

Published by the decision of the Scientific Council
of Khachatur Abovian
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic
named after Academician Georg Brutian



W I S D O M

Special Issue 3(4), 2022

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources
Citation Index service*

ASPU Publication
YEREVAN – 2022

SOCIAL AND PEDAGOGICAL FACTORS OF MANAGEMENT IN THE EDUCATIONAL SPACE

Liubov HONCHAR¹  | Yevhen PLISKO²  | Dmytro YEFIMOV³  |

Yaroslav KRUTOGORSKIY⁴  | Anzhela MALAKHOVA¹  | Volodymyr IVANCHUK⁵  |

Alina STOPKINA² 

1 Department of Accounting and Auditing of the Donbas State Pedagogical University, Sloviansk, Ukraine

2 Department of Social Work of the Donbas State Pedagogical University, Sloviansk, Ukraine

3 Department of Pedagogy and Teaching Methods of the Horlivka Institute of Foreign Languages, Bakhmut, Ukraine

4 Department of Management, Donbas State Pedagogical University, Sloviansk, Ukraine

5 Department of Philosophy, History and Socio-Humanitarian Disciplines of the Donbas State Pedagogical University, Sloviansk, Ukraine

* *Correspondence*

Liubov HONCHAR, Komyahova st.,
ap. 65, 22, Slavyansk, Ukraine
E-mail: gonchar_liubov@ukr.net

Abstract: The article examines the socio-pedagogical factors of management in the educational space as a need or phenomenon and social necessity. Emphasis is placed on the natural, a priori endowment of the desire to control the power of all living organisms to the consideration of management as a kind of response of an organism or individual to the requirements of social structure. It was found that the principle, in this case, is the provision that the process has a psychological and social nature, i.e. is carried out in society in a managerial manner and according to certain government standards. Whatever individual, social, political, or psychological forms they acquire in a historically specific type of education, culture or subculture, in the end, society itself determines its essence and direction, priorities and values, purpose and method of organization. *The aim* of the article is a philosophical and logical-methodological analysis of management as a specific educational and social phenomenon and an important social institution and as a natural need of the initial mental impulses of the individual psyche, not in a political but in a behavioral sense.

Keywords: power, subjectivity, activity, society, education, management, pedagogy, philosophy of education, socialization.

Introduction

Nowadays, the relations between human subjects which arise in the process of social interaction are always filled with power-subject content and therefore turn out to be power-subject relations.

It is known in the educational process that “true management is the ability of one subject to influence the states and actions of another subject, to determine them. In this regard, the determining factor is not the availability of objective power resources and capabilities but the psychological

possession of power, mutual subjective assessment of power means and capabilities of the participants in the interaction. Due to the authoritarian influence in education, the student-individual subject acquires the ability to reflect on his subjectivity, realize the presence and experience of the contents of his own intersubjectivity and transcendence, acquires the desire and ability to own the world and himself in the world, seeking to avoid individual freedom to a psychologically comfortable existence.

In fact, education in its traditional forms and methods does not have time to adapt to change, which leads to its serious deep crisis, overcoming which requires new management and educational paradigm. The development of this paradigm is almost impossible without a deep philosophical understanding of the meaning of education itself, its current crisis, and ways and means to overcome it effectively. This understanding is the subject of the study of the phenomenon of power as management, as it can exist in various forms. In order for the education system to be able to effectively fulfil its extremely important and responsible role, it must be substantially restructured on an innovative basis. First of all, it is necessary to resolutely overcome the generally recognized crisis of the world educational management system in education. Its cause and, at the same time, a significant manifestation is the inconsistency of the goals, content and nature of traditional education with the new realities of modernity and new social needs, which are due to the peculiarities of innovative development. There are two main approaches to understanding the nature and content of management in education. According to the first approach, power is seen as a somewhat abstract theoretical reflection on the nature and development of education. The second approach considers the task of forming a culture of philosophical thinking in teachers, the ability to comprehend the goals and meaning of their activities and the problems that accompany it as well as instilling such a culture in students as future professionals.

