International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Vol. 24, Issue 08, 2020
ISSN: 1475-7192

Innovative Personality as a Social Type in the Transition to an Innovative Way of Development

[1]Yuliya Aleksandrovna Petrovskaya

Abstract: *Modern society of innovative technologies makes new demands on personal qualities and competencies that characterize personality as innovative. Traditional sociological approaches to the structure and typology of personality do not correspond to the objectively developed social reality and the level of achievements of modern cognitive sciences. The aim of the research is to determine the key characteristics of innovative personality as a social type in the society of innovative technologies and the conditions of its formation in the context of Russian civilization. The used research methods: theoretical analysis, secondary analysis of empirical descriptions, survey methods allowed to achieve this goal.*

Keywords*: innovative personality, technological revolution, innovative society, social type*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the context of the ongoing tectonic social shifts, scientists are increasingly expressing concern about the fate of sociological science. Honored Professor of sociology R. Jenkins writes: "If we want to abandon both the pursuit of illusory novelty and the solipsistic, alien to the empiricism of theoretical greatness, we need to get used to a modest idea: we have a whole toolkit of basic concepts and methods to document and analyze the human world in its change. In this context, sociology appears to be an intellectually acute and methodologically strong analytical and critical commentary on the human world and its changes, an invaluable contribution to the historical chronicle" (Jenkins, 2015).

In the context of the accelerating change of innovation cycles, science increasingly needs, on the one hand, a timely understanding of the ongoing social processes, and on the other hand, to return to the issues of social ontology, the nature of social phenomena in need of sociological reflection: personality, society, social structure, etc. Let's turn, for example, to the question of what an innovative personality is. What does this concept mean in modern reality? Where are its semantic boundaries and what are the typological characteristics of the innovative personality of the XXI century?

II. Theoretical and methodological bases of research

In fact, the theory of innovative personality is not presented in modern sociology. This is due to many circumstances. First, the discovery of new information about human nature and personality structure, thanks to scientific discoveries in the field of biology and biotechnology, including The Human Genome Project, HGP. (Human Genome Project Information, 2020). Secondly, the incomplete development of the international project "Human Connectome",

[1] Department of Sociology and Social Work, Petrozavodsk State University, Institute of History, Political and Social Sciences; 33 Lenin ave., Petrozavodsk, Russia

Received: 27 Mar 2020 | Revised: 20 Apr 2020 | Accepted: 05 May 2020

which in the future will give new data about the architecture of human neural connections. (Human Connectome Project, 2020). Third, the opposition of different approaches in sociological theory.

The theoretical and methodological basis of the research is a synergistic approach to the analysis of social phenomena and processes, the world-system analysis of I. Wallerstein, and the understanding of the innovative personality as a special social type. So, we use so called "fifth generation" theories that study nonlinear socio-cultural dynamics and processes of self-organization of society. In this research, based on the theory of innovation Y. Schumpeter, we follow the civilizational approach to the analysis of innovation cycles.

What is the nature of an innovative personality? This phenomenon can and should be considered from different perspectives: from the point of view of the possession of certain (innovative) qualities, as well as from the point of view of belonging to a civilization of innovation, innovative society, and the possession of innovative warehouse in accordance with the requirements of time and level of technological development. The first approach focuses us on the fact that there is a separate category of individuals who can be considered “innovators” because of their personal characteristics, which can be applied in specific areas of life as efficiently as possible. The second approach suggests that it makes sense to study the innovative personality as a special social type only in the civilizational context from the point of view of the stage of social and technological development of particular society, taking into account its socio-historical experience and civilizational foundations. At each stage of technological development of society there are own ideas of what is the innovative personality, how it is formed and what qualities has to possess according to requirements of time and the tasks facing society and the state. Modern society needs a completely different type of personality, a person of innovative warehouse.

Nevertheless, the reasoning about the essence of the innovative personality should begin with the statement of the fact that the concepts of “innovation”, “innovative activity”, “innovative personality” in the scientific literature are quite widespread and in different senses, which often creates additional methodological difficulties. Quite often in the scientific literature it is possible to read that modern transformations in various spheres of social life are connected with activity of so-called innovative persons, individuals occupied with development and introduction of innovations. There is a feeling that with the help of a different terminology, modern scientists describe phenomenon which was comprehensively studied a few decades ago, and in the modern sense, the innovative personality still remains the creator of innovation. At the same time, it is necessary to have a deep understanding of the essence of the innovative personality as not just a developer of innovations, but a special social type of personality inherent and required by society at a particular stage of technological development. For Russian society, the mass formation of innovative personality in the XXI century and its spread as a type in all spheres of public life becomes a condition that gives the opportunity to become innovative.

