show that the socio-economic specialist works not only at the level of individual assistance, but also at the level of social integration and the preservation of humane relations.

The fourth result is the interpretation of helping behavior as a professional activity (Rogers, 1961; Stamatopoulou, G., 2024). In everyday life, help may be spontaneous, emotional, and based on personal sympathy. In socio-economic professions, however, helping activity is purposeful, methodologically grounded, ethically regulated, and based on specialized knowledge and skills. The specialist does not simply “comfort” or “advise”; they assess the situation, establish contact, identify needs and resources, select appropriate methods, accompany the person or group, support decision-making, and evaluate the effectiveness of assistance. This distinction is essential because it prevents the reduction of socio-economic work to kindness alone. Humanistic orientation is necessary, but it must be supported by professional competence.

The fifth result concerns professional roles (Pryshliak, 2021). The role of the social manager emphasizes the capacity to organize processes, coordinate resources, connect people with institutions, plan assistance, and ensure the continuity of support. This role is especially important in crisis conditions, where the client’s needs may simultaneously include psychological support, social protection, access to services, documentation, education, employment, and family assistance. The social manager role requires systemic thinking, responsibility, the ability to cooperate with other specialists, and an understanding of institutional mechanisms.

The role of mediator reflects the need to work with conflict, misunderstanding, divergent interests, and social tension. A mediator in the socio-economic sphere does not impose a decision but creates conditions for dialogue, clarifies positions, reduces emotional escalation, and helps participants find acceptable solutions. In wartime and post-crisis contexts, mediation becomes particularly relevant because social relations are often marked by trauma, loss, displacement, changes in family roles, and tension between individual needs and institutional possibilities. The mediator’s effectiveness depends on neutrality, empathy, communicative accuracy, ethical restraint, and the ability to tolerate uncertainty.

The role of mentor reveals the developmental dimension of socio-economic work. A mentor helps a person recognize resources, define goals, interpret experience, and build a trajectory of growth. This role is not identical to directive instruction. It presupposes partnership, respect for autonomy, support for self-efficacy, and the gradual transfer of responsibility to the person receiving assistance. In this sense, mentoring is close to the humanistic logic of helping relationships: the specialist creates conditions in which the client, student, family, or community can develop their own capacity for action.

The role of reflective listener is one of the most important for the personality of a socio-economic specialist (Pryshliak, 2021). Listening is not a passive act; it is a professional skill that includes attention, empathy,

interpretation, clarification, emotional containment, and the ability to hear both the explicit message and the hidden meaning of a person's experience. Reflective listening makes it possible to avoid premature judgment, to understand the client's life world, and to support the person's dignity. Modern professional discourse emphasizes that society needs specialists who can not only speak but also listen and understand others. This requirement is both communicative and moral.

The sixth result is the systematization of personality requirements (Dubchak, 2015; Faiermen, 2021). The modern socio-economic specialist must have a humanistic orientation, because the purpose of the profession is to support human welfare, dignity, development, and social inclusion. They must have empathy, because without the capacity to understand another person's emotional and social situation, professional interaction becomes formal and ineffective. They must have emotional stability, because socio-economic work often involves stress, conflict, trauma, uncertainty, and responsibility for vulnerable persons. They must have communicative competence, because communication is the main instrument of work. They must have reflexivity, because the specialist's own attitudes, emotions, and decisions influence the process of assistance.

Tolerance for uncertainty is a separate requirement (Branitska, 2012; Faiermen, 2021). Social interaction in socio-economic professions is marked by creativity, individuality, and unpredictability of results. A person who seeks help is not a passive object of intervention but an active participant with their own history, will, limitations, and resistance. Therefore, the specialist cannot rely only on rigid algorithms. They must be able to act in open situations, make responsible decisions without complete information, revise their actions, and preserve ethical orientation when the result is not immediately visible.