Development

As a result of the contradictory interaction of these trends in the late XX - early XXI century, the world became different from twenty years ago. It

is defined by another spirit - the spirit of interaction and interdependence of peoples and cultures and, at the same time - the spirit of internal independence based on awareness of self-sufficiency and ability to independent development, the spirit of disobedience to external influences imposed by superpowers. It is clear that the preparation of the individual for life should be different. Obviously, the role of education and upbringing must change. How are these variables taken into account at the level of state educational policy? Despite some positive developments in the last decade, the situation in Ukraine's education remains difficult. Unfortunately, we are entering the 21st century with the same problems that prevented us from reaching the level of developed countries in the past and which we simply do not have today. In accordance with the requirements of the "spirit of globalization and anti-globalization", we must form a high professional who would at the same time be a patriot of his homeland; a highly cultured person who mastered the full range of humanitarian culture. Where globalization processes unfold contrary to humanitarian and national priorities, social cataclysms and disturbances arise. People are not satisfied with the imbalance of interests of international political institutions and business structures with the hopes and aspirations of the world community. Opponents of globalization are united by a general rejection of the negative consequences of this process - the polarization of wealth and poverty, permanent hunger in the "third world", exploitation of child labour, genetic manipulation, environmental destruction, wage decline, and hegemony of capital. Humanitarian values are an essential feature of sociality, humanity, and civilization. Without them, humanity simply cannot exist. Experiencing any crises, wars, recessions, clashes and cataclysms, humanity always returns to humanitarian priorities as a single spiritual core, the basis of its existence. A similar return is observed in the context of overcoming the negative effects of globalization. Education must be the first to respond to this return. "Management in education exists regardless of our worldview, challenges of time, reflection, feeling and at the same time with them, through them and thanks to them. And today, management in education inspires us to live and to prepare for its perception is carried out through society and culture, science and religion, and art. "First of all, we un-

derstand management as a single philosophy of education which makes it possible to organize it (both in content and form) in accordance with the general historical tradition and the challenges of modern times.

In the life and professional activity of many people, there comes a time when gaining experience and achieving a significant level of competence leads to the need for a deep philosophical understanding of the meaning and purpose of this management activity. This understanding usually pursues the following three goals. First, the general critical focus of this understanding opens up opportunities for significant improvement of both management activities and increases efficiency. Secondly, philosophical comprehension allows a person to more clearly determine the compliance of his chosen profession and professional activity to their abilities and natural inclinations. Third, this understanding also actively contributes to the personal, spiritual and cultural development of man. It can even be argued that it is in the pedagogical field that these circumstances are most clearly, fully and vividly manifested. This is due firstly to the significant social significance of higher education management, secondly to the complex structure of professional activity of teachers, and thirdly the need to ensure not only the highly professional and social competence of future professionals but also their proper education and personal development. Today we have become not only witnesses but also direct participants in a qualitatively new stage of governance and development of human civilization. Its main feature is the transition to an innovative type of world development when changes in almost all spheres of public life are happening so fast that we do not have time to comprehend them. Under these conditions, society puts forward fundamentally new requirements for the education system, which should play a decisive role in their staffing in preparing the younger generations for success and activity in an innovative society.

In the intellectual history of mankind, there is a close interaction of management in the educational space. Any pedagogical management system has always been based on a certain worldview system.

And although one or another person periodically feels discomfort and kind of, as Freud wrote, “dissatisfaction with culture”, he tries,

according to Albert Camus, to “overcome the absurdity” caused by contradictions and often “breaks” beyond the existing, social harmonious culture, brilliantly demonstrates its individual creative abilities, everything eventually returns to its place: his “genius breakthrough” becomes public property, and he himself - a genius or a crazy, outstanding, historical figure or an ordinary person whose importance is determined by society, specifically historically, and not otherwise. Management is a mechanism for its implementation on the subconscious and social levels. Moreover, the subconscious in man, as a rule, is specific and creative; social is reflected and implemented in education.

From the point of view of philosophy, management is a reflection of society and the worldview of the individual.

First of all, we emphasize the need for management, which exists in the worldview, the mentality of the individual. Psychoanalysis interprets power management as a natural need as a symbol, pathology, gift or social necessity, not often interpreted as symbolic, i.e. “false”. The emphasis has always been on the subjective side of power as a social phenomenon. In our view, management is primarily an attitude towards others and the need for self-realization.

