

## CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOUR OF STUDENTS OBTAINING DIFFERENT PROFESSIONS

**Yulia Tovstokorya**

*Institute of Social and Political Psychology, NAPS (Ukraine)*

### **Abstract**

This article is about the empirical research of the relationship between the components of communicative behaviour of young people. Article describes the basic components of communicative behaviour: communicative tolerance, social communicative competence, perceptual-interactive competence. These components make it possible to investigate holistically and comprehensively communicative behaviour of a person, as well as to build a correctional program for effective social dialogue construction. We describe the procedure and statistical methods to research communicative behaviour components. Analysis of relationships between components shows that the communicative behaviour of a person is build up through various systems of relationships between its components. Based on this, we found that components of communicative behaviour were dependent on characteristics of the educational environment (of such specializations as: humanitarian, technical, military). The revealed features of communicative behaviour can be used to resolve problems of discrimination, both within the student group and beyond.

KEY WORDS: mutual perception, mutual influence, communicative behavior, communicative tolerance, communicative social competence, socially perceptive competence, social adaptation.

### **Anotacija**

Straipsnyje pristatomas empirinis jaunuolių bendravimo elgsenos komponentų sąsajų tyrimas. Skiriami pagrindiniai bendravimo elgsenos komponentai: tolerancija bendraujant, socialinė bendravimo kompetencija, percepcinė-interakcinė kompetencija. Jie leidžia visapusiškai ir išsamiai išnagrinėti asmens bendravimo elgseną bei sukurti korekcinę efektyvaus socialinio dialogo puoselėjimo programą. Straipsnyje aprašomos bendravimo elgsenos tyrimo procedūros ir statistiniai metodai. Komponentų tarpusavio sąsajų analizė atskleidžia, kad asmens bendravimo elgsena formuojasi įvairiose sistemose. Taigi bendravimo elgsenos pobūdis priklauso nuo edukacinės aplinkos (humanitarinių, techninių, karinių specialybių atveju). Atskleisti bendravimo elgsenos bruožai gali būti panaudoti sprendžiant diskriminacijos problemas studentų grupėse ir už jų ribų.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: abipusis suvokimas, abipusė įtaka, bendravimo elgsena, tolerancija bendraujant, socialinė bendravimo kompetencija, percepcinė-interakcinė kompetencija, socialinė adaptacija.

### **Introduction**

The issues of personal communicative behaviour characteristics are of particular importance due to communication process intensification, broad spreading of information technologies, permanent changes in various areas of the society, such as economy, politics, education and so on. That is why the interest to the communicative behaviour components when agents having different professional and

social orientations interact is growing. This is especially true for the educational sector, including higher education, where the existence of different discrepancies and inconsistencies between communicants is manifested, including not only the differences in speaking system functioning, but also differences relating to the mastery of one or another specialty. Given the above, communicative behaviour is implemented in various strategies depending on the communication purpose, environment, situations, role relations of communicators and others. So deep understanding of this research subject and its main components is required.

Importance of studying of the correlations existing between the major components of personal communicative behaviour is determined by general interest to society communicative effects.

The article goal is to examine the basic components of personal communicative behaviour, to identify their relations based on such a social condition as the educational environment. In particular, the impact of education types (of such specializations as: humanitarian, technical, military) is discussed.

## **1. Characteristics of communicative behaviour of components**

The most essential, in our view, communicative behaviour components determining effective solutions of communication challenges that young people are facing in various areas of social interaction, are communicative tolerance, social communicative competence, social perceptive competence.

Communicative tolerance is a purely personal characteristic, showing the degree of tolerance to interlocutors' inappropriate mental conditions, qualities and deeds, defining internal psychological specifics of communications, and yet is a specific communicative feature, expressing acceptance of others (Boyko, 1998, p. 5).

