

UDC: 316.46.058.5: 37.011.3 - 051 (045)
 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-4665-2017-11-11>

Alla Skok,
*PhD (Candidate of Psychological Sciences), associate professor,
 Dean of the Faculty of Psychology and Pedagogy,*
Irina Shlimakova,
*PhD (Candidate of Psychological Sciences), associate professor,
 head of the Department of Ecological Psychology and Sociology,
 T. Shevchenko National University "Chernihiv Collegium",
 53, Hetman Polubotko Str., Chernihiv, Ukraine*

MANIPULATIVE INFLUENCE APPLICATION IN WORK BY RESEARCH-PEDAGOGICAL STAFF

The purpose of the research is to analyze the results of the study of manipulative techniques application by school teachers, principals and university teachers in their work; searching for correlations between psychodynamic manifestations of the temperament of teachers and peculiarities of manipulations use. The following research methods were used in the study: Bant's Scale of Manipulation Approach techniques, S. Bartchenko's "Personality Orientation in Communication" Scale and V. Rusalova's "Questionnaire of the Structure of Temperament". On the basis of the results obtained, it has been determined that all the respondents use manipulating strategies in their work. The indicators vary from the average level to high. It has been found that school principals are characterized by the high level of manipulations application as distinct from university teachers. In the process of pedagogical interaction, university teachers are oriented mainly to equal communication, mutual understanding and communicative cooperation. There is a relationship between communicative authoritarianism and the manipulative influences of educators. Also, there are statistically significant relationships between social flexibility and the use of manipulative actions. Taking this into account, four types of pedagogical workers have been distinguished ("Indifferent", "Conformal", "Dialogical" and "Authoritarian"). One of the main tasks of training future educators is the formation of their skills according to the "Dialogical" type. The realization of this task is considered by means of the introduction of the principles of humanization and fundamentalization into the educational space of a higher educational establishment.

Keywords: *influence, manipulation, makiavellizm, humanitarization, fundamentalization, humanization.*

Introduction

The problem of manipulating human consciousness is relevant nowadays. Some researchers believe that one of the reasons for this is the existence of a modern human in the artificial intellectual space, that is, in the system of civilization values created by people, which, in the context of those socio-economic processes taking place today in Ukraine, has undergone significant transformational changes in moral, ethical and environmental aspects, interpersonal interaction. It explains the possibilities for targeted influence on the society and individual groups of people and makes it possible to apply technologies of manipulation of consciousness and public opinion.

Analyzing the content of information coming from mass media, it is possible to assert that the issue of manipulation is actively discussed today by people and is the subject of scientists' discussions. A significant number of works of domestic and foreign scientists deal with the issue of manipulation [1; 2; 3; 8; 9; 11]. Researchers state that the methods of manipulative influence on a personality are widely spread in various social interaction spheres, such as politics, economics, diplomatic relations, jurisprudence, etc. There is also an educational sphere, where various kinds of manipulations are observed in educational institutions of all types: from preschool to higher educational [8].

Analyzing the techniques and strategies described by the researchers of the manipulative actions in the educational sphere (in different fields: teacher-preschooler, supervisor-tutor, teachers-parents, teacher-pupil, pupil-teacher, director-teacher, teacher-student, student-teacher, etc.), we conclude that destructive manipulations act as one of the crisis factors in higher education, which was recognized by the vast majority of scientists from different countries at the end of the twentieth century. The main features of the crisis in higher education are distinguished: insufficient development of future specialists' spirituality, humanity, culture, which leads to the formation of technocratic thinking, the authoritarian type of the education management system (as manifestations of destructive manipulations) [5; 11].

Taking into account all this information, we can talk about the relevance of the study of manipulative influence in general, and in the professional activity of teaching staff in particular. Despite this, numerous attempts of specialists to give a clear, meaningfully filled definition of the very concept of manipulation that would take into account all its aspects, do not have the expected results yet.

The purpose of the article is to explore the relationships between psychodynamic manifestations of temper-

ament and the scientific and pedagogical workers' tendency to manipulate.

To achieve the goal, the following tasks are identified:

1) to find out the tendencies of using the manipulative attitude of scientific and pedagogical workers in their professional activities;

2) to establish the presence of statistically significant interrelationships between the parameters of structural components of temperament and signs of tendency to manipulative tendencies among teachers;

3) to distinguish types of scientific and pedagogical workers on the grounds of the growth of manipulative influence.