Modern society is in a state of global social changes occurring at an unprecedented rate (Buzgalin and Kolganov, 2019). In the context of modern civilization, the driving force is new technologies and institutional changes occurring in connection with technological development. Describing modern technological processes, it is appropriate to use the concept of “epoch-making innovations” of the Nobel laureate in Economics S. Kuznets, who used this term in 1971 to refer to coups that occur every few centuries and fundamentally change society.

Global trends of innovative development of humanity in the XXI century become one of the most important factors that change the structure and content of the entire civilization. The formation, dynamics, and transformations of this form of globalization (Yanitsky, 2019) reflect the main trends in the cyclical development of the world economy and its innovative component.

One of the successful, from a methodological point of view, definition of innovation gives V.I. Lisov: "innovation is a process aimed at the implementation of the results of completed research and development or other scientific and technical achievements into a new or improved product sold on the market, into a new or improved technological process used in practice." In other words, innovation is a product created in the process of innovation, which really gives a qualitatively different commercial or practical significance (Lisov, 2004). One of the methodological problems is to establish a link between the sphere of research and development and real social processes, the needs of society in the sphere of production, education, social technologies, etc. (Neto, 2018). Among the conditions that affect the efficiency of this process, of course, the presence of certain organizational structures that are included in the innovation space. However, according to V.N. Shevchenko, the key aspect are the people capable to carry out this interrelation (Shevchenko, 2010), and it is difficult to disagree with this statement.

Thus, the cognitive problem is connected with the fact that the emergence of innovative personality and its allocation as a special social type does not coincide with the previously established approaches to the social typology of personality. At the same time, if the Russian society sets itself the task of transition to an innovative way of development, the society and its members need to focus on continuous innovative development in all spheres of public life. Such a result can be achieved only through a purposeful, carefully thought-out policy of influence not only on individual elements of the innovation space, but also on the entire population taking into account the mental characteristics and historical experience of the country. Modernization has not only an economic but also a social dimension. The decisive role in these processes may belong to the system of education, primarily higher education, which also needs serious reform, as one of the civilizational foundations.

Analyzing empirical descriptions of innovative personality through the prism of general sociological personality, V.N. Shevchenko identifies several main features of an innovative personality, and, accordingly, the tasks associated with its formation: the ability to create; the presence of a certain intellectual resource; social maturity as a willingness to innovate; the ability and willingness to work in a collective subject of innovation. The most important feature of an innovative personality is creativity, but not just as a term, but as a quality that implies a different side of mental activity than the universal scientific understanding of creativity. Among all these qualities, the most significant is social maturity as a readiness for innovation, for conscious activity in a risk society, the willingness to take this risk and take responsibility, including for the results of innovation.

In Russian practice, the development of innovation in the human (in any sphere of life) faces difficulties. This is understandable from the point of view of traditions, social and historical experience of Russian society, including a number of periods of anomie. Traditionalist thinking provokes fear of novelty, lack of desire for new, alertness. The analysis of the results of research and expert assessments leads to a conclusion about the high degree of conservatism of the Russian personality. According to the director of "Levada center" L. Gudkov, "the Soviet man is not going anywhere". The reason for this is not only the special values and personal qualities with which modern youth enters society, but also the immutability of basic social institutions (Gudkov, 2018). In continuation of this thesis we would like to cite the results of empirical research conducted in 2018-2019 in Republic of Karelia (A. Yumashev, E. Koneva, M. Borodina, D. Lipson, A. Nedosugova, 2019).

III. Materials and methods

Young people are traditionally considered to be one of the most mobile groups of the population, the most easily and quickly adapting to the changes dictated by social and technological development. The key competencies

that need to be formed in today's youth as a subject of innovative activity in the digital economy are formulated in the "Strategy of innovative development of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2020" adopted in 2011 (Strategy of Innovative Development of the Russian Federation for the Period up to 2020, 2018). Thus, the state forms a request for a certain type of personality corresponding to the transition period from the fifth to the sixth technological order, and the society sets the framework of personal characteristics that will allow the individual to exist and realize himself as comfortable as possible in the conditions of the transition period. However, there are alarming signals indicating a certain degree of maladaptation of young people in rapidly changing conditions of public life. Part of the young population shows dependent positions (parasitic attitude) and moods expressed in the reluctance to learn, work, engage in socially useful activities, characterized in the European scientific literature by the abbreviation NEET (Powel, 2018).

