

ISSN 2414-05-62

NGO "UKRAINIAN ASSEMBLY
OF DOCTORS OF SCIENCE
IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION"

INTERREGIONAL ACADEMY
OF PERSONAL MANAGEMENT



PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ПУБЛІЧНЕ УРЯДУВАННЯ

№ 3 (8) – June 2017 (Special edition)

*Collection is trained in scientific partnership
with the Ukrainian Technological Academy*



Українська
Технологічна Академія



IIAS
International Institute
of Administrative Sciences



NISPAcee
THE NETWORK OF INSTITUTES AND
SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Kyiv
ДП "Видавничий дім "Персонал"
2017

Редакція

Головний редактор
Романенко Євген Олександрович,
доктор наук з державного управління,
професор, академік Української
Технологічної Академії, академік Міжнародної
Кадрової Академії та Академії наук
публічного управління, заслужений юрист України
Заступник головного редактора
Чаплай Ірина Віталіївна,
кандидат наук з державного управління
Випусковий редактор *Ю. А. Носанчук*
Комп'ютерне макетування *А. П. Нечипорук*

Публічне урядування
Свідцтво KB 21596-11496 P

Видається з листопада 2015 року
Періодичність: 1 раз на квартал + 1 на рік
Друкється за рішенням Вченої ради
Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом
(Протокол № 5 від 31.05.2017)

Видання є таким, що реферується в міжнародних
наукометричних базах Index Copernicus,
РИНЦ та КіберЛенінка, у вітчизняній
реферативній базі даних “Україніка наукова”
та українському реферативному журналі
“Джерело”.

Збірник внесено до Переліку наукових фахових
видань з державного управління
(Наказ Міністерства освіти і науки України
від 10.05.2017 № 693).

Відповідальність за зміст, достовірність фактів,
цитат, цифр несуть автори матеріалів. Редакція
залишає за собою право на незначне редагування
і скорочення (зі збереженням авторського стилю та
головних висновків). Редакція не завжди поділяє
думки авторів та не несе відповідальність за надану
ними інформацію. Матеріали подано
в авторській редакції.

Передрук — тільки з дозволу редакції.

Адреса редакційної колегії: Андріївський узвіз,
буд. 11, оф. 68, м. Київ, Україна, 04070
E-mail: Assembly2015@ukr.net
www.vadnd.org.ua

Адреса видавництва:
ДП “Видавничий дім “Персонал”
просп. Червонозоряний, 119, літ. XX,
Київ, Україна, 03039

Editorial

Editorial in Chief
Yevgen Oleksandrovych Romanenko,
Doctor of sciences in Public Administration, Professor,
Academician of the Ukrainian Technological Academy,
Academician of the International Personnel Academy
and Academy of Sciences of Public Administration,
Honored Lawyer of Ukraine
Deputy Editor
Iryna Vitaliivna Chaplay,
PhD in Public Administration
Managing Editor *Y. A. Hosanchuk*
Computer modeling *A. P. Hechyporuk*

Public management
Certificate KB 21596-11496 P

Published from november 2015
Pereodisity: 4 times on a year + one
Published by the decision of Academic council of
Interregional Academy of Personnel Management
(Protocol № 5 from 31.05.2017)

The edition is such that is reviewed in the interna-
tional scientometric bases Index Copernicus, РИНЦ,
КіберЛенінка and in the domestic abstract database
“Україніка наукова” and ukrainian abstract journal
“Джерело” (Series 3. Social and Human
Sciences. Arts).

The collection included in the list of scientific
professional edition from Public Administration
(Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
from 10.05.2017 № 693).

The authors are responsible for the content,
accuracy of the facts, quotes, numbers. The editors
reserves the right for a little change and reduction
(with preservation of the author's style and main
conclusions). Editors can not share the world
views of the authors and are not responsible for the
information provided. Materials filed
in the author's edition.

Reprinting — with the editorial's permission strictly.