Moral maturity is the integrating quality of the socio-economic specialist (Dubchak, 2015; (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2024). It includes responsibility, respect for the dignity of others, justice, tolerance, decency, kindness, professional honesty, and awareness of the limits of one's competence. Moral maturity prevents manipulation, paternalism, emotional exploitation, and the replacement of professional support with personal domination. It also supports the specialist's resilience, because a clear ethical position helps preserve meaning in emotionally difficult work. For this reason, the analysis leads to the conclusion that the effectiveness of socio-economic activity depends primarily on the personal maturity of the specialist.

The seventh result concerns professional-personal development (Bila, 2013). Current educational discourse emphasizes that in the context of European integration and modernization of education, the state system of education should prepare highly qualified specialists capable of independent productive activity, creative self-improvement, and self-development. For the socio-economic sphere, professional-personal development means the continuous integration of knowledge, skills, values, experience, reflection, and self-regulation. It is not completed at graduation. Since social problems, technologies, institutional requirements, and human needs constantly change, the specialist must remain open to learning and self-correction throughout professional life.

Professional-personal development also includes the prevention of professional deformation and burnout (Dubchak, 2015; (Tiuptia, 1999)]. Socio-economic specialists face constant emotional involvement, responsibility, exposure to other people's suffering, and the need to make decisions under pressure. Without self-regulation, supervision, reflective practice, and institutional support, the same qualities that make helping possible may become a source of exhaustion. Therefore, the development of emotional stability, boundaries, ethical self-awareness, and self-care should be considered not as private matters but as components of professional reliability.

Taken together, these results allow the socio-economic profession to be defined as a human-centered, value-based, communicative, and ethically responsible form of professional activity aimed at solving social problems, supporting personal development, and improving the quality of life of individuals and groups. Its effectiveness is determined by the unity of professional knowledge, communicative technologies, institutional competence, and the personality of the specialist.

Discussion

DOI: 10.31379/sed.2.5.2025.45

The obtained results make it possible to rethink the socio-economic profession as an activity in which the boundary between professional competence and personality is especially thin. In many professions, the personal qualities of the employee may influence the quality of work, but the main product can still be evaluated independently of interpersonal interaction. In socio-economic professions, however, the process of interaction is itself a central part of the result. The way the specialist listens, responds, explains, supports, mediates, and regulates emotions directly shapes the client's experience of help.

This does not mean that personality replaces professional knowledge. On the contrary, the paper shows that humanistic qualities must be professionalized. Empathy must be connected with analytical thinking; kindness must be connected with responsibility; flexibility must be connected with ethical boundaries; tolerance for uncertainty must be connected with methodological competence. The modern socio-economic specialist therefore needs a complex professional identity that combines compassion and discipline, responsiveness and reflection, autonomy and institutional accountability.

The Ukrainian context gives this problem special significance. Pandemic restrictions and war have transformed the conditions of social interaction. Many people face simultaneous psychological, economic, family, legal, educational, and health-related difficulties. Such complexity requires specialists who can work across disciplinary boundaries and who can preserve human-centered communication even when institutions are overloaded. The analyzed material shows that under crisis conditions socio-economic specialists become not only providers of services, but also carriers of social trust, stability, and moral support.

At the theoretical level, the study supports an interdisciplinary understanding of socio-economics (Burkova, 2010; Korneshchuk, 2010). The profession cannot be adequately explained by sociology alone, psychology alone, pedagogy alone, or social work alone. It requires a methodological synthesis that accounts for social norms, interpersonal communication, personal development, ethical responsibility, institutional support, and the cultural meaning of assistance. This synthesis is the basis for understanding why the requirements for the personality of the specialist are so high.

At the practical level, the findings indicate that professional training should include not only knowledge of legislation, methods, technologies, and service systems, but also structured development of communication, empathy, emotional regulation, reflexivity, mediation, conflict resolution, and ethical decision-making. Modern professional education should form specialists capable of acting in dynamic and non-standard social situations. Therefore, educational programs for socio-economic professions should integrate theoretical learning, practical cases, reflective assignments, supervision, and value-oriented training.