Hypothesis of the research: more often than other pedagogical workers, manipulative techniques of Machiavellian nature are used by school principals in their professional activity. Propensity for manipulative actions in teaching staff may be mediated by the social pace of personality and social ergonomy.

Research Methods

The empirical research was carried out in stages during 2017, February-July. At the first stage, the scientific literature on the issue was studied. A diagnostic toolkit that contributed to the achievement of the goals and objectives of the study was selected. In particular, we used the following techniques: Manipulative Attitude Scale by Bant, Personality Orientation in Communication by S. Bratchenko and Temperament Structure Questionnaire by V. Rusalov.

Also, this stage included test study (March 2017), in which 90 people took part (30 teachers from each category studied, respectively). The actual research phase was conducted on May, 2017; the sample included teachers and principals of secondary schools of Chernihiv city (hereinafter referred to as the NSP) and teachers of higher educational institutions of Chernihiv. Totally, there were 199 people (65 people were teachers of health centers, 58 – heads of health centers and 76 – professors of university, including 134 women and 65 men).

Diagnostic measurements were mainly carried out in the Q-data measuring system, using the L-data system (if necessary). Teachers were suggested to answer the questions of the methodology in the prepared forms at a time convenient for them, the purpose of the study was not reported.

The interpretation stage included quantitative and qualitative analyzes. Statistical data processing was carried out using the SPSS for Windows 21.0 computer package using variance, correlation and cluster analysis.

Theoretical analysis

The word “manipulation” comes from the Latin phrase “manus” (hand) and “ple” (fill), its primary meaning was very positive: manage, manage with knowledge of the case, to provide help, etc. Then the interpretation of the concept acquired another character, researchers determine this psychological category as a latent management of consciousness and behavior of people in certain

political, social and economic interests of the authority [3]. Researchers of social influence phenomenon state that manipulation is a deliberate and hidden awakening of another person to perform some kind of action or make decisions.

English-language dictionaries of synonyms give such meanings for the term “manipulate” – to manage, control, use, etc. (English Thesaurus, 2001). Regarding the concept of manipulator, it is usually believed that it is a person who achieves his/her goal through the purposeful control of other people (Dictionary of Contemporary English, 2003).

Summarizing the ideas of scientists who study manipulative influence, manipulation can be defined as a type of psychological influence, the masterful realization of which leads to the awakening of intentions in another person that do not coincide with his/her real desires [3; 6; 8; 10]. Typically, manipulative actions are considered in the context of interpersonal communication, in which, in a hidden form, the influence on the partner in communication in order to achieve one's intentions is performed. Thus, based on a survey of 300 respondents, researchers found that 9% enjoyed their manipulations, 12% - often use manipulations, 21% use manipulations with professional intentions, and 55% - use them for survival [1].

In the continuum of the educational sphere, the pedagogical influence, as a special kind of teacher's activity, involves the achievement of positive changes in the intellectual and personal development. A teacher using manipulative techniques creates goals for his/her students, which they must accept and master, and thereby make use of it for themselves. That is, we can say that modern pedagogy of manipulation is an alternative variant of pedagogy of authority, in which constructive manipulation in education is a positive means of intensive development of education, which allows children understand themselves, rather than the pedagogy of authority.

It is this impact that can ensure the realization of the main goal of modern education – the development of young people's confidence of dynamic knowledge, the formation of the ability to learn and re-learn, to realize the need for the development of creative potential. However, along with this, the comprehension of the results of modern theoretical and empirical researches in the continuum of pedagogical influences gave an opportunity to draw conclusions about the growth of the trend of using manipulative technologies in the educational sphere. Scientists emphasize that manipulation, as a form of communication in education, is often used as a type of control, while it can be carried out both by educators over students vice versa.

The following typical manipulations are more commonly used: provoking protective reactions; provoking disorganization; triggering partner's impatience, greed; delaying the discussion time, etc. [7; 8]. Unfortunately, according to researchers, very often in such situations, manipulators use such a kind of manipulative influence, as Machiavellianism, characterizing the attitude of another

er person as a means that can be neglected in pursuit of personal benefit. We are talking about destructive forms of manipulative actions. We share the opinion of some scientists who believe that the use of “barbaric” methods of manipulation can be mediated by certain individual-typological features of the manipulator, which are related to the dynamic aspects of the person’s activity.