Personal communicative tolerance was studied in a number of psychological researches. Thus, this component of communicative behaviour was presented in the works of V. Ageev (Ageev, 1990), S. Zizek (Zizek, 2010), S. Ilinskya (Ilinskya, 2007), L. Grishaeva (Grishaeva, 1995), I. Zhadan (Zhadan, 2003), etc. in the context of political relations; some aspects were reflected in the theory of communicative acts of J. Habermas (Habermas, 2000), the concept of professional communication of M. Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1995), A. Bodalev (Bodalev, 1995), L. Petrovskya (Petrovskya, 1996), Yu. Emelyanov (Emelyanov, 1985), etc.; communicative tolerance as a form of active interaction with the world is manifested through tolerant attitude toward others, recognition of social life multidimensionality V. Zolotukhin (Zolotukhin, 1999) and others.

V. Boyko remarks that communication tolerance is systematizing characteristic, because many other personal qualities are adjusted to it, creating an ensemble, especially moral, intellectual and characterological qualities (Boyko, 1996, p. 200). There are: acceptance of another person individuality; evaluating of people based on their self; overcoming of own estimation finality; harbouring or smoothing of unpleasant experiences in contacts with non-communicable personal qualities; using of self as a reference in communication; a desire to reform a communication partner; a desire to fit an interlocutor to own ideas about him/her; inability to forgive others mistakes; intolerance for discomfort caused by communication partner features; tolerance of others; unforgivingness or absence of it.

Thus, communicative tolerance means a formed in personal mind significant sample of tolerant communication behaviour and willingness to implement it in different situations of communication with "other as someone else". V. Lektorskiy, a Russian philosopher, notes that communicative tolerance has various manifestations, such as "tolerance as indifference" that implies existence of the idea that truth never will be proven (religious views, specific values of different cultures, peculiarities of ethnic faith and beliefs); "tolerance as impossibility of mutual understanding" that creates limits of tolerance manifestations, which cannot be understood and which cannot be a guide; "tolerance as indulgence" when own social group obtain the major importance and all other are estimated as weaker ones (they can be tolerated, but also ignored); "tolerance as expansion of own experience and critical dialogue" that gives a opportunity not only to be guided by own beliefs, but also to change them as a result of a critical dialogue (Lektorskiy, 1997, p. 46).

In addition, communicative competence plays, in our view, a significant role in the structure of young people's communicative behaviour, which is an important element of relations between different social groups. Personal communicative competence was represented in a row of psychological researches. Thus, this component of communicative behaviour was presented in the works of and L. Festinger (Festinger, 1999) and R. Glaser (1984), Yu. Emelyanov (Emelyanov, 1985), Yu. Zhukov (Zhukov, 1990).

In our study, we define communicative competence as the capability to establish and maintain necessary contacts with other people, or as a system of internal resources required to create effective communication in a defined range of situations of interpersonal interaction Yu. Zhukov (Zhukov, 1990), L. Petrovskaya (Petrovskaya, 1990), P. Rastyanykov, (Rastyanykov, 1990).

N. Fetiskin, V. Kozlov, G. Manuilov thinks that the main structural components of personal communicative competence are: sociability as the ability to influence a communicative partner; listening and possession of effective tactics to convict another person; reflection as understanding of own internal states, emotions, po-

wers, preferences, intuition; emotional stability as protection of emotional states and processes against destructive influences of internal and external conditions; capacity to social and psychological adaptation; moral beliefs (empathy as awareness of feelings, needs and interests of others, respect for a communicative partner, tact, etc.); conformism – non-conformism, control over own behaviour, knowledge of social communicative norms, behavioural patterns, social roles (Fetiskin, Kozlov, Manuilov, 2002, p. 120).

As was noted above, social perceptive competence is important for young people's communicative behaviour toward differences of "others". Thus, this component of communicative behaviour was presented in the works of G. Andreeva (Andreeva, 2001), S. Kondratieva (Kondratieva, 1980), V. Kunitsyna (Kunitsyna, 1985), L. Regush (Regush, 2003), R. Fatihova (Fatihova, 2000).

I. Ivanova notes that social perceptual competence, as an individual psychological feature of a person, provides an adequate perception of others, namely, personal states and qualities manifested at three sides of communication (perceptual, communicative, interactive). In addition, this communicative behaviour component is implemented at four levels: motivational, cognitive, emotional and operational-activity, providing observation, empathy, reflection, sensitivity and identification (Ivanova, 2004, p. 27).