The limitation of this paper is its theoretical character. It is based on theoretical analysis and synthesis of scholarly material rather than on new empirical research. However, this limitation corresponds to the purpose of the paper, which is to provide theoretical and methodological substantiation. Further research may empirically examine how specific personality qualities of socio-economic specialists influence professional outcomes, client trust, burnout risk, and the effectiveness of support in crisis conditions.

Conclusions

Conclusions

The study establishes that the socio-economic profession is an interdisciplinary human-centered profession operating in the "human-human" system and aimed at solving complex social problems, supporting personal development, and improving the quality of life of individuals and groups. Its theoretical and methodological foundations are formed at the intersection of sociology, social work, psychology, pedagogy, communication studies, ethics, and professional education.

The paper clarifies that the criteria of socio-economic professions include direct interaction with people, communicative mediation, the active participation of the person or group receiving assistance, situational uncertainty, and the absence of rigidly standardized requirements for the product of labor. The main functions of these professions include identification of difficult life circumstances, social and psychological support, education, upbringing, mediation, diagnosis of interpersonal problems, protection of vulnerable groups, and facilitation of social integration.

DOI: 10.31379/sed.2.5.2025.45

The professional roles of the modern socioeconomic specialist include social manager, mediator, mentor, and reflective listener (Pryshliak, 2021). These roles demonstrate that the specialist must simultaneously organize support, regulate interaction, guide development, and create a communicative space in which another person can be heard, understood, and empowered.

The key requirements for the personality of such a specialist are humanistic orientation, empathy, emotional stability, communicative competence, responsibility, reflexivity, tolerance for uncertainty, ethical awareness, and moral maturity (Dubchak, 2015; Fairmen, 2021). These qualities are not secondary additions to professional knowledge; they are integral conditions of professional effectiveness.

The general conclusion is that the activity of socioeconomic specialists depends above all on the individual properties of the personality and the degree of moral maturity. Professional technologies, methods, and institutional resources are necessary, but they become effective only when implemented by a specialist capable of humane, responsible, reflective, and ethically grounded interaction with another person.

References

1. Moreno, J. L. (1951). *Sociometry, experimental method and the science of society: An approach to a new political orientation*. Beacon House. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/search?query=Sociometry%20experimental%20method%20and%20the%20science%20of%20society%20Moreno> [in English].
2. Branitska, T. R. (2012). Zahalna kharakterystyka fakhivtsia sotsionomichnoi profesii [General characteristics of a specialist in a socioeconomic profession]. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats Khmelnytskoho instytutu sotsialnykh tekhnologii Universytetu "Ukraina"*, (6), 25–28. Retrieved from URL: <https://pedbezpeka.vntu.edu.ua/index.php/b/article/download/15/7/15>. [in Ukrainian].
3. Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/onbecomingperson00roge> [in English].
4. Stamatopoulou, G., Tsouparopoulou, E., & Symeonaki, M. (2024). Educational status as a mediator of intergenerational social mobility in Europe: A positional analysis approach. *Mathematics*, 12(7), 966. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/math12070966> [in English].
5. Burkova, L. V. (2010). Vyznachennia klasu sotsionomichnykh profesii [Definition of the class of socioeconomic professions]. *Praktychna psykholohiia ta sotsialna robota*, (7), 68–73. [in Ukrainian].
6. Hvozdi, S. P. (2016). Pidhotovka maibutnykh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnykh spetsialnostei do bezpeky zhyttia i profesiinoi diialnosti yak sotsialno-pedahohichna problema [Training of future specialists in socioeconomic specialties for life safety and professional activity as a socio-pedagogical problem]. *Pedahohika bezpeky*, (1), 40–47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31649/2524-1079-2016-1-1-40-47> [in Ukrainian].
7. Dubchak, H. M. (2015). Porivnialnyi analiz stresostiikosti maibutnykh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnykh profesii [Comparative analysis of stress resistance of future specialists in socioeconomic professions]. *Actual Problems of Psychology*, 5(15), 43–50. Retrieved from https://www.newlearning.org.ua/sites/default/files/praci/actual_problems_of_psychology_2015_v5_i_15_p43-50.pdf. [in Ukrainian].
8. Berezovska, L. I. (2020). *Formuvannia komunikatyvno-movlennievoi kompetentnosti sotsialnykh pratsivnykiv u protsesi profesiinoi pidhotovky* [Formation of communicative and speech competence of social workers in the process of professional training]. NAIR. [in Ukrainian].
9. Korchova, O. M. (2013). Rytorychna kompetentnist yak skladnyk profesiinoi pidhotovky sotsialnykh pedahohiv [Rhetorical competence as a component of professional training of social educators]. *Visnyk Hlukhivskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Oleksandra Dovzhenka*, (22), 23–28. [in Ukrainian].