Research results and their discussion

The results of the empirical study of the use of manipulative actions by teachers in their professional activity show that, in general, more than half of the respondents apply manipulative influence using Machiavellianism techniques (Table 1). Average values with a tendency to high are peculiar for 56.7% of the teachers.

More than a half of the teachers deliberately use manipulative techniques of Machiavellian character in order to achieve their goals (their students’ academic success, diligence, etc.).

In the context of psychology Machiavellianism is interpreted in the following three aspects: as behavior (conscious use in the process of interpersonal interaction of techniques in order to achieve benefits by applying techniques of deceit, slander, bribery, etc.); as attitude (cynical attitude to people as weak and dependent on social pressure, that is, the communication partner is only a tool by the help of “which” a desired result can be achieved); as ignoring social morality (when it prevents achieving the desired result).

Therefore, we can state that a high level of manipulative attitude is characterized by behavioral disposition of superiority, the desire for leadership using the techniques of attack, and conquest. Teachers who show a high level of manipulation techniques have quite good communication skills, but, as a rule, their communication style has an authoritarian character. Such educators appreciate their ideas, put their own interests above the others’ ones.

The low level of manipulative attitude indicates the use of effective techniques of professional interaction by the teaching staff in the positions of cooperation. Such teachers have a wide range of communication programs, in which manipulative techniques are the ways to achieve educational goals in their students’ interests.

Comparing the results of the three categories of individuals on the basis of data presented in Table 1, it should be noted that the majority of school teachers and headmasters have medium and rather high propensity for manipulating, while university teachers – mostly its average level with a tendency to the low one. Thus, at general educational institutions, the interaction in the system of “teacher-pupil” is often built on the principle of dominance, while university teachers tend to apply the principle of partnership.

Thus, school principals are more prone to manipulative actions, and university teachers are the less prone to it, which confirms our first research hypothesis.

Table 1.

Expression of manifestations of manipulative actions in the educational sphere (in %)

Indicator of manipulative tendencies	% of subjects			
	Total sample	Teachers	Headmasters	Professors
Low values	06.7	04.9	10.0	03.4
Average values with a tendency to low	35.0	30.1	25.0	51.5
Average values with a tendency to high	56.7	65.0	65.0	40.0
High values	01.9	0	05.1	0

NB: low indicator – 40 points or less; average indicator with a tendency to low – 40-60 points; average indicator with a tendency to high – 60-80 points; high indicator – 80 points or more.

Analyzing the results of the research using the “Personality Orientation in Communication”, we should underline the following: the orientation to equal communication, mutual understanding, mutual openness and communicative cooperation is more peculiar for university teachers than to school teachers and principals. The authoritarian orientation in communication is the most expressed in school principals, which is logically explained by their status role. School teachers often use manipulative communication, rarely use dialogic, indifferent, and conformal orientation of communication with pupils.

Such results show that the specialists of higher education have stepped forward on the way to humanizing the educational space; the principles of equality, justice, love and respect for others, respect for their dignity, and the care of the welfare of others are more often used in

their work. Ensuring the continuity of the educational space humanization is one of the effective ways of forming a person of a new type as an open system capable of self-organization and self-management. And it will provide the training of specialists for the educational sphere in accordance with the humanistic model of a specialist of a new type.

Correlation analysis has established direct relationships between: authoritarian communication strategy and tendency to manipulation ($r=0.315, p\leq 0.05$), so authoritarian communication is directly interrelated with Machiavellian manipulative action; manipulative strategy and tendency to manipulate ($r = 0.526, at p\leq 0.001$), as well as inverse relationship between the indifferent orientation of communication and manifestations of manipulative actions ($r=-0.274, at p \leq 0.01$). These relationships are quite

logical and confirm the preliminary studies on this issue, the manipulative attitude of the Machiavellian character is determined by the authoritarian strategy of communication.

For testing the hypothesis concerning the mediating tendencies of manipulative actions by individuals psychophysiological peculiarities which are related to the dynamic aspects of the person's activity, the structure of the temperament of the studied categories of pedagogical workers was examined.