Address of the editorial board: 11, Andriyivskyy
Descent, office 68, Kyiv, Ukraine, 04070
E-mail: Assembly2015@ukr.net
www.vadnd.org.ua

Address of the editorial:
ДП “Видавничий дім “Персонал”
ave. Chervonozoryanyj, 119 lit. XX,
Kyiv, Ukraine, 03039



Українська
Технологічна Академія



IIAS
International Institute
of Administrative Sciences



NISPAcee
THE NETWORK OF INSTITUTES AND
SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Головний редактор — Романенко Євген Олександрович, доктор наук з державного управління, професор, академік Української Технологічної Академії, академік Міжнародної Кадрової Академії та Академії наук публічного управління, заслужений юрист України.

Заступник головного редактора — Чаплай Ірина Віталіївна, кандидат наук з державного управління.

Редакційна колегія

1. Андрущенко Тетяна Вікторівна — доктор політичних наук, професор, провідний науковий співробітник Інституту вищої освіти Національної академії педагогічних наук України.

2. Афонін Едуард Андрійович — доктор соціологічних наук, професор, професор кафедри політичної аналітики та прогнозування Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України.

3. Балашов Анатолій Миколайович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, професор кафедри публічного адміністрування Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом, Президент Всеукраїнської академії наук публічного управління.

4. Бова Тетяна В'ячеславівна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, Херсонський національний технічний університет, професор кафедри державного управління і місцевого самоврядування.

5. Бодров Володимир Григорович — доктор економічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри управління національним господарством та економічної політики Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України.

6. Бульба Володимир Григорович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, декан факультету підготовки магістрів державного управління Харківського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України.

7. Бутирська Тетяна Олександрівна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри державного управління та місцевого самоврядування Івано-Франківського національного технічного університету нафти і газу.

8. Валевський Олексій Леонідович — доктор наук з державного управління, старший науковий співробітник, провідний науковий співробітник Національного інституту стратегічних досліджень.

9. Ващенко Костянтин Олександрович — доктор політичних наук, Голова Національного агентства України з питань державної служби, член-кореспондент Національної академії педагогічних наук України, Заслужений економіст України.

10. Вендт Ян Анджей — доктор хабілітований наук про Землю у сфері географії, професор, заступник директора з питань науки та розвитку Інституту океанографії та географії Гданського університету (Польща).

11. Гаєвська Лариса Анатоліївна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, заступник начальника управління з навчальної роботи — начальник відділу менеджменту знань Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України, професор кафедри управління освітою.

12. Гвожджевiч Сильвія — кандидат наук, кафедра адміністрації та національної безпеки Державної професійної вищої школи ім. Якуба з Парадижу в Гожуві-Великопольському (Гожув-Великопольський, Польща).

13. Гечбайя Бадри Нодарович — доктор економічних наук, Асоційований професор, Батумський державний університет ім. Шота Руставелі, факультет економіки і бізнесу. Керуючий департаментом управління бізнесом (Грузія).

14. Гурковський Володимир Ігорович — доктор наук з державного управління, перший заступник директора ВГО “Центр дослідження проблем публічного управління”.

15. Дацій Надія Василівна — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри менеджменту зовнішньоекономічної діяльності та адміністративного менеджменту Академії муніципального управління.

16. Девадзе Анзор Хемидович — кандидат економічних наук, доктор економіки, професор, Батумський державний університет ім. Шота Руставелі, факультет туризму (Грузія).

17. Денисюк Світлана Георгіївна — доктор політичних наук, професор кафедри суспільно-політичних наук Вінницького національного технічного університету.

18. Довгань Валерій Іванович — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри державного управління та місцевого самоврядування Хмельницького університету управління та права.

19. Драган Іван Олександрович — доктор наук з державного управління, старший науковий співробітник, проректор з наукової роботи та міжнародних зв'язків Академії муніципального управління.

20. Драгомирецька Наталія Михайлівна — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри філософських та соціально-політичних наук Одеського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентіві України.

21. Жулева Гергана — Доктор PhD, виконавчий директор болгарської урядової “Програми доступу до інформації” (Болгарія).

22. Іваницька Ольга Михайлівна — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри маркетингу та реклами Київського національного торговельно-економічного університету.

23. Ірвін Студін — Доктор PhD, професор Школи державної політики та управління Університету Торонто, Президент Інституту питань ХХІ століття, головний редактор і видавець журналу Global Brief (Канада).

24. Кайдашев Роман Петрович — доктор юридичних наук, професор кафедри публічного адміністрування Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом.

