

Socio-philosophical paradigmatic approaches to the typology of modern humanitarian expertise*

T. V. Kovaleva¹, Z. Plasienkova²

¹ St Petersburg State University,

7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation

² Comenius University in Bratislava,

2, Gondova St., Bratislava, 811 02, Slovakia

For citation: Kovaleva T. V., Plasienkova Z. Socio-philosophical paradigmatic approaches to the typology of modern humanitarian expertise. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Philosophy and Conflict Studies*, 2022, vol. 38, issue 3, pp. 332–340. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2022.305>

The aim of the article is to define socio-philosophical paradigms for typology of humanitarian expertise, to show its possibilities and role in the life of society and the world for the solution of modern sociocultural problems. Objectives: With the help of historical paradigmatic approaches to demonstrate theoretical grounding of socio-philosophical foundations of expertise in humanitarian fields and the purpose of humanitarian expertise for the individual, society and professional organizations. This research is methodologically based on the socio-philosophical analysis of some works of famous sociologists and philosophers of the 20th–21st centuries which created preconditions for formation of methodological foundations of humanitarian expertise, and it also includes presentation of three types of humanitarian expertise and demonstration of their distinctive features. Thanks to the developed methods and techniques in sociology, philosophy, culturology, etc., experts and expert communities had some new approaches for studying various problems of society and quickly eliminating the consequences of negative results of scientific and technological progress on it. Developed methods and techniques underlying humanitarian expertise allowed experts to go beyond the subjectivism of the individual and consider socio-cultural phenomena objectively based on facts in justification of social actions. When the role of science in the life of society becomes predominant there is a need for such methods, techniques, and technologies that would make it possible to stop the use of scientific achievements to the detriment of society, to determine the unethical behavior of scientists and every member of society, to anticipate dangerous man-made situations. The focus of expert knowledge should be the monitoring of unethical behavior of professionals in the humanitarian spheres of society protecting the interests and health of people.

Keywords: social facts, social action, humanitarian expertise, social and cultural products, ethics.

Introduction

Modern humanitarian expert science is currently undergoing a process of internal reform and theoretical justification. It is necessary to comprehend the reason for the emergence of technologies for humanitarian expertise, the content of each of them and their focus on identifying the significance and relevance of moral assessments.

* The research was funded by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) grant no. 20-011-00124 “Transformation of moral culture under the influence of neuroscience” (T. V. Kovaleva) and the Slovak Research and Development Agency (SRDA) contract no. APVV-18-0103 “Paradigmatic Changes in the Understanding of Universe and Man from Philosophical, Theological, and Physical Perspectives” (Z. Plašienkova).

Methods and sources

Since cultural and social factors are markers for moral judgments and foundation for the development of society, it is possible to use the study and interpretation of social facts proposed by Durkheim in his work *Rules of Sociological Method*. He wrote: “A social fact is any way of acting... capable of exerting over the individual an external constraint; or: which is general over the whole of a given society whilst having an existence of its own, independent of its individual manifestations” [1, p. 59]. E. Durkheim suggested looking for signs to divide facts into normal and pathological ones, since without their methodological justification it is easy to make a mistake in interpreting associations into everyday concepts such as species, organ, function, health, disease, cause, purpose. Application by experts of social methodology, as a part of technologies for humanitarian expertise, allows them to consider the discovered social facts as scientific and objective. It is the social methodology applied to justification of concrete social phenomena that has practical application as it is based on adherence to two principles of objectivity and internal and external independence. However, a little later it became clear that a complete scientific picture can't be created by considering only social factors without taking into account cultural and ethnographic aspects. Marcel Moss expanded the range of facts by adding cultural elements and products. Moss considered that given cultural and social facts allows us to evaluate market relations.