According to N. Fetiskin (Fetiskin, 2002), the structural components of social perceptual competence are: mutual perception (adequate assessment of interacting partners' personal characteristics); mutual understanding (conflicts in a group, common interests, ability to understand an opponent's point of view); mutual influence (importance of own point of view, actions of other group members, self-correction, self-reflection); social autonomy (importance of personal positions during joint actions, organization or participation in joint activities); social adaptability (relationship successfulness, satisfaction with own position in the group, behavioural flexibility, in-touch capabilities within own group and with the external environment); social activity – social orientations, leading motives of interaction with others, effectiveness of joint activities.

Thus, these components allow us to examine personal communicative behaviour holistically and comprehensively and to develop a correctional program for efficient dialogue construction and resolution of the problem of discrimination both within a student group and in a wide range to be used in teaching of such disciplines as social psychology, ethnic psychology, psycholinguistics, experimental psychology.

Study methods and organization. The empirical study was carried out on the basis of Zaporizhzhya, of Chernigov, of Kiev, of Lvov, of Odessa and Kharkov universities. 324 respondents of first-sixth academic years (94 of them had techni-

cal specialties, 150 were humanitarians and 80 obtained military education) were interviewed. The young people sample was limited by large cities due to the fact that city young people created a homogenous group, but its representatives had different origins and reflected different interests, learned different values.

For the study purpose, we did not set the task to investigate young people communicative tolerance in dependence of gender characteristics, but were guided by the sample homogeneity principle as for gender.

To achieve this purpose, the following methodological tools were used: the technique for determination of tolerant and intolerant personal attitudes during communication with the communicative tolerance questionnaire (Boyko, 1998). The social communicative competence questionnaire was used also (Fetiskin, Kozlov, Manuilov, 2002). The technique for perceptual-interactive competence determination was used to determine integration criteria of interactive communicative competency (Fetiskin, 2002).

Control over such internal validity threats as sample non-equivalence and sequence effects was performed during the empirical study.

Control over samples non-equivalence was done by using of a quasi-experimental plan that did not include random distribution of the respondent, but required a basic indirect variable in the context of control over conclusion. It means that a basic indirect variable in the quasi-experimental plan was a variable of internal conditions included into the main investigation: a subjective variable, a factor of inter-individual differences etc.

The sequence effect was controlled by using of the block randomization procedures (with different sets of randomized actions for different participants).

Testing situation monitoring was done with creation of the appropriate study conditions (frustration minimization); study anonymity; warning that result credibility could be determined.

Mathematical and statistical processing of the study data was carried out with the computer program SPSS for Windows 19.0.

## **2. Study results analysis component of communicative behaviour of students obtaining different professions**

Sample check for distribution normality for the most scales showed deviations from the normal distribution, therefore Kruskal-Wallis test (for three or more samples with abnormal distribution) was used. The test results showed existence of significant difference between I, II and III groups determined by education types (specializations).

In particular, there was statistically significant difference between groups for the following indexes: “self-righteousness or conservatism at estimating of others” ( $\rho = 0.000$ ); “inability to hide or smooth unpleasant feelings if an interlocutor demonstrates non-communicative qualities” ( $\rho = 0.000$ ); “the desire to change or re-educate of an interlocutor” ( $\rho = 0.002$ ); “the desire to fit a partner to own ideas, to make him/her manageable” ( $\rho = 0.003$ ); “inability to be adapted to characters, habits and desires of others” ( $\rho = 0.003$ ); “sociability” ( $\rho = 0.002$ ); “conformity” ( $\rho = 0.009$ ); “social autonomy” ( $\rho = 0.007$ ). Thus, we proved our assumptions about existence of specific features of communicative behaviour for each of the groups formed.

Correlation analysis allowed us to identify meaningful and significant correlations between different components of communicative behaviour. Analysis of communicative behaviour correlation parameters was carried out with Spearman criterion for each of the three samples and showed the next results.

The first sample included the *respondents receiving humanitarian specialities*. This group of respondents is characterized by the fact that they are socially oriented, their educational activities are based on interactions with people, which is a prerequisite for more pronounced manifestations of the affiliation need, empathy in communicating with others.