10. Pryshliak, O. Yu. (2021). Formuvannia mizhkulturnoi kompetentnosti maibutnikh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnykh profesii: teoretychnyi kontekst [Formation of intercultural competence of future specialists in socio-economic professions: theoretical context: monograph]. Osadtsa Yu. V.. [in Ukrainian].

11. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2024). *Assessment of the impact of the war on micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises*. UNDP. URL: <https://www.undp.org/ukraine/publications/assessment-impact-of-war-on-micro-small-and-medium-sized-enterprises-in-ukraine> [in English].

12. Korneshchuk, V. V. (2010). Teoriia i praktyka formuvannia profesiinoi nadiinosti maibutnikh spetsialistiv sotsionomichnoi sfery diialnosti [Theory and practice of forming professional reliability of future specialists in the socio-economic sphere of activity: abstract of doctoral dissertation]. Odesa. [in Ukrainian].

13. Tiulpa, T. M. (2020). Sotsionomichna sfera yak pole dlia formuvannia sotsialnoi kompetentnosti maibutnikh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnykh spetsialnostei [The socio-economic sphere as a field for forming social competence

of future specialists in socio-economic specialties]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*, 27(5), 133–137. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.5/27.204502> [in Ukrainian].

14. Tiuptia, O. V. (1999). Formuvannia psykholohichnoi hotovnosti do sotsionomichnoi profesiinoi diialnosti [Formation of psychological readiness for socio-economic professional activity: abstract of candidate dissertation in psychological sciences]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].

15. Faiermen, O. O. (2021). Do pytannia pro vymohy do maibutnikh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnoi sfery [On the requirements for future specialists in the socio-economic sphere]. *Visnyk Universytetu imeni Alfreda Nobelia. Seriiia "Pedahohika i psykholohiia"*, 2(22), 293–298. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/2522-4115-2021-2-22-32> [in Ukrainian].

16. Bila, O. O. (2013). Pidhotovka maibutnikh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnoi sfery do proektuvannia profesiinoi diialnosti: teoriia i praktyka [Training of future specialists in the socio-economic sphere for designing professional activity: theory and practice: monograph]. Astroprint. [in Ukrainian].

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Ternova Liudmyla

Data curation: Ternova Liudmyla

Formal Analysis: Ternova Liudmyla

Methodology: Ternova Liudmyla

Resources: Ternova Liudmyla

Supervision: Ternova Liudmyla

Validation: Ternova Liudmyla

Investigation: Ternova Liudmyla

Visualization: Ternova Liudmyla

Project administration: Ternova Liudmyla

Funding acquisition: –

Writing – review & editing: Ternova Liudmyla

Writing – original draft: Ternova Liudmyla

FUNDING

The authors received no funding for this article.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

DOI: 10.31379/sed.2.5.2025.45