In his turn, M. Weber, when conducting social studies of society, proposed to define social action as “action is the human behavior to which the acting individual (or individuals) attached a subjective meaning... Action is ‘social’ if the acting individual takes account of the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course” [2, p. 2]. Any action must have a motive, but although it determines its character, it is not always obvious. Weber suggests starting from the characteristics of the action to clearly identify the motive behind purposefulness. This expands the range of research activities, since these criteria can characterize not only social action, but also cultural, ethical, economic, political, etc. ones as well. Thus, this approach can be applied in for many areas of research. Since humanitarian expertise is mostly used in professional fields, Weber's principle of reciprocity and rationality of behavior is very relevant. He defines ethical behavior of people in society and in professional sphere as “‘ethical’ standard (that) is a certain type of value-rational belief in a norm of their action. In this sense it can be spoken of as defining what is ‘ethically good’ in the same way that action which is called ‘beautiful’ is measured by aesthetic standards” [2, p. 28]. When analyzing the behavior of a professionals, Weber focuses on motives of the system requirements. Thus, the behavior of a professionals can be explained by the rules and norms developed by the system to which they belong, which should be considered when drawing up ethical professional codes. However, since social systems and institutions are diverse, Weber suggests taking into account the causality between average behavior in society and professional behavior in order to regulate the order. He also notes that the violation of social order will cause the reaction of third parties, whose opinion must also be taken into account during the expertise, since the result of the professional's activity may affect the interests of third parties involved in such professional activity. This means that all of Weber's recommendations must be considered when drafting the code of expert activity.

In his work *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Robert Merton, an American sociologist, justified the theoretical foundations behind the creation of humanitarian exper-

tise. He proposed a functional analysis of social and cultural products. In his opinion, this analysis “includes, not only a study of the functions of existing social structures, but also a study of their dysfunctions for diversely situated individuals, subgroups or social strata, and the more inclusive society... this mode of analysis can assess not only the bases of social stability but the potential sources of social change. The phrase ‘historically developed forms’ may be a useful reminder that social structures are typically undergoing discernible change” [3, p. 93]. Assessing research capabilities of various branches of science, R. Merton notes that for natural and exact sciences there are various tools for conducting this or that analysis in controversial cases, while sociology and other humanities do not have them, yet they are necessary in order to resolve conflicts. He notes that when resolving a conflict, cognitive problems turn out to be most vulnerable in a dispute, since they can be easily distorted. Like Aristotle, Merton builds his methodology based on the “golden mean”, which fits into the idea of Weber and P. Sorokin as “Middle-range theory” which “is principally used in sociology to guide empirical inquiry (empirical testing). Middle-range theories deal with delimited aspects of social phenomena (social mobility, or role-conflict and of the formation of social norms and so on)” [3, p. 38]. Only averages can give an objective picture in the study. The assessment of “interaction at different levels” in the comparative analysis allowed us to distinguish micro and macro levels of interaction between small/large social groups and official institutions, organizations, where social and cultural problems arise which are now successfully dealt with by humanitarian expertise. The system deformations (discrepancies, contradictions, stresses) are the object of research of humanitarian expertise since they carry changes for the system. Merton suggests considering the following as an object of research: cultural values, the action of social mechanisms, the action of psychological mechanisms, the functional significance of various non-financial rewards, the replacement of “a sense of security” with “ambition” as a priority value, changing the rules of interaction to expand the field of economic and political opportunities for people who had been deprived of them before, etc.

At the end of the 20th century, based on the idea of an integrated paradigm by A. Edel and J. Gurevich, G. Ritzer proposed a multilevel social analysis of the study of socio-cultural problems at macro and micro levels (from individual thinking to global systems). A flexible multilevel system of interrelations of macro-objective and subjective as well as micro-objective and subjective levels enables humanitarian expertise to be more mobile, because they are able to identify and isolate the essence of the problem from different angles and create a multidimensional view of all its aspects. Ritzer assigned “the macro-subjective level encompasses large-scale nonmaterial phenomena such as norms and values” [4, p. 503]. This classification made it possible to expand the range of research by considering and analyzing deviations and changes in the moral values of society and each member of the professional community through their actions and misdemeanors. For example, the use of a selfish motive when reaching an expert opinion by an expert and the disclosure of this offense can lead to undermining the reputation of the entire expert community. Thus, individual misconduct can affect the reputation of all experts. A similar situation can occur in any professional sphere and everyday life of people.

We can conclude that Weber’s rationality of social action, Durkheim’s social facts, and Merton’s functional analysis of social and cultural products have formed the basis of humanitarian expertise. Ritzer’s introduction of an ethical component into the analysis of

multilevel systems of the micro- and macro-orders allowed to conduct an ethical assessment of the actions of professionals in different spheres of society.