It has been found that in general, the most common type of temperament of the teaching staff is the social pace and social ergency, the lowest values were obtained according to the scale of social flexibility and emotionality. Such results demonstrate the low sensitivity of the educational workers to their failures, their emotional balance and self-confidence. Higher Educational Institutions teachers have indicator of social pace as a dominant position, and social flexibility as the least pronounced one; school teachers also have the highest percentage of social significance, and emotionality has the lowest rate. Among psychodynamic manifestations of temperament, school principals are characterized by social ergency, and social flexibility is poorly developed in them. There were no statistically significant differences in the groups. The results obtained are consistent with the specifics of the professional activities of the respondents, and the priority of social ergency in directors can be explained by their

need for social contacts, the desire for leadership and high social status. The dominant position of the social pace of school and university teachers is a vivid illustration of such a peculiarity of pedagogical activity as the desire for high-speed linguistic acts of teachers, which must be carried out to ensure the high quality of the educational process. Correlation relationship between social ergicity and manipulative attitude of teachers has been established ($r = 0.371$, at $p \leq 0.05$).

The better developed of the educational workers' communication skills are, the more they are prone for manifestation of manipulative actions. The correlation between these components is significant at the level ($r = 0.304$, at $p \leq 0.05$). Probably, communicative activity and impulsiveness are among the factors of using manipulations. The statistically significant relationship between social tempo and the tendency to manipulation ($r = 0.296$, at $p \leq 0.01$) can be substantiated by the status factor of the teacher, which is peculiar for the educational sphere, that is, having the position "above" ("I teach – you study", "You are my student, not I am your teacher, and I have no time to discuss it", etc.), educational workers choose a faster path of influence – manipulative, neglecting non-manipulative methods to achieve the desired result. On the basis of cluster analysis, based on the use of manipulative techniques four types of pedagogical workers were distinguished (Table 2).

Table 2.

Typology of Pedagogical Workers on the Basis of Using Techniques of Manipulative Influence

Types of pedagogical workers		Level of manifestation of manipulations	% Experiment participants
1	Indifferent	low	06.4
2	Conformal	average with tendency to low	15.2
3	Dialogic	average with a tendency to high	48.7
4	Authoritarian	high	29.7

The first cluster included individuals with low propensity to manipulation and high indicators of indifferent orientation in professional communication. These teachers can be described as those who usually ignore communication itself in the process of communicative interaction, manipulative strategies for them act as means of pedagogical influence for the achievement of just professional goals. Such educators fall into to the "Indifferent" type.

The second cluster involves those educational workers who have average indicators of using manipulations with a tendency to the low one, and high levels of conformational orientation in the process of professional communication. In order to get the desired result, such teachers with the help of manipulations show the position of refusal of equal communication in favor of the interlocutor, trying to "adjust" themselves to his/her communication style. Typically, these educators get the predicted result. The second group is called "Conformal".

The third cluster involves teachers with average indicators of applying manipulations with a tendency to a high level and high indicators of dialogue orientation in

the process of professional communication. These teachers during communication use manipulative techniques "equality", "respect", "trust", "cooperation". According to our ideas, they constitute the "Dialogue" type.

The fourth cluster is made up by those teachers who have high indicators of using manipulations and show a high level of communicative authoritarianism. They treat the interlocutor as an object of their manipulations, showing domination in the process of communication, unwillingness to hear and understand the interlocutor, disrespect for his/her point of view. They use their status and professional role. This type of educators is called "Authoritarian".

One of the important tasks of training future educators, who are able to raise the future generation in the conditions of European integration of Ukraine, is the formation of their skills according to the "Dialogical" type.

The realization of this task is provided through the introduction of the following principles of the higher educational institution in the educational space:

- *Humanitarization*. The reorientation of the educational process from technocratic to informational involves the formation of humanitarian, systemic ecological thinking, the identification of a future teacher with his/her people, country, culture, the acquisition of skills of social communication, as the basis of effective professional interaction. It can be provided by means of teaching the disciplines Psychology of Communication, Ethnic Psychology, Psychology of Influence, Psychology of Management.

- *Fundamentalization*, which involves the formation in the minds of students of the unified worldview as an integrity, which is developing and functioning on the basis of single universally recognized laws. In higher education system, the appropriate components of fundamentalization can be the following: the priority of forming future specialists in systemic thinking, general and professional culture; the direction of educational disciplines to study the rules of the development of nature and society, the formation of the integrity of representations about the global system of the world, its problems and solutions (subjects “Ecological Psychology”, “Psychology of Health”, “Psychology of Social Cognition”, “Psychology of Extreme Situations”, “Psychology of Art”).

- *Humanization* (humanism is considered as humanity). In this aspect, the introduction of the courses “Psychology of Tolerance”, “Psychology of Development”, “Psychology of Sexuality”, “Phenomenology of Emotional Intelligence”, “Cross-cultural Psychology of Childhood” is appropriate.