Online survey of young people from 14 to 30 years (1100 people selected by the method of spontaneous selection); expert survey in the form of interviews (15 people; the selection of respondents was carried out by the method of "snowball"), as well as a survey of University teachers (100 people selected using the available array method) were conducted in 2018-2019. The experts were the heads and specialists of organizations and departments working directly with young people in the field of youth initiatives, innovative projects and programs, including employees of the Youth innopark and the Department for innovation and production activities of the Petrozavodsk State University, representatives of government agencies and public organizations.

The gender structure of the youth sample is 75.5% of girls and 24.5% of young men. By age, the respondents were divided into groups from 14 to 17 years, from 18 to 21 years, from 22 to 25 years and from 26 to 30 years in approximately equal shares. The largest age group (41%) were young people from 18 to 21 years. The survey was conducted using an electronic questionnaire developed using the Internet service Google Forms. The questionnaire was distributed to young people in social networks, where the most active users are young people aged 18 to 21. At the time of the survey 32.5% of respondents were enrolled in high school; 25.5% of the unemployed; 24% were enrolled in school; and 11.8% were enrolled in secondary professional education institutions; and 3.3% identified themselves as unemployed; 1.6 percent were enrolled in institutions of primary professional education. The remaining young people chose to answer the option "other", which turned out to be "maternity leave", "disability" and "military service". Representatives of all regions of the Republic took part in the survey.

IV. Results

Among the respondents, the majority records the presence of most of the qualities and competencies required by an innovative society. However, it is worth noting that the level of formation of such important qualities as innovation and high level of intelligence, young people assesses quite modestly. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that these are only the results of self-assessment of young people. The vast majority of young people (95%) have an interest in learning something new, but not everyone wants to create something new themselves. A little more than half (61%) of respondents are engaged in creativity. Among the obstacles to creativity often sounded: lack of time, laziness, lack of creativity. The answer options related to the lack of conditions for creative activities in the locality and the lack of funds were not excluded. Not all young people, in their opinion, easily adapt to the changes taking place in their lives. 50% said that adaptation depends on the severity of the changes.

Performing any educational, working or creative tasks, respondents prefer different forms of work in approximately equal shares: alone; alone, but under the guidance of a more experienced person; in a team. The most common foreign language spoken by young people – English, but the level of proficiency on average rated them at 3

points. However, almost 27 per cent indicated that they did not speak any foreign languages. 70% of young people, according to them, would like to learn throughout life, constantly improve their intellectual level. According to the results of subjective self-assessment, only 20% of young people own a computer skill for 5 points. The majority (49%) rated this competence by 4 points. Describing grading policy, a score of 0 is set to "not speak", and 5 points is set to "speak perfectly". Active life position and help to other people is an important quality of innovative personality, but 60% of respondents do not participate in the activities of any public organizations, movements, volunteer groups, etc.

According to the survey, the school, according to the feelings of young people, is not an active subject in informing students about innovations in society but allows them to implement their own innovative projects and ideas. The situation is much better at the University (the question was answered only by graduates or students of the University). However, almost 80% of respondents do not have their own innovative ideas or projects. During the survey, respondents were asked to assess the quality of the formation of a number of competencies on a 5-point scale (0-very low quality, 5-excellent quality). The majority of respondents who has completed or are still enrolled in school, noted the willingness and ability of a reasonable risk, but estimated the level of completeness of 3 points; the ability and willingness to lifelong learning, continuous improvement, re-Skilling, self-education (3 points); ability to work independently (4 points). The same question was asked to answer those who study or studied at the University. Respondents emphasized: the ability to work independently (5 points), the ability to work in a team (5 points), the ability and willingness to continuous education and new knowledge (4 points). The competences formed at the school form the basis for further development and improvement of them at the University. However, according to respondents, school, especially rural, plays a smaller role in the formation of the most important competencies of the digital economy. Much higher respondents estimate the role of universities in the implementation of this task.

Expert opinions on how modern youth meets the requirements of an innovative society are divided. On the one hand, young people more correspond them than older people, as they were born and brought up in a society of innovative technologies. On the other hand, experts noted the lack of modern youth qualities such as independence, responsibility, the ability to make informed choices, make independent decisions. Most often, young people see themselves as performers, not always ready to create something on their own, to take responsibility for the results of collective work.