Discussion and results

Nowadays there are three types of humanitarian expertise: socio-humanitarian, global-humanitarian and ethical. The most well-known and applied in many humanitarian fields type is the ethical one. It is worth noting that socio-humanitarian expertise is actively applied in sociology, psychology, pedagogy, law, etc. It should be noted that this expertise has appeared recently and causes many difficulties understanding its purpose and application. Since this expertise has been developed relatively recently, it is not as popular and is used in narrowly professional areas. Global-humanitarian expertise is difficult to perform and it is used to analyze the global ethical problems.

Socio-humanitarian expertise was formed in the first decade of the 21st century. Initially, it was considered synonymous with humanitarian expertise. “The idea and concept of socio-humanitarian (humanitarian) expertise, as an important mechanism for preserving human potential in modern conditions, belongs to many scientists and specialists, including N. N. Avdeev, I. I. Ashmarin, G. V. Ivanchenko, D. A. Leontiev, R. M. Petruneva, D. A. Pokrovsky, F. S. Safuanov, G. Skirbekk, G. L. Smolyan, P. D. Tishchenko, G. L. Tulchinsky, B. G. Yudin and many others” [5, p. 66]. A group of Moscow philosophers identifies socio-humanitarian expertise as an independent direction of scientific technologies in the article “Socio-humanitarian Expertise of the National Biomaterials Depositories Functioning”, published in 2016. “Broad socio-humanitarian expertise of science can be carried out in procedural, effective, valuable and systemic perspectives, each of which has its own characteristics. It is necessary at different stages of scientific knowledge, most importantly, at the level of assessing the possible use of results of scientific knowledge and their impact on social development. The most important thing here is to understand that such expert assessment should be carried out within the framework of the very process of working on a particular scientific problem, and should not be reduced to an assessment of the already implemented consequences” [6, p. 10] This expertise is aimed at managing science and scientific institutions when solving social problems as a form of social management. It should bind science and society. It provides development of methods that allow the introduction of scientific achievements, minimizing ethical tensions due to the commercialization of science.

Socio-humanitarian expertise is used as an independent study or together with legal, linguistic, psychological and other expertise when their conclusions will be inconclusive or disputable. For example, when assessing the content of imported literature for extremist content on the territory of the Russian Federation can be applied a comprehensive socio-humanitarian expertise (according to A. Y. Vinnikov’s methodology) [7], which will have a set of expertise depending on the specific situation. Central Forensic Customs Administration invites outside qualified experts to study the seized literature. The concept of complexity is determined by the possibility and necessity of contacting experts from other humanitarian areas, such as conflict studies, religious studies, ethics, sociology, philosophy, etc. The problem of such expertise is to overcome the biased attitude of experts towards the objects (texts and illustrations) or subjects (authors of texts/illustrations) in line with the designated investigation and the desire to find any

evidence on the issue. An epistemic flaw (self-deception) is quite difficult to identify, especially if it is a complex and consistent expertise, where a large number of experts from different areas of expertise are involved.

Bioethics and biomedical ethics can use socio-humanitarian expertise as an addition to the two main types expertise — global-humanitarian and ethical. The main purpose of these two expertise is to identify and analyze the implication for use of the results of scientific and technological progress. Ethical dilemmas that arise in this case are the consequences of imperfections of science and the response of society to them in social and cultural terms.

Global-humanitarian expertise¹, according to professor I. I. Ashmarin and academician I. T. Frolov, is considered to be an expertise that is focused on an objective ethical assessment, often found in a specific situation in biology and medicine. "...Humanitarian expertise 'suggests itself' primarily where there are no formalized criteria and characteristics, approved regulations, algorithms, etc. In other words, humanitarian expertise is based not so much on norms as on values and is focused not so much on objects as on technologies. This is perhaps one of the main differences between humanitarian expertise and professional expert examinations" [8, p. 203]

Today, its range of application has expanded to the analysis of socio-cultural dilemmas arising in various humanitarian (scientific) areas. It is often called socio-cultural expertise in online sources and is reduced to a narrow understanding of its purpose, which is the study of social life. However, it is important to draw attention to its special purpose, which is overcoming subjectivism in the analysis of multi-time repeated moral and ethical dilemmas in different societies and providing objective criteria for resolving universal global moral problems.