At the same time, the integrated approach in the teaching of psychological disciplines plays the important role. It makes a contribution to the formation of a specialist who meets the requirements of time.

REFERENCES

1. Garifullin, R. (1997). *Illyuzionizm lichnosti kak novaya fyilosofsko-psikhologicheskaya kontseptsiya* [Illusionism of the individual as a new philosophical and psychological concept]. *Psikhologiya obmana, manipulyatsii, kodirovaniya – Psychology of deception, manipulation, coding*. Yoshkar-Ola [in Russian].
2. Bessnovov, B. (2010). *Istoriya i filosofiya nauki: uchebnoe posobie* [History and philosophy of science: textbook]. BM. : Publishing house «Yurait»; ID «Yurait» [in Russian].
3. Dotsenko, E. L. (1997). *Psikhologiya manipulyatsii: fenomeny, mekhanizmy i zashchity* [Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection]. Moscow: CheRo, Moscow State University [in Russian].
4. Kara-Murza, S.G. (2006). *Manipulyatsiia svidomosti: navchalnyi posibnyk* [Manipulation of Consciousness: Textbook]. Kyiv: Orioni [in Ukrainian].
5. Mikhailova, N.N. (2001). *Pedagogika podderzhki: uchebno-metodicheskoe posobie* [Pedagogy of support:

Conclusions

Summarizing the research results, the following ideas are worth emphasizing. The issue of manipulation is very relevant nowadays, especially in the educational sphere.

1. The tendencies of using manipulations in the professional activity of the pedagogical and scientific-pedagogical staff under study are expressed at the average level with a tendency to high. University teachers rarely use manipulative techniques as distinct from school principals.

In the process of pedagogical interaction, teachers are focused mainly on equal communication, mutual understanding and communicative cooperation. The authoritarian orientation in communication is expressed in the school principals, school teachers often use manipulative-oriented communication.

2. There are relationships between communicative authoritarianism and the manipulative influences of educators. Besides there is statistically significant relationship between such psychodynamic manifestations of temperament, as social flexibility. The manipulative tendencies of teachers are interconnected with these psychodynamic manifestations of temperament.

Thus, the hypothesis of the study was confirmed.

3. Based on this research, four types of pedagogical workers are distinguished: “Indifferent”, “Conformal”, “Dialogical” and “Authoritarian”.

One of the main tasks of training future educators is the formation of their skills of teachers according to the “Dialogical” type. The realization of this task is seen through the introduction of the principles of humanitarization, fundamentalization and humanization in the educational space of a higher educational establishment.

educational and methodical manual]. Moscow: MIROS [in Russian].

6. Sidorenko, E.V. (2004). *Training of influence and confrontation with influence* [Trening vliyaniya i protivostoyaniya vliyaniyu]. St. Petersburg: Rech [in Russian].

7. Sosnin, V.A. (1993). *Uchymsia obshcheniyu: vzaymoponymany, vzaymodeistviye, perekhovory, trenynh* [Learn to communicate: mutual understanding, interaction, negotiations, training]. Moscow [in Russian].

8. Shainov, V.P. (2010). *Psikhologiya manipulyrovaniya* [Psychology of manipulation]. Minsk: Harvest [in Russian].

9. Goodin, R.E. (1980). *Manipulatory politics*. Yale U. Pr. N. Haven [in English].

10. Hayes, N. (1993). *Principles of social psychology*. Hove, Hillsdale : Lawrence Erlbaum Ass. [in English].

11. Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continun, N.Y. [in English].