Today, power is fear, violence, phenomenon, need, hatred and love, selfishness and altruism, and so on. The desire for power also had its forerunner in psychology – A. Adler (1997), who tried to convince humanity that the biggest problem is not sexual needs but a sense of inferiority due to experiencing their real or apparent inferiority from other people, including sex. Both the existential fear of the unknown and the unwillingness to leave the psychological zone of comfort motivate one to seek compensation through the acquisition of control-power over others – teacher-student, comrade-girlfriend, employer-subordinate, president-people. We agree with Freud and Adler’s psychoanalytic theory that there is a need for sex and power in the human subconscious. In many psychological and sociological concepts, the concept of power is seen as central, basic from which other categories are derived, which are in a position dependent on the category of power. This was especially characteristic of the scientific developments of the twentieth century. B. Russell proposed to consider power as a fundamental explanatory con-

cept that unites all the social sciences, similar to the concept of energy in physics (Heckhausen, 1986, p. 307). G. Yavorska (2000) notes that in the late twentieth century, the concepts of power and authority, together with value orientations and instructions, determine the main directions of development of the social theory (p. 97). The main reason for such considerations is that power-subject relations permeate all human relations and appear as their essential and integral characteristic. In each case of interpersonal interaction, the attempt of its participants to determine the physical, mental, and social activity of the partners in some way can be more or less clearly traced. At the same time, it should be noted that not in all variants of interaction, the power-subordination relations constitute its essence are decisive and leading. However, in some cases, this is true, and in others - the authoritative characteristics of the interaction, at least, to some extent, nuancing its philosophical and psychological content. At the level of pedagogical and economic conceptual aspects, power is first of all correlated with the category of dependence in its broad sense close to the categories of "connection", and "relation". From a logical point of view, however, such an understanding of them is more justified when dependence is considered as a psychological and existential category. First of all, in our work we emphasize power as a managerial relation. It is in this case that power acquires the status of the essential submission. First of all, the existential-psychological moment of F. Nietzsche identified existence with the will to power. He understood this will as an insatiable desire to express or use power, to use it as a creative instinct (Nietzsche, 1993, pp. 329-414). Such pancratism has had and still has many followers: power is called a fundamental aspect of the life process, understood as broadly as possible, identifying with the concept of dependence, interpreted as "dissolved" in a society where it belongs to altogether and to no one in particular (Ilyin, 2002), considered as a real and inevitable source of human relations (Moskovichi, 1996) recognize as a common integrator of many finite human tendencies (Kaverin, 1991). As dependence and management power has a priori existed and will always exist. It unites all objects and phenomena and is an integral attribute of their interaction. The same can be said about power in the human environment. It is often interpreted as

a category of existence between people (Groshev, 2000; Keizerov, 1973; Pistriy, 1998; Proleev, 1999). And in this sense, power as government should not be considered as a purely social, political, religious or economic phenomenon. In the context of the outlined problems of the category of power, such its attributive characteristic as economic subtext is expressed. People aspire to the power to satisfy their material needs and, first of all, to have an economic resource. First of all, we emphasize the analysis of the philosophical and economic subtext and the structure of power, the identification of semantic characteristics and motivational sources of power-management interaction; Firstly, we are talking about the socio-psychological nature of power. Here the main attention is paid to the psychological content of the desire for power in the structure of personal motivation (A. Adler), biopsychological preconditions of social control (M. Foucault), the psychological essence of the mechanisms of social influence (Zimbardo & Leippe, 2000), the place of power in the system of socio-political relations (Wiatr, 1979).

At least two positive points can be seen in relying on such a broad methodological basis. First, it is about ensuring the economic component of the already mentioned comprehensiveness by highlighting the many links between mental phenomena of different levels, which are manifested and actualized in the discourse of intersubjective interaction. Secondly, the involvement of a wide range of methodological provisions provides a view of the philosophical and psychological approach, the blemo (krato) centrism (although moderate problem-centrism is always inevitable because, without it, the study loses its purpose). However, a third remark should be made that the status of the central problem in this study should be claimed by the authorities in all the breadth and completeness of its content, but the "central" was the intersubjective interaction. The analysis of power-subordination relations through its prism, it is hoped, helped to prevent excessive fascination with power issues and, at the same time, contributed to the adequate disclosure of essential and important characteristics of power - the most interesting psychological phenomenon.