Global-humanitarian expertise is usually used by international expert commissions and committees that qualify as independent public organizations. For example, International Bioethics Committee (IBC), World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) at UNESCO, WHO mission, MBA, etc. On their websites you can see such problems as equitable access to necessary resources in all countries, for example, access to the COVID-19 vaccine and a delicate approach to decision-making when the social responsibility of representatives of for-profit businesses fades into the background before getting an opportunity of obtaining marginal profit. Other current issues over the last several years' can be found on the IBC website, for example, bioethical response to the situation of refugees (2017), the principle of benefit sharing (2015), modern parenthood, i. e., "reflecting on the interactions between societal and technological developments that are leading to new concepts and forms of parenthood, including the impact on cross-border practices and reproductive justice" (2018–2019), etc. Adopted resolutions are not focused on a specific country and people and are more of a response to a certain global ethical problem that affects most countries.

Global-humanitarian expertise expresses the professionalism of different academics who work on finding the causes that had given rise to these problems in related areas (global economy, politics, sociology, culture, science, etc.) and who strive for their successful solution. For example, the UNICEF focuses on ethical issues of children around the world, related to the protection of their health, safety, gender discrimination, resource

¹ Authors have included their name "the global-humanitarian expertise" when professor I. I. Ashmarin and academician I. T. Frolov named it simple "humanitarian expertise".

access, education, etc. The organization's experts identify a general trend of the global problem of child poverty it is a contravention of a justice principle, which results from unequal distribution of economic resources in European and Central Asian countries [9]. Charles Michel, the President of the European Council, notes that “we can't repeat mistakes of the past — excessive exploitation of our natural resources. We have abused these resources and put our planet and our biodiversity on the brink of destruction. Therefore, we shouldn't abuse data, which is the new resource of the 21st century. However, in recent years we have witnessed abuse of personal data, for example, excessive use of data by companies in pursuit of profit. Or by such countries as China, which are trying to control their citizens. We have to use our new digital resources wisely in order to protect the environment of our core values — democracy and individual freedom” [10]. It is obvious that global-humanitarian expertise is based on the principles of universal human values to achieve balanced coexistence of all people. It is aimed at finding the truth to solve vital social and cultural problems. In other words, active use of global-humanitarian expertise, social consolidation and commitment to ethical regulations of modern scientific knowledge will allow the global society to properly use the results of scientific and technological progress in overcoming modern moral dilemmas. One of the most famous scholars who continued the study of global-humanitarian expertise at the end of the 20th century was the ethicist, Professor B. G. Yudin from the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences. His colleague A. A. Voronin tried to define humanitarian expertise in the article “B. G. Yudin on Humanitarian Expertise and the Challenges of Neurorevolution” (2018). “Humanitarian expertise (HE) is fundamentally interdisciplinary, humanitarian-oriented, competent, but at the same time it takes into account the interests of potential actors, it is predictive, it codes responsibility, calculates potential risks, it is a systematic research and consulting activity of a special expert community and wider circles of interested parties” [11, p. 93].

Ethical expertise was originally created for prevention of abuse in experimental medicine. Yudin wrote: “Ethical expertise... firstly, is carried out within the framework of a specially created and existing structure — ethics committee, and, secondly, has clearly defined goals. Ethical committees exist in every scientific institution, conducting biomedical research, involving humans or animals” [12, p. 126].

Ethical expertise is used for analyzing applied bioethical problems such as abortion, euthanasia, eugenics, cloning, etc. within the framework of national legislation, cultural attitudes and traditions, and social characteristics of each country. Bioethicists, ethicists, bio-lawyers, psychologists, etc. are involved in solving such problems. When necessary, they participate in the work of ethics commissions and committees at various levels. Ethical expertise should always be aimed at positively solving society's moral problems.

From a theoretical perspective, bioethical issues can be classified as both historical, i. e., inherent in all societies of the world throughout human existence and unresolved to this day, and those that are being addressed as new scientific knowledge becomes available.