25. Кіслов Денис Васильович — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, член-кореспондент Української Академії Наук, доцент кафедри маркетингу та реклами, Київський національний торговельно-економічний університет.

26. Козаков Володимир Миколайович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, професор кафедри державної політики та суспільного розвитку Національної академії державного управління при Президентіві України.

27. Корнієвський Олександр Анатолійович — доктор політичних наук, доцент, завідувач сектору громадянського суспільства Національного інституту стратегічних досліджень.

28. Кринична Ірина Петрівна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри державного управління та

місцевого самоврядування Дніпропетровського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентіві України.

29. Крюков Олексій Ігорович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри політології та філософії Харківського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентіві України.

30. Литвин Юрій Олексійович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, завідувач кафедри державного управління та місцевого самоврядування Академії муніципального управління.

31. Лопушинський Іван Петрович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, Херсонський національний технічний університет, завідувач кафедри державного управління і місцевого самоврядування.

32. Мамічев Олексій Юрійович — доктор політичних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри теорії та історії російського та зарубіжного права Владивостоцького державного університету економіки і сервісу (Росія).

33. Миколайчук Микола Миколайович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, Одеський регіональний інститут державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентіві України, професор кафедри економічної та фінансової політики.

34. Мікеладзе Едуард Важаєвич — кандидат економічних наук, професор, Хічурський навчальний університет ім. святої Тбел Абусерідзе, факультет економіки та бізнесу (Грузія).

35. Молодцов Олександр Володимирович — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри державного управління та місцевого самоврядування Івано-Франківського національного технічного університету нафти та газу.

36. Науменко Раїса Андріївна — доктор наук з державного управління, старший науковий співробітник, Київський національний торговельно-економічний університет, професор кафедри менеджменту.

37. Наумкіна Світлана Михайлівна — доктор політичних наук, професор Державного закладу “Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет ім. К. Д. Ушинського” (м. Одеса).

38. Непомнящий Олександр Михайлович — доктор наук з державного управління, академік Академії будівництва України, професор кафедри публічного адміністрування Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом.

39. Новак-Каляєва Лариса Миколаївна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри державного управління та місцевого самоврядування Львівського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України.

40. Новаченко Тетяна Василівна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри парламентаризму та політичного менеджменту Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України.

41. Олуйко Віталій Миколайович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, голова Хмельницького обласного територіального відділення Антимонопольного комітету України.

42. Пархоменко-Кутцевіч Оксана Ігорівна — доктор наук з державного управління, Радник Голови Національного агентства з питань запобігання корупції.

43. Пірен Марія Іванівна — доктор соціологічних наук, професор, Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича, завідувача кафедрою.

44. Плющ Руслан Миколайович — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри державного управління і місцевого самоврядування Херсонського національного технічного університету.

45. Половцев Олег Валентинович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри державного управління і місцевого самоврядування Херсонського національного технічного університету.

46. Радченко Олександр Віталійович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор надзвичайний Поморської академії в Слупську (Польща).

47. Ромат Євгеній Вікторович — доктор наук з державного управління, завідувач кафедри маркетингу та реклами Київського національного торговельно-економічного університету.

48. Руденко Ольга Мстиславівна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент,

директор Науково-дослідного інституту публічного адміністрування та менеджменту Чернігівського національного технологічного університету.

49. Ручка Анатолій Олександрович — доктор соціологічних наук, професор, Інститут соціології НАН України, головний науковий співробітник.

50. Саханенко Сергій Єгорович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри державного управління і місцевого самоврядування Одеського регіонального інституту державного управління НАДУ при Президентові України.

51. Сіцінська Майя Володимирівна — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри філософії та політології Національного університету державної податкової служби України.

52. Слінько Олександр Анатолійович — доктор політичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри політології та політичного управління Воронежської філії Російської академії народного господарства та державної служби при Президенті Російської Федерації (Росія).

53. Соболева Наталя Іванівна — доктор соціологічних наук, старший науковий співробітник, Інститут соціології НАН України, провідний науковий співробітник.

54. Сурай Інна Геннадіївна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри парламентаризму та політичного менеджменту Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України.

55. Суший Олена Володимирівна — доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, Інститут соціальної та політичної психології НАПН України, завідувач лабораторії.