In philosophical conceptions of power, its two main variants are often compared and contrasted: power coercion and power influence (manage-

ment). This division is fundamental to the philosophical, economic, and pedagogical understanding of power as management. In some cases, power and governance are seen as quite different, psychologically polar ways of exercising power. In others, the psychological nature of management as a variant of power itself is denied, and the psychological content is recognized only in various forms of managerial-authoritarian influence. If we interpret the existential connection as primarily intersubjective, then we should obviously prefer the second of these two understandings of power management.

Of course, the simplest, even the most primitive understanding of power means seeing in it primarily a coercive, psychological, psychosomatic concept.

First of all, management could be considered a mandatory need for the individual in view of his socialization and formation, and each person assumes that he seeks to control and subjugate, which reveals his existence. A person always experiences a sense of fear to some extent, and this feeling motivates him to take measures to overcome or avoid a situation of threat. Of course, this situation does not disappear by itself, so a person must apply a certain control element to the threat carrier.

The next type, according to Fromm, is irrational violence for revenge, the purpose of which is to calm the inner world, to restore the lost mental balance. Even more compensatory violence is subordinated to this function. Finally, another type of violence is the archaic thirst for blood, the complete embodiment of which is murder. Then the coercion over the soul again turns into coercion over the body. If you cannot master the soul, master the body. And thus, the subject of coercion regresses to the initial states. However, quite often, real power is recognized as one that does not contain an element of violence. Violence is coercion and possession, but not real power. Violence, says T. Boll (1993), is not power but its lack; it is pseudo-power. And the most obvious condition for the effectiveness of power is a combination of elements of coercion and influence. Effective enslavement cannot be achieved by a single tool - either violence or ideology, Foucault (1997) wrote: enslavement can be direct and physical but not violent. It can be calculated, organized, and refined but still have a physical nature. Thus, it should be about

the optimal combination of controls. We are always ruled and forced to command because this is how our lives are arranged... S. Moskovichi (1996) also speaks about this: on the one hand - violence in various forms; on the other - the government that justifies and sanctifies domination. Internal faith, which complements external violence, is a formula of management. Thus power exists only when there is a more or less significant influence of one subject on another. This does not mean that coercion as a fact of interaction can be psychologically ignored. There is every reason to believe that psychological influence is born and derived based on initially non-psychological coercion. Moreover, initial coercion in its various forms and meanings is obviously the basis not only for the ability to reflect psychological influence but also for the emergence of subjectivity itself in education. It is possible that these two processes in the very first stages of the subject's development constitute a holistic process. If physical coercion and violence against the body fully and adequately satisfy all the needs of the individual, then his departure from the passive object of coercive power becomes unnecessary and even impossible. However, in the real existence of a living individual, there is always a kind of gap between the level of existing needs and the level of satisfaction through forced external intervention. Thus, greater or lesser dissatisfaction with the need motivates the individual to go beyond a purely physical or biological situation and take a specific position of readiness to experience extra- and supra-coercive influences. As the subject develops, he develops the ability to perceive and distinguish between various forms of coercion and power, such as physical and social coercion, violence against body and soul, physical violence and psychological authority. In the early stages of development, such attributes of physical coercion as pain or fatigue push the individual both in the direction of submission to him and in the direction of liberation from him. In both cases, the corresponding behaviour becomes a fact of mental life, and coercion acquires the character of psychological influence. In a highly developed subject, behaviour as a reaction-response to coercion often appears as an important structural element of his value orientations, and decision-making in a situation of coercion has a significant moral colour. Thus, power as coercion "in