Yudin interpreted the essence and the purpose of this expertise as follows: “Ethical examination of research protects not only the examinees, but also the researchers themselves, since it allows them to share the burden of responsibility... The continuous evolution of ethical expertise arises from the fact that this practice has caused many problems, such as inconsistencies between independence and competence of the ethics committee

members, common formalism, etc.” [12, p. 130]. First and foremost, ethical expertise is needed for deontological professional development, for example, for doctors, psychologists, journalists, rescuers, firefighters, etc. These are the professions that have an anthropological nature and are related to life and well-being of every person. People orientation gives the right to manage people’s lives and at the same time requires maximum liability of a specialist. Such liability should be subjected to regulatory acts and possibility of verification with the help of expertise. Today, ethical expertise remains the most well-known and relevant technology of all three mentioned above, since it is a tool for solving internal professional and ethical problems not only at the micro level of local state institutions, but also in international public organizations.

Ethical expertise can be both a method and a technology of applied ethics, within the framework of which all its participants (voluntary and involuntary) become moral subjects, and the motives of their actions become objects of evaluative attention of other moral subjects. Therefore, the choice of axiological approaches becomes a priority act of interaction between subjects, which are placed in particular circumstances. In this regard, the statement of A. Y. Sagomonov on moral pluralism in ethical expertise is substantial. “In a world of huge differences, social and political contrast, discursivity and consequentialism are becoming dominant ethical paradigms” [13, p. 36].

Conclusion

To date, three types of humanitarian expertise have been formed in Russia. Ethical expertise due to its name is the most recognizable and often other types of expertise are used under this name. Its popularity is due to its wide range of applications in medicine and biology, as well as in the formation of professional ethical relationships in a team or among professional groups. All kinds of possible examinations, used in various humanitarian areas for assessing human activity, are collected in the European practice, called ethical expertise.

Humanitarian expertise provides the most objective criteria for solving ethical tasks, covering humanitarian activity on a planetary scale. This expertise is used by international public organizations for analyzing global ethical problems.

Socio-humanitarian expertise has been formed recently. An important feature of this expertise is the regulation of scientific research, which has a direct impact on a society. Its task is to prevent and analyze social and cultural problems and to develop strategies to improve social management. The modern world is built on the results of scientific and technological progress and therefore the role and influence of expert scientists on the lives of ordinary people is increasing every year. In this situation the role of humanitarian expertise is great, because only with their help it is possible to reveal unethical behavior of a professional and to defend the interests of an ordinary person, a non-expert. The creation of ethical codes becomes the result of use of such expertise. They are designed to control the activities of experts and help them to do the moral choice avoiding ethical distortions and the epistemic evil and always directing their efforts towards the boon to society.

References

1. Durkheim, E. (1982), *The Rules of Sociological Method*, New York, London, Toronto and Sydney: The Free press.
2. Weber, M. (2000), *Basic concepts in sociology*, United Kingdom: Kensington Publishing Corporation.

3. Merton, R. K. (1968), *Social Theory and Social Structure*, New York: The Free Press.
4. Ritzer, G. (2011), *Sociological theory*, 8th ed., New York: McGraw-Hill.
5. Petruneva, R. M. and Vasiljeva, V. D. (2010), About a methodology of the Multi-Social and Humanitarian expertise of engineering projecting decision, *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*, no. 2, pp. 65–70. (In Russian)
6. Bryzgalina, E. V., Alasania, K. J., Sadovnichy, V. A. et al. (2016), The Social and Humanitarian Expertise of Functioning of the National Depositories of Biomaterials, *Voprosy filosofii*, no. 2, pp. 8–21. (In Russian)
7. Vinnikov, A. Y., Girenko, N. M., Korshunova, O. M. et al. (2005), *The Social and Humanitarian Expertise of hate crimes*, St Petersburg: Norma Publ. (In Russian)
8. Ashmarin, I. I. (2006), Under professional senses of the Humanitarian Expertise, *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*, no. 4, pp. 202–205. (In Russian)
9. Stages of research process of Philosophy and Bioethics in our country, *History of sector of the humanitarian expertise and bioethics*. Available at: <https://iphras.ru/page24514316.htm> (accessed: 27.02.2020). (In Russian)
10. International Bioethics committee, *UNESCO*. Available at: <https://ru.unesco.org/themes/etika-nauki-i-tehniki/ibc> (accessed: 15.06.2021). (In Russian)
11. World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology, *UNESCO*. Available at: <https://en.unesco.org/themes/ethics-science-and-technology/comest> (accessed 15.06.2021).
12. Yudin, B. G. (2005), From the Ethical expertise to the Humanitarian expertise, *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*, no. 2, pp. 126–135. (In Russian)
13. Sogomonov, A. Y. (2012), Two vectors of the Ethical expertise in modern world, in: Bakshtanovsky, V. I. and Novoselov, V. V. (eds), *Applied ethics: expertise. Collected papers*, iss. 41, Tyumen: TiumSU Publ., pp. 30–39. (In Russian)