The inverse correlation was determined between communicative tolerance and social communicative competence: “inability to manage own emotions in communication” and “logical thinking” ( $-0,228$  at  $p \leq 0.01$ ). We can say that the higher “the inability to control own emotions in communication” is, the lower “person’s logical thinking”. That is, students who think logically well and are able to analyze their actions are more tolerant in dealing with others.

Humanitarian students showed the inverse correlation between the scales of “the desire to make another person like themselves” and “social adaptation” ( $-0,313$  at  $p \leq 0.01$ ). It means that the higher “social adaptation” is, the lower “the desire to make another person like themselves”.

Correlation analysis of the components of communicative tolerance and interactively-perceptual competence showed average negative relationships between indicators: “evaluation themselves as a model for communication” and two scales of “mutual perception” ( $-0,178$  at  $p \leq 0.05$ ) and “mutual understanding” ( $-0,187$  at  $p \leq 0.05$ ). So, we can conclude that high indexes of “mutual perception” and “mutual understanding” correspond to adequate perception of themselves in communication. Accordingly, adequate self-estimation and own communicative skill evaluation influence on successful acknowledgment and understanding of other people differences.

There was significant correlations between the components of social communicative competence and perceptual-interactive competence, namely inverse re-

relationship between “logical thinking” and “mutual perception” (-0.223 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ), and direct correlation with “mutual influence” (0.228 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ). Thus, the higher the “logical thinking”, the lower indicators of the adequacy assessment of personal features of the interlocutor (mutual perception), and the degree of significance actions on the interaction of partners (mutual influence).

As for the sample of *the students having technical specialties*, the following results were obtained. First, characteristics of this group should be noted: educational activities based on interaction with unanimated objects, which is a prerequisite for rational understanding of the reality; technical subjects are studied much more widely than subject based at relationships with others.

So, the following correlations between the components of communicative tolerance and social competence communicative were determined: the direct correlation between “misunderstanding and rejection of another person” and “social adaptation” (-0,278 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ). We can note that the higher the person’s social adaptation is, the lower misunderstanding and rejection of an interlocutor.

The determined inverse relationship between “intolerance to discomfort” and “conformism” (-0,282 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ) and between “inability to forgive mistakes of others” (-0,282 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ) and “conformism” (-0,311 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ) can be explained by approximately the same reasons.

The “inability to control emotions at communication” scale correlated negatively “self-acceptance” (-0,254 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ) and “emotional stability” (-0,226 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ). Thus, the higher “inability to control emotions at communication” is, the lower the listed component of social communicative competence. In other words, over-evaluation of own forces can affect adversely adequate perception of themselves in everyday life and become a prerequisite to confrontations of such a person with his/her group.

There are also negative correlation between the “logical thinking” scale and “mutual perception” (-0,330 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ), “mutual understanding” (-0.225 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ), “mutual influence” (-0,254 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ), social activities (-0,394 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

The next sample, including the *students of military specialties*, is characterized by a certain isolation because cadets live in the barracks and their education and communications with others are subject to statutory regulations (the procedure of communications between a chief and their subordinates, military greeting, addressing, orders, etc.), all these conditions are absent in life of the students of humanitarian or technical specialties. The mentioned circumstances lead to the fact that students of military specialties perceive themselves as representatives of a socially isolated community: “friends” and “others” (civil people).

Correlation analysis of the components of communicative tolerance and communication social competence showed the following relationships: inverse statistically significant correlation between “evaluation themselves as a model for communication” and “self-acceptance” (-0,317 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ), and also direct correlation between “evaluation themselves as a model for communication” and “moral beliefs” (-0,239 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ). We can say that the higher the “evaluation itself as the standard of communication”, the lower “self-acceptance” by the respondent to communicate. Also, the higher the “evaluation itself as the standard of communication”, the lower “moral representations” subjects.