56. Тадеуш Троціковскі — доктор наук про управління, професор, член-кореспондент Регіональної Академії Менеджменту, Голова Правління Регіонального Центру Європейської Інтеграції (Польща).

57. Усаченко Лариса Михайлівна — доктор наук з державного управління, професор, професор кафедри публічного адміністрування Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом, заслужений діяч науки і техніки України, кавалер ордена “За заслуги III ступеня”, державний службовець I рангу.

58. Халецька Аліна Анатоліївна — доктор наук з державного управління, про-

фесор, завідувач кафедри менеджменту організацій та зовнішньоекономічної діяльності Волинського інституту економіки та менеджменту.

59. Філіпенко Тетяна В'ячеславівна — доктор наук з державного управління, професор Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом.

60. Чаплай Ірина Віталіївна — кандидат наук з державного управління, доцент кафедри публічного адміністрування Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом, Виконавчий директор Президії громадської організації “Всеукраїнська асамблея докторів наук з державного управління”.

61. Червякова Ольга Володимирівна — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри публічного адміністрування Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом.

62. Чернишов Юрій Георгійович — доктор політичних наук, професор, завідувач

кафедри Алтайського державного університету, директор Алтайської школи політичних досліджень (Росія).

63. Шайгородський Юрій Жанович — доктор політичних наук, доцент, головний науковий співробітник Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України.

64. Шпак Юрій Валерійович — доктор наук з державного управління, професор кафедри економіки підприємства Східноєвропейського університету економіки і менеджменту.

65. Якимчук Аліна Юрївна — доктор економічних наук, професор, професор кафедри державного управління, документознавства та інформаційної діяльності Національного університету водного господарства та природокористування.

66. Яутріте Брієде — доктор юридичних наук, професор, Латвійський університет, юридичний факультет (Латвія).

Editor in Chief — Yevhen Oleksandrovych Romanenko, Doctor of sciences in Public Administration, Professor, Academician of the Ukrainian Technological Academy, Academician of the International Personnel Academy and Academy of Sciences of Public Administration, Honored Lawyer of Ukraine.

Deputy Editor — Iryna Vitaliivna Chaplay, PhD in Public Administration.

Editorial board

1. Tetiana Viktorivna Andrushchenko — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, leading researcher of the Institute of Higher Education of National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine.

2. Eduard Andriiovych Afonin — Doctor of sociological science, Professor, Professor of the Department of Political Analysis and Forecasting of the National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

3. Anatolii Mykolaiovych Balashov — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor, Professor of the Department of Public Administration of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, President of the Ukrainian Academy of Science of Public Administration.

4. Tetiana Viacheslavivna Bova — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local Self-Government of the Kherson National Technical University.

5. Volodymyr Hryhorovych Bodrov — Doctor of economic science, Professor, Head of the Dept. of administration of National Economy and Economic Policy of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

6. Volodymyr Hryhorovych Bulba — Doctor of Science in Public Administration, Professor, Dean of the Faculty of Masters Preparation of Public Administration of the Kharkov Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

7. Tetiana Oleksandrivna Butyrska — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local Self-government of the Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas.

8. Oleksii Leonidovych Valevskiy — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Senior Researcher, Senior Research of the National Institute for Strategic Studies.

9. Kostiantyn Oleksandrovych Vashchenko — Doctor of Political Sciences, Head of the

National Agency of Ukraine on Civil Service, member-correspondent of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Honored Economist of Ukraine.

10. Andrzej Jan Wendt — Habilitovany doctor of Earth Sciences in the field of geography, professor, Deputy Director from questions of Science and Development of Institute of the Oceanography and Geography of the Gdansk University (Poland).

11. Larysa Anatoliivna Haievaska — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor, Depchief of Management from Educational Work is a Chief of Department of Management of Knowledge of the National Academy of State Administration at President of Ukraine, Professor of Department of Management Education.

12. Sylvia Hvozhdzhyevich — Candidate of Science, Dept. of Administration and the National Security of State Higher Professional School named Jakub from Paradyzhu in Lublin-Velykopolckomu (Gorzow Wielkopolski, Poland).

13. Badry Nodarovych Hechbayya — Doctor of