Received: January 31, 2022

Accepted: June 17, 2022

Authors' information:

Tatiana V. Kovaleva — PhD in Philosophy, Assistant Professor; trandafir@yandex.ru
Zlatica Plasienkova — Dr. Sci. In Philosophy, Professor; zlatica.plasienkova@uniba.sk

Социо-философские парадигматические подходы к типологии современных гуманитарных экспертиз*

*Т. В. Ковалева*¹, *З. Плашиенкова*²

- ¹ Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
 Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9
² Университет им. Коменского в Братиславе,
 Словакия, 811 02, Братислава, ул. Гондова, 2

Для цитирования: *Kovaleva T. V., Plasienkova Z.* Socio-philosophical paradigmatic approaches to the typology of modern humanitarian expertise // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Философия и конфликтология. 2022. Т. 38. Вып. 3. С. 332–340.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2022.305>

Цель статьи — определить социально-философские парадигмы для типологии гуманитарных экспертиз, показать их возможности и роль в жизни общества и мира для

* Статья подготовлена при финансовой поддержке грантов: Российского фонда фундаментальных исследований (РФФИ) № 20-011-00124 «Трансформация нравственной культуры под влиянием нейронаук» (Т. В. Ковалева) и Словацкого агентства исследований и развития (SRDA), № APVV-18-0103 «Парадигматические изменения понимания Космоса и Человека с точки зрения философии, теологии и физики» (З. Плашиенкова).

решения современных социокультурных проблем. Задача — с помощью исторических парадигматических подходов продемонстрировать теоретическое обоснование социально-философских основ экспертологии в гуманитарных областях и назначение гуманитарных экспертиз для человека, общества и профессиональных организаций. Исследование методически основано на социально-философском анализе некоторых работ известных социологов и философов XX–XXI вв., которые создали предпосылки для формирования методологических основ гуманитарной экспертизы, а также включает презентацию трех типов гуманитарных экспертиз и демонстрацию их отличительных особенностей. Благодаря разработанным методам и технологиям в социологии, философии, культурологии и т. д. у экспертов и экспертных сообществ появились некоторые новые подходы для изучения различных проблем общества и быстрой ликвидации последствий воздействия на него негативных результатов научно-технического прогресса. Разработанные методы и приемы, лежащие в основе гуманитарных экспертиз, позволили экспертам выйти за рамки субъективизма отдельного человека и рассматривать социокультурные явления объективно, основываясь на фактах в обосновании социальных действий. Когда роль науки в жизни общества становится главенствующей, появляется необходимость в таких методах, приемах и технологиях, которые дали бы возможность пресекать использование научных достижений в ущерб интересам общества, определять неэтичное поведение ученых и каждого члена общества, предвосхищать опасные техногенные ситуации. В центре внимания экспертных знаний должен находиться мониторинг неэтичного поведения профессионалов в гуманитарных сферах жизни общества, защита интересов и здоровья людей.

Ключевые слова: социальные факторы, социальное действие, гуманитарные экспертизы, социально-культурные продукты, этика.

Статья поступила в редакцию 31 января 2022 г.;
рекомендована к печати 17 июня 2022 г.

Контактная информация:

Ковалева Татьяна Викторовна — канд. филос. наук, доц.; trandafir@yandex.ru
Плашиенкова Златица — д-р филос. наук, проф.; zatica.plasienkova@uniba.sk