The results of the survey of teachers confirmed the positive dynamics of the formation of innovative competencies during training at the University.

V. Discussions

In the characterization of the innovative type of personality, of course, intelligence is of great importance as the ability to operate with existing knowledge. The undoubted advantage of Russian society is a fairly high level of education. Russia is among the countries with a very high education index (Jahan, 2016). But a person or a group of people may have any amount of knowledge, but not be professionally and socially included, i.e. this amount of knowledge remains unclaimed and does not develop in the context of changing requirements and conditions of society. Solving the most complex innovative tasks requires more than just a high level of general culture or a rich set of narrow professional knowledge. Modern technological activity takes place at the junction of different, sometimes, at first glance, incompatible branches of scientific knowledge. Meaningful creativity requires a wide range of knowledge and the ability to apply them in the most unpredictable variations.

An innovative person should be able and ready to live and carry out innovative activities in conditions of constant risk. This, in our view, is social maturity in the context of an innovative society, directly linked to personal motivation and a meaningful willingness to take risks and mobilize all available resources to achieve the goal. An important aspect in this is the motivation for intensive intellectual work. The real connection between innovations and the growing level of social development, social well-being of citizens, the level and quality of life of the population, the elevation of socially significant goals of society, national interests (Levashov, 2018) should be established in the Russian society and be understandable for the population. In the Russian innovative sphere of the XXI century there is a collective subject of innovative activity in the face of innovative centres of different forms of organization and innovative product as a result of collective creativity of a large group of qualified specialists with the use of modern technology and high-tech technologies. There is a problem of motivation and building interpersonal relationships in organizations or structures of innovative type.

The innovation process itself is often very long in time. From the moment of scientific discovery to the introduction of its results in mass consumption can take decades. It should be noted that the University scientific community demonstrates some conservatism, "growth" to their private topics and unwillingness to integrate into interdisciplinary project teams, which is contrary to modern scientific methodology. In this regard, not only the University itself as a subject of innovation needs to be transformed, but also the consciousness of each individual scientist should be reformatted taking into account modern trends in the development of scientific knowledge and the requirements dictated by time. In addition, as the world experience shows, the innovation environment should "mature". It takes time.

For a deep understanding of the essence of an innovative personality, it is necessary to analyze the objective technological and socio-cultural reality in the context of which its formation takes place. Together with the society and economic way of life, the person himself, his worldview, spiritual world, needs, interests and values, habits, lifestyle, subjective ideas about his own well-being, which is often determined not only by the level and quality of life, are changing. Modern society is characterized by the rapid development of science, technology and technology. In the context of the global environmental, economic, spiritual and moral crisis, the developed countries are irreversibly and forcefully moving to a new technological order based on the rapid convergence and synergy of nano -, bio -, information and cognitive sciences and technologies (NBIC). The development of NBIC-technologies takes place in such socially important areas as the expansion of intellectual, cognitive and communication capabilities of the person; improvement of health and physical capabilities, including the fight against aging; strengthening the effectiveness of the activities of certain social groups and society as a whole; the strengthening of national security and defense; integration of science and education; strengthening of the neural networks and the potential of the human brain; cognitive and computational neuroscience; Nano medicine; artificial intelligence; Nano electronics; Biomedicine etc. (Kazantsev et al., 2015). These technological trends interact with each other and lead to various modifications at different levels; their social, political, environmental and other effects are often contradictory and sometimes unpredictable.

The current situation raises the question of the positive and negative impact of the civilizational development on people, nature, society, as well as the problem of choosing a new paradigm of development based on overcoming the contradiction and establishing sustainable cooperation in the system "nature – society – human". The modern race for technological discoveries is in extreme contradiction with environmental priorities, ideas about the human-oriented future and human values.

Ideological results of the development of modern science to date, discussing by representatives of different fields of scientific knowledge, reveal a range of ambivalent values, not allowing to give clear answers to questions about nature, "sociogram" of innovative personality and the impact of technological progress on it. The need for a holistic picture of the world, convergence, interdisciplinarity, and sometimes transdisciplinarity, although the term does not yet have clear boundaries, exists in all areas of scientific research, despite the increasing differentiation of scientific knowledge, which in detail represents the private subject areas of research. The rigid contradictions between scientific rationality and non-rational cognitive practices (for example, religion), considered as a source of adequate information necessary for the preservation and development of the system, are smoothed out (Leshkevich, 2017).