The next inverse correlation, identified during the analysis, indicated correlation of “misunderstanding and rejection of another person” with “control over own behaviour”, namely, with a social role and behavioural models obtained in everyday life (-0,271 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ), and “emotional stability” (-0,258 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

There was inverse correlation between “rejection of discomfort in communication” and “conformism” (-0,265 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ). Correlations existed between the components of interactive perceptual competence and communicative tolerance, namely, inverse relationships between “mutual understanding” and “rejection of another individuality” (-0,337 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ), “evaluation themselves as a model for communication” (-0,343 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ), “inability to forgive mistakes of others” (-0,321 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ), “rejection of discomfort in communication” (-0,284 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

Correlation analysis showed also statistically significant direct correlations between “social adaptation” and “mutual influence” (at 0,298  $p \leq 0.01$ ), “self-acceptance” and “mutual understanding” (0,366 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ), “logical thinking” and “social autonomy” (0,314 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ). These results indicate that social communicative competence as a personal power for efficient communication correlates with indexes of mutual influence, mutual understanding and social autonomy.

Statistical correlations were found between indicators of “self-acceptance” and “social autonomy” (0,239 at  $p \leq 0.05$ ). Accordingly, we can state that the higher the “self-acceptance” is, the lower the significance of a personal position in organization or participation in joint activities (social autonomy). This correlation says that students who control themselves better know how to obey rules and are more disciplined. However, dependence of such respondents on characteristics of the group they which they belong to should be noted.

## Conclusions

Thus, we can conclude that the type of education (specialization) is essential for personal communicative behaviour formation. Correlation analysis shows



different relationships between indicators of communicative tolerance and social adaptation, social perceptual competence for representatives of different professions: military, technical, humanitarian.

As a result of the correlation analysis revealed the most significant relationship in three samples tested: “the desire to make another person like themselves” and “social adaptation” (-0,313 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ) in the first sample (the students receiving humanitarian specialities); “logical thinking” scale and “mutual perception” (-0,330 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ) in the second sample (the students having technical specialties); self-acceptance” and “mutual understanding” (0,366 at  $p \leq 0.01$ ) in the third sample (the students of military specialties).

So, we can say that personal communicative behaviour is developed through various systems of relationship between its components (communicative tolerance, social communicative competence, and social perceptual competence) that depend on characteristics of the educational environment (university students' specializations). Accordingly, students of military specialties have such social conditions of their educational environment as living in the barracks where communication with others is subjected to statutory regulations, which is different of the conditions of students at humanitarian or technical universities. Educational activities impact significantly on the communicative behaviour characteristics; such activities of students-humanitarians is based on interactions with people, which is a prerequisite for more pronounced manifestations of the affiliation need, empathy in communications with others. Contrary to humanitarians, student specializing in technical sciences are more focused on interaction with unanimated objects, which is a prerequisite for the rational understanding of reality.

Due to existence of many correlations between different scales for each group of the respondents we can say that the relationships between the communicative behaviour components (communicative tolerance, social communicative competence, and interactive perceptive competence) should be used as resource for the personal communicative behaviour study and for development of a corrective program aimed at effective dialogue creation.

The promising directions for further research of young people's communicative behaviour can become a study of correlations of its main components depending on such a communicative condition as an academic year of students.