its purest form” does not exist psychologically: coercion which causes a psychological response turns into influence. Therefore, the psychological understanding of power often means the interpretation (but not identification) of it as an influence. This interpretation of power obviously focuses on external to subjective assessments and values of the circumstances of interaction. It is more about achieving the desired effect as a result of influencing the behaviour of another individual. Here we see the difference between power as a dispositional influence and power as an influence for the sake of control. It is also given to the interpretation of power as the influence of the manipulative or magical (Dyurvill, 1993; Kurbatov, 1996; Shostrom, 2002). Speaking about the grounds for identifying power and influence, V. Kunitsyna and others note that firstly, both power and influence imply the presence of a subject and object of influence. Secondly, it is almost always an influence on the motivational sphere. And thirdly, such action always has consequences. However, they insist that the understanding of power as an influence should be complemented by the recognition of the asymmetry of relations between members of such interaction. Power relations are always asymmetric, and this criterion brings the concept of power closer to the concept of manipulation than to personal influence (Kunitsyna et al., 2001, pp. 158-161). The phenomenon of management has a manipulative influence needed by the subject for self-affirmation: according to the ability to act on others - a sure sign that you exist and that this existence matters, so the impact can be interpreted as a special action, which generates the event of existence (Tatenko, 2002). Thus, it can be either about influencing another subject in order to make him dependent on himself (as well as himself from him) or about influencing the established order of things, about the appropriate arrangement of the common space of interaction with another subject. Power coercion and power influence can be seen as the poles of the authoritarian, critical continuum. At the pole of coercion, power as a psychological phenomenon does not exist because “pure” coercion precludes the involvement of “subordinate” subjectivity in the process of interaction. In education, management has a manipulative nature. R. Aron (2000, pp 68-69) proposes to distinguish between strength and power: power is the ability of a per-

son to influence the behaviour or feelings of others. So when power uses force, it becomes real power. According to M. Ilyin and A. Melville, power, on the one hand, is an influence of a special kind, and on the other - the ability to achieve certain goals and the ability to use certain means (Ilyin & Melville, 1997). R. May (2001) speaks of two dimensions of power: possibilities and realities (p. 114). We find an interesting substantiation of potential and real power in E. Canetti. Comparing power and violence, he said that violence is more direct and urgent than power. Instead, procrastinating violence becomes power. Power is much more general and extensive, includes much more and is not as dynamic as violence (Canetti, 2001). Thus, Canetti identified real power with violence while power in general, firstly, has a broader meaning and, secondly, is just a set of potential opportunities for violence.

Conclusion

Thus, we can assume that power as such is, to some extent, a social illusion, a convenient and acceptable for human consciousness way of interpreting the functional content of human relations. Relationships are concluded more independently of the subjective aspirations of man and more in accordance with the general laws of inter-object relations in the environment. Instead, the average person, incapable of realizing such overly complex dependencies, interprets these relations for himself in the categories of power-subordination relations, and thus the function of interaction becomes the function of power. Since power is an integral property of the interaction between people, such interaction does not exist without power-subordination relations. At the same time, there is no power outside the interaction. In many psychological concepts, especially personality-oriented power is interpreted as personal ability, a set of dispositional characteristics of the individual. Those who can potentially interact with each other already have various opportunities to take a position of power or subordination. However, before interaction, these possibilities exist only potentially. First, such personal abilities are the product of the previous intersubjective interaction within which the personality was formed. Secondly, only the process of interaction itself, in the end, places its partici-

pants in positions of power. With the exception of pronounced psychopathic and mentally problematic individuals, each person in interaction with others is more or less guided by social norms and patterns that this interaction must meet. At the forefront here are institutionalized social roles that individuals take on according to their own desire and the pressure of the environment. Thus, the subject of interactive behaviour in its manifestations combines its own critical properties and socially conditioned power-subordinate functions. In the process of interaction, this behaviour is detected, interpreted, and changed in accordance with similar behavioural manifestations of other participants and the context, primarily semantic, of the entire interaction. M. Weber (1993) wrote that the struggle as a desire to oppose their will to another will is potentially inherent in all kinds of jointly directed actions. Thus, power is not an integral attribute of interaction but its potential characteristic, which makes it even more similar to a specific function. On the contrary, T. Parsons (2000) noted that a person holds power only to the extent that his ability to influence others and achieve or maintain what he possesses is not authorized institutionally. That is, if Weber's actual power and socially assigned functions seem to be identified, then Parsons insisted on distinguishing them. Power is not a property that a person has but the result of interpersonal relationships in which one person looks at another as superior to himself (Fromm, 1990, p. 142). The essence of power is determined by the fact that it is the main means of a meaningful combination of actions of many people to achieve agreed or at least generally understood and accepted goals (Ilyin, 2001). Power is also an inevitable, even desirable context of psychotherapeutic interaction (Massey, 1987). However, power relations should not be understood as being determined solely by mutual agreement and understanding. Understanding is based on conflicting relationships. Thus, M. Foucault wrote that power should be understood not as a right of ownership but as a strategy that the consequences of its domination should be attributed not to appropriation but to certain inclinations, manoeuvres, tactics, techniques, and methods of functioning. In power, one should see a system of always tense and always active relations rather than a privilege that can be taken away (Foucault, 1997). The phenomena of pow-