Speaking about information technologies, it should be noted that, changing, they change a person, significantly oppressing him in the functions of a regulator and a limiter of information flows. Due to the lack of competence in complex communication technologies, a person becomes vulnerable, information overloaded and dependent, limited in real "live" communications and emotional contacts. Accessibility and mobility of the Internet create new patterns of speech behaviour, a new style of Internet communication, new technology of the creative process, blurring the lines between the real and the symbolic, affecting the brain of the person, his emotional-volitional sphere, the sphere of subjective experience and causing dependence on these strong sensations (Kataeva, 2012). In addition, the Internet creates new ways of creating and transferring knowledge.

The possibilities of NBIC-technologies allow to change the physiological and spiritual essence of man, his thinking, mind, i.e. the nature of human, which is real and potentially has a number of consequences. NBIC-technologies lead to the formation of neuroethics, neuropolitics and the requirement to radically change morals in connection with the ability to control human consciousness. Gradually the line between the natural human and his artificial creation is blurred. Unequal access to technological advances increases social inequality. All brain processes can potentially be subjected to "external observation", which leads to the need to take a fresh look at the issues of conscience, guilt, responsibility, etc. Thus, an innovative personality is formed through a change in intellectual and physical characteristics with the help of cognitive technologies. However, the consequences are unknown.

At the beginning of the XXI century the whole paradigm of philosophy has changed. Global trends of convergence and synergy of different scientific areas, the desire to create a holistic picture of the social world do not dictate the appeal to the class-formation or ideological approach, but rather relate to the natural laws of society and ideas of human-oriented future. At a certain stage of development, humanity is aware of the real possibility of self-destruction and is puzzled by the search for ways of unity and cooperation. The basic concepts of the new picture of the social world were "nonlinearity" and "uncertainty" (Osipova et. al., 2019).

The basic principle of modern innovation is the principle of continuous change of innovation. One innovation generates another, and it turns into a continuous cyclic process that requires the innovative personality of conceptual and strategic thinking, and not just the understanding of individual, discrete events or phenomena. It is necessary to know and foresee the real and potential consequences of the use of an innovative product, as well as the period of time when its limit will come, and a new innovation will be required. One of the features of an innovative personality is the ability to constantly rethink the surrounding reality, life orientations and meanings. The person of innovative civilization should not only be able, but also constantly be ready to accept the rapid changes taking place in the world in the era of changes, to recognize the pluralism and diversity of points of view, the probabilistic nature of events, which, however, does not mean that the innovative personality is lightweight and superficial. An innovative personality necessarily implies a certain constant, a stable system of views and guidelines, which under any circumstances retains its

framework. This becomes the basis of the reflexive process of change. Otherwise, the lack of social maturity and moral values generates technocratic thinking, social inequality and a person who is a danger to society.

VI. Conclusion

Thus, despite the many approaches and methodological difficulties in the analysis of innovative personality as a social type in the new technological revolution, we are still trying to find some typological features with the emphasized caveat: the analysis of innovative personality as a social type is possible only in the civilizational context of a particular society. First of all, the emergence of an innovative type of personality in an innovative society is possible only due to high intelligence and the ability of the individual to quickly and painlessly adapt to the rapidly changing social environment and influence it. The second most important characteristic of an innovative personality is social maturity as a readiness for innovative activity, for conscious activity in the conditions of society of risk and uncertainty, readiness to assume this risk and to take responsibility, including for the results of innovative activity. In an innovative society, the development of social maturity must take place at a much faster pace and begin at the earliest possible age. The third characteristic is the full range of innovative competencies required by society in order to rapidly "break" into the sixth technological order. Further analysis of the strategy of the innovative type of personality formation will undoubtedly give answers and new opportunities in understanding the deep foundations of social structure.