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Гарифуллин Р. Иллюзионизм личности как новая философско-психологическая концепция / Р. Гарифуллин // Психология обмана, манипуляций, кодирования. – Йошкар-Ола, 1997.
2. Бессонов Б. История и философия науки: учебное пособие / Б. Бессонов. – М.: Издательство «Юрайт»; ИД «Юрайт», 2010. – 395 с.
3. Доценко Е. Л. Психология манипуляции: феномены, механизмы и защиты / Е. Л. Доценко. – М.: ЧеРо, Издательство МГУ, 1997. – 344 с.
4. Кара-Мурза С. Г. Манипуляція свідомістю: навчальний посібник / С. Г. Кара-Мурза. – К.: Оріони, 2006. – 528 с.
5. Михайлова Н.Н. Педагогика поддержки: учебно-методическое пособие / Н.Н. Михайлов, С.М. Юсфин. – М.: МИРОС, 2001. – 208 с.
6. Сидоренко Е.В. Тренинг влияния и противостояния влиянию / Е. В. Сидоренко. – СПб.: Речь, 2004. – 256 с.
7. Соснин В.А. Учимся общению: взаимопонимание, взаимодействие, переговоры, тренинг / В.А. Соснин, П.А. Лунев. – М., 1993. – 156 с.
8. Шейнов В.П. Психология манипулирования / В.П. Шейнов. – Минск : Харвест, 2010. – 704 с.
9. Goodin R.E. Manipulatory politics / R.E. Goodin. – Yale. U. Pr. N. Haven; L, 1980. – 250 p.
10. Hayes N. Principles of social psychology / N. Hayes. – Hove, Hillsdale : Lawrence Erlbaum Ass., 1993. – 168 p.0
11. Freire P. Pedagogy of the oppressed / P. Freire. – Continun, N.Y., 1990. – 186 p.

Алла Георгіївна Скок,

кандидат психологічних наук, доцент, декан психолого-педагогічного факультету,

Ірина Іванівна Шлімакова,

кандидат психологічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри екологічної психології та соціології,

Національний університет «Чернігівський колегіум» імені Т. Г. Шевченка,

вул. Гетьмана Полуботка, 53, м. Чернігів, Україна,

МАНИПУЛЯТИВНИЙ ВПЛИВ У ПРОФЕСІЙНІЙ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ПЕДАГОГІЧНИХ ТА НАУКОВО-ПЕДАГОГІЧНИХ ПРАЦІВНИКІВ

Актуальність теми зумовлена поширенням тенденції вживання деструктивних технологій маніпулятивного впливу у різних сферах соціальної взаємодії. Особливо гостро проблема деструктивних маніпуляцій постає в освітній сфері, де використання педагогами макіавеллістичних технік негативно позначається як на процесі гуманізації освітнього простору загалом, так і на формуванні особистості нового часу зокрема. Мета статті полягає у дослідженні зв'язків між психодинамічними проявами темпераменту та схильністю до маніпулювання у науково-педагогічних працівників. Також важливим для авторів було осмислення принципів гуманізації освіти у контексті переходу від педагогіки авторитарності до педагогіки конструктивного маніпулювання. Діагностичні вимірювання здійснювалися у вимірювальній системі Q-даних (методики «Шкала маніпулятивного ставлення» Банта, «Спрямованість особистості у спілкуванні» С. Братченка та «Опитувальник структури темпераменту» В. Русалова). На підставі отриманих результатів визначено, що усі категорії досліджуваних запобігають до маніпуляцій, такі дії виражені у них на середньому рівні з тенденцією до високих, при цьому найменше маніпулюють викладачі університетів, більш за всіх – директори. У процесі педагогічної взаємодії викладачі орієнтуються переважно на рівноправне спілкування, взаєморозуміння та комунікативну співпрацю, авторитаризм у спілкуванні найчастіше спостерігається у директорів. Існують зв'язки між комунікативним авторитаризмом та маніпулятивними впливами педагогів. Також встановлено статистично значущі зв'язки між маніпулятивним ставленням науково-педагогічних працівників та соціальною ергічністю; маніпулятивним ставленням та соціальною пластичністю і темпом. Тобто маніпулятивні тенденції педагогів взаємопов'язані з цими психодинамічними проявами темпераменту. З урахуванням цього виокремлено чотири типи педагогічних працівників за ознаками використання технік маніпулятивного впливу: «Індиферентні», «Конформні», «Діалогічні» та «Авторитарні». Викладачі вищої школи пішли на крок вперед на шляху гуманізації освітнього простору, проте відлуння авторитарної системи середньої освіти гальмує процес підготовки майбутніх спеціалістів у контексті гуманістичної моделі нового типу. У зв'язку з цим виникає проблема неперервності гуманістично зорієнтованого освітнього середовища. Одним із пріоритетних завдань підготовки майбутніх педагогів є формування у них навичок педагогів типу «Діалогічні». Реалізація цього завдання вбачається через упровадження в освітній простір вищого навчального закладу принципів гуманітаризації, фундаменталізації та гуманізації.

Ключові слова: вплив, маніпулювання, макіавеллізм, гуманітаризація, фундаменталізація, гуманізація.

Sumbitted on September, 13, 2017

Reviewed by Doctor of Psychology, O. Palamarchuk