er are based on the widespread situation of social conflict, which arises from the incompatibility of the goals of different people or the means to achieve them (Heckhausen, 1986). Thus, a certain process becomes necessary in order for the initially conflicting relations of the power-subject dependencies to become more orderly and moderate.

Psychologically sound power is the ability of one subject to influence another, to motivate him to perform / not perform certain actions, and to change his mental state and psychological properties. Psychological influence in the interaction of two human subjects, firstly, is always mutual, secondly has a different subjective meaning for each of them and, thirdly, causes more or less asymmetry of the relationship while complete equilibrium is rather situational with the exception. The actual use of power is the embodiment of always potentially greater and never fully used power capabilities of the subject and the realization of the power context of the situation; before being realized, power must exist potentially as a set of certain conditions - intra- and inter-subject. The only space where such conditions can arise is intersubjective space because power is not directed at another subject, even if only in the imagination of the subject of power influence has no psychologically authoritative meaning, i.e. is not power. Individual subjects interacting in the social space carry out a continuous exchange and coordination of mutually oriented positions. An essential characteristic of such positions and their exchange is the power-subordinate relations that are formed and function between the subjects. Since in society, there is not two, but a strong force of subjects interact at the same time this process can be characterized as a continuous circulation of power which gives it a regulatory function in the social environment. This functioning of power leads to the formation of a social structure. However, this very power immediately and at the same time destroys the structure, making it temporary and transient because the main form of its existence is a potential existence which can be realized only in the conditions of interaction between the subjects. Such interaction cannot be an incessantly repetitive structure; it constantly changes the positional relations of the interacting subjects and thus destroys the structure, bringing elements of spontaneity to it. Power is rather a property of interaction, the re-

sult of relationships that develop between individuals who are in a certain relationship rather than the dispositional characteristics of the individual or society. In the process of legitimation, they can be disposed of, turning into relatively rigid social relations while remaining basically an interactive rather than an attributive work.