References

1. Buzgalin, A.V. and Kolganov, A.I. 2019. Transformation of the Social Structure of Late Capitalism: From the Proletariat and the Bourgeoisie to the Precariat and the Creative Class. *Sociological Researches, 1,* 18-28. [in Russian]
2. Dzhevaga, N. V., & Lobacheva, O. L. (2018). Separation of the rare-earth elements (REE) by flotation approaches. The International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference Surveying Geology and Mining Ecology Management,SGEM 2018, 18 (5.1), pp. 801-808.
3. Government of Russian Federation 2018. Strategy of Innovative Development of the Russian Federation for the Period up to 2020 [online]. http://www.consultant.ru (Accessed 04 November 2018). [in Russian]
4. Gudkov, L. 2018. We Understood that the Soviet Man was not Going Anywhere', *Vedomosti News* [online] 24 July 2017. https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/characters/2017/07/24/725468-sovetskii-chelovek. (Accessed 22 August 2017). [in Russian]
5. Human Connectome Project 2020. [online]. http://www.humanconnectomeproject.org (Accessed: 04.02.2020).
6. Human Genome Project Information 2020. [online]. https://web.archive.org/web/20080315062131/http://www.ornl.gov/sci/techresources/Human_Genome/home.shtml (Accessed: 04.02.2020).
7. Jahan, S. 2016. The Human Development Report 2016. [online]. United Nations Development Programme, 1 UN Plaza, New York. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr_2016_report_russian_web.pdf (Accessed 22.08.2017).
8. Jenkins, R. 2015. What Does Await Sociology: Extinction, Stagnation or Evolution? *Sociological Researches, 3,* 11-21. [in Russian]
9. Kataeva, O.V. 2012. Virtual Reality in the Works of the Rostov Researchers. *Philosophical Innovation: Search, Problems, Solutions,* 619-633. [in Russian]

10. Kazantsev, A.K., Kiselyov, V.N., Rubvalter, D.A., Rudenskiy, O.V. 2015. *NBIC-Technologies: The Innovative Civilization of the XXI century.* Moscow. [in Russian]
11. Koneva E.S., Timashkova G.V., Shapovalenko T.V., Lyadov K.V. 2018. Functional spatially – oriented rehabilitationof elderly patients after cerebral stroke. Resarch Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences. – 2018. – V.9, №5; P. 2232-2238.
12. Koneva E.S., Omelchuk N. N., Kuzmenko L., Kosova I., Afanasyeva N.V. 2019 Introduction of electronic cancer registries. La Prensa Medica Argentina. – 2019. - Vol.105-№9, P. 546-555
13. Leshkevich, T.G. 2017. The Philosophical Outcomes of Modern Science: Informational World and Homo Interneticus. In Yastreb, N.A. (Ed.), *Philosophy of Science and Technology in Russia: Challenges of Information Technology, Collection of scientific articles*, Vologda. [in Russian]
14. Levashov, V.K. 2018. New Socio-political Contradictions on the Way to Sustainable Development. *Sociological Researches, 12*, 107-119. [in Russian]
15. Lisov, V.I. 2004. The Role, *Tasks and Principles of State Innovation Policy at the Present Stage of Socio-economic Development of Russia*, Moscow, School book. [in Russian]
16. Lobacheva, O., & Dzhevaga, N. (2018). Flotation technologies in the removal of the Pr(lll) salts from aqueous solutions. The International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference Surveying Geology and Mining Ecology Management,SGEM 2018, 18 (5.1), pp. 415-422.
17. Osipova, N.G., Vershinina, I.A., Martynenko, T.S. 2019. Inequality and Uncertainty: Modern Challenges for Cities. *Sociological Researches, 1*, 153-155. [in Russian]
18. Powell, A. 2018. NEET: Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training. [online] Briefing Paper, House of Commons Library. http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN06705/SN06705.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2019).
19. Neto, J.R., Neto, A.R. 2018. Talent management for innovation: Personality traits and organizational climate impact in creativity process. *Handbook of Research on Strategic Innovation Management for Improved Competitive Advantage*.
20. Schumpeter, J. 1995. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Moscow. [in Russian]
21. Sobol O.M., Domatskiy V.N., Koneva E.S., Nifontov K.R.. Review of Basic Trends in Cryotherapy Applications for Horse Injuries // Arq. Bras. Med. Vet. Zootec. vol.71 no.4
22. Shevchenko, V.N. 2010. Innovative Personality as a Social Type. *Scientific Statements. The Series of Philosophy, Sociology, Right, 2(73),* 37-50. [in Russian]
23. Wallerstein, I. 2004. *The End of the Familiar World. Sociology of the XXI Century*. Moscow. Logos. [in Russian]
24. Yanitskiy, O.N. 2019. Challenges and Risks of Globalization. Seven Theses. *Sociological Researches, 1*, 29-39. [in Russian]
25. Yumashev A., Koneva E., Borodina M., Lipson D., Nedosugova A. Electronic apps in assessing risk and monitoring of patients with arterial hypertension // La Prensa Medica Argentina. 2019. Vol.105, N 4, P. 235–245