*Received 2016 11 26*  
*Approved for publishing 2016 12 03*

## References

- Glaser, R. (1984). Education and thinking: The role of knowledge. *Amer. Psychologist*, Vol. 39 (2), p. 93–104.
- Martynova, E. (2004). Culture of communicative behavior in interpersonal communication. *Vedecko vydavateľske centrum Sociosfera-CZ s.r.o.*, Vol. 60, p. 59–60.
- Агеев, В. (1990). Межгрупповое взаимодействие: социально психологические проблемы [Ageev V., *Intergroup interaction: social and psychological issues*]. Москва: Издательство московского университета, 240 с.
- Андреева, Г. (2001). *Социальная психология [Andreeva G., Social Psychology]*. Москва: Аспект Пресс, 384 с.
- Бахтин, М. (1995). *Человек в мире слова [Bakhtin M., The man in the world the word]*. Москва: Издательство Российского открытого университета, 140 с.
- Бодалев, А. (1995). *Личность и общение: избранные психологические труды [Bodalev A., Personality and communication: Selected psychological works]*. Москва: Международная педагогическая академия, 326 с.
- Бойко, В. (1996). *Энергия эмоций в общении: взгляд на себя и на других [Bojko V., The energy of emotions in communication: glance at myself and on others]*. Москва: Филинь, 472 с.
- Бойко, В. (1998). *Коммуникативная толерантность: методическое пособие [Bojko V., Communicative tolerance is: manual]*. Санкт-Петербург: МАПО, 23 с.
- Гришаева, Л. (2015). *Механизмы манипулирования и способы организации текста [Grishaeva L., Mechanisms of manipulation and methods of organization of text]*. Орел: Орел ГТУ, с. 290–316.
- Емельянов, Ю. (1985) *Активное социально-психологическое обучение [Emelyanov Yu., Active socially-psychological training]*. Санкт-Петербург: Ленкнига, 342 с.
- Жадан, І. (2003). Толерантність в системі ставлень суб'єкта політичної активності [Zhadan I., *Shovkoplyas I., Tolerance in the relations system of the subject of political activity*]. *Соціально-психологічний вимір демократичних перетворень в Україні*. Київ: Український центр політичного менеджменту, с. 450–459.
- Железovская, Г. (2015). Креативное коммуникативное поведение как средство творческой самореализации личности обучающегося [Zhelezovskaja G., Abramova M., Gudkova E., *Creative communicative behavior of as the means of creative self-realization of personality student*]. *Образование и наука. Известия Уральского отделения РАН: журнал теоретических и прикладных исследований*, Выпуск 4, с. 79–87, doi:10.17853/1994-5639-2015-4-79-88
- Жижек, С. (2010). *О Насилии [Zizek S., About the violence]*. Москва: Европа, 184 с.
- Жуков, Ю., Петровская, Л., Растянкин, П. (1990). *Диагностика и развитие компетентности в общении: практикум по социальной психологии [Zhukova Yu., Petrovskaya L., Rastyanykova P., Diagnostics and development of competence in communication: practical work on the social psychology]*. Москва: Издательство московского университета, 25 с.
- Золотухин, В. (1999). *Две концепции толерантности [Zolotukhin V., The two concept of tolerance]*. Кемерово, 63 с.
- Иванова, И. (2004). Сущность и структура социально-перцептивных способностей [Ivanova I., *The essence and structure of social and perceptual abilities*]. *Вестник СевКавГТУ "Гуманитарные науки"*, Выпуск 1, с. 25–37.
- Ильинская, С. (2007). *Толерантность как принцип политического действия: история, теория, практика [Ilyinskaya S., Tolerance as a principle of political action: the history, theory, practice]*. Москва: Праксис, 288 с.
- Кондратьева, С. (1980). Понимание учителем личности учащегося [Kondratyeva S., *Understanding individual student teacher*]. *Вопросы психологии*, Выпуск 5, с. 143–148.
- Куницына, В. (1985). *Стиль общения и его формирование [Kunitsyna V., Communication style and its formation]*. Санкт-Петербург: МАПО, 377 с.
- Лекторский, В. (1997). О толерантности, плюрализме и критицизме [Lektorskiy V., *About the tolerance, pluralism and criticism*]. *Вопросы философии*, Выпуск 11, с. 44–58.
- Петровская, Л. (1996). О природе компетенции в общении [Petrovskaya L., *On the nature of competence in communication*]. *Мир психологии*, Выпуск 3, с. 31–35.
- Регуш, Л. (2003). *Психология прогнозирования: успехи в познании будущего. [Regush L., Forecasting Psychology: success in cognition of the future]*. Санкт-Петербург: Речь, 352 с.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOUR OF STUDENTS...

- Фатихова, Р. (2000). *Культура педагогического общения и ее формирование у будущих учителей* [Fatihova R., *The culture of pedagogical dialogue and its formation at the future teachers*]. Уфа: Башгоспедуниверситет, 51 с.
- Фестингер, Л. (1999). *Теория когнитивного диссонанса* [Festinger L., *Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*]. Санкт-Петербург: Ювента, с. 15–52.
- Фетискин, Н. (2002). *Социально-психологическая диагностика развития личности и малых групп* [Fetiskin N., Kozlov V., Manujlov G., *Socio-psychological diagnosis development of personality and small groups*]. Москва: Издательство Института Психотерапии, 490 с.
- Хабермас, Ю. (2000). *Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие* [Habermas J., *Moral awareness within and communicative action*]. Санкт-Петербург: МАПО, 380 с.