References

- Adler, A. (1997). *Vzaimosvyaz mezhdru nevrozom i ostroumiem* (The relationship between neurosis and wit, in Ukrainian). Kyiv. Kaguei: Port-Royal.
- Aron, R. (2000). *Mir i viyna mizh natsiyami* (The world and every nation, in Ukrainian). Kyiv: Yunivers.
- Boll, T. (1993). *Vlast'* (Power. Policy, in Russian). (Vol. 5). Moscow: Moscow State Institute of International Relations.
- Canetti, E. (2001). *Massa i vlast'* (Mass and power, in Russian). Moscow: Nauka. <https://gtmarket.ru/library/basis/5454/5455>
- Dyurvill, G. (1993). *Psikhicheskoe mogushchestvo cheloveka (Lichnyy magnetizm)* (The mental power of a person (Personal magnetism, in Ukrainian). Dnipropetrovsk: Dnipro.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *Istoriya bezumiya v klasicheskuyu epokhu* (The story of insanity in the classical era, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg University publication.
- Fromm, E. (1990). *Missiya Zigmunda Frejda. Analiz ego lichnosti i vliyaniya* (Mission of Sigmund Freud. Analysis of his personality and influence, in Russian). (A. M. Rutkevicha, Trans.). Moscow: Ves' mir.
- Groshev, I. V. (2000). *Gendernye predstavleniya o vlasti* (Gender perceptions of power, in Russian). (Vol. 12). Tambov: Sociologicheskije issledovaniya.
- Ilyin, Ye. P. (2001). *Differentsialnaya psikhofiziologiya muzhchiny i zhenshchiny* (Differential psychophysiology of men and women, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Piter.
- Ilyin, M., & Melville, A. (1997). *Vlast'* (Power, in Russian). Moscow: Polis.
- Heckhausen, Kh. (1986). *Motivatsiya i deyatelnost* (Motivation and activity, in Russian). (Vol. 1). (B. M. Velichkovskogo, Trans.). Moscow: Pedagogika.
- Kaverin, S. B. (1991). *Potrebnost vlasti* (The need for power, in Russian). Moscow: Znaniye.
- Keizerov, N. M. (1973). *Vlast i avtoritet. Kritika burzhuaznykh teoriy* (Power and authority. Criticism of bourgeois theories, in Russian). Moscow: Yuridicheskaya literatura.
- Kunitsyna, V. N., Kazarinova, N. V., & Pogolsha, V. M. (2001). *Mezhlichnostnoe obshchenie* (Interpersonal communication, in Russian). University Textbook. Saint Petersburg: Piter.
- Kurbatov, V. I. (1996). *Magiya vlasti. Kharizma i realii* (The magic of power. Charisma and reality, in Russian). Rostov-on-Don: Feniks.
- May, R. (2001). *Smysl trevogi* (The meaning of anxiety, in Russian) (M. I. Zavalov & A. I. Siburina, Trans.). Moscow: Klass.
- Moskovichi, S. (1996). *Vek tolpy. Istoricheskiy traktat po psikhologii mass* (Age of crowds. Historical treatise on mass psychology, in Russian). (T. P. Yemelyanova, Trans.). Moscow: Center of Psychology and Psychotherapy.
- Nietzsche, F. (1993). *Zhadannya vladi* (The desire for power, in Ukrainian). (A. Onishka, & P. Tarashchuka, Trans.). Kiiv: Osnovi, Dnipro.
- Parsons, T. (2000). *O strukture social'nogo dejstviya* (On the structure of social action, in Russian). Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt.
- Pistriy, I. V. (1998). *Kulturno-psikhologichni aspekti vladnikh vidnoshen* (Cultural and psychological aspects of power relations, in Ukraine). In *Praktichna psikhologiya v konteksti kultur. Zbirnik naukovikh prats* (Practical psychology in the context of cultures: Collection of scientific papers, in Ukrainian) (pp. 153-160). Kyiv: Nika-tsentr.
- Proleev, S. (1999). *Buttya ta vlada: Transtsendentalni peredumovi ta istorichna geneza vladaryuvannya* (Being and power: Transcendental preconditions and historical genesis of rule, in Ukrainian).

- Kyiv: Geneza.
- Shostrom, E. (2002). *Chelovek-manipulyator. Vnutrennee puteshestvie ot manipulyatsii k aktualizatsii* (Man-manipulator. The inner journey from manipulation to actualization, in Russian). (N. Shevchuk, & R. Kuchkarovoy, Trans.). Moscow: Aprel-Press, EKSMO-Press.
- Tatenko, V. O. (2002). *Do problemi avtentshnosti lyudskogo butya: paradigma vchinku* (To the problem of the authenticity of human existence: The paradigm of action, in Ukrainian). Kharkiv: OVS.
- Massey, R. (1987). *Transakcionnyj analiz i social'naya psihologiya vlasti: razmyshleniya, vyzvannye Dzhejkobsom "Avtokraticeskaya vlast'"* (Transactional analysis and the social psychology of power: Reflections Evoked by Jacobs "Autocratic Power", in Russian). Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/036215378701700311>
- Wiatr, J. (1979). *Sotsiologiya politicheskikh ot-nosheniy* (Sociology of political relations, in Russian). Moskow: Progres.
- Weber, M. (1993). *Poklikannya do politiki. Sotsiologiya. Zagalnoistorichni analizi. Politika* (Call to politics. Sociology. General historical analyzes. Policy, in Ukraine). Kyiv: Osnovi.
- Yavorska, G. M. (2000). *Preskriptivna lingvistika yak diskurs: Mova, kultura, vlada* (Prescriptive linguistics as a discourse: Language, culture, power, in Ukraine). National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of Linguistics named after O. O. Potebny.
- Zimbardo, F., & Lyayppe, M. (2000). *Sotsialnoe vliyanie* (Social impact, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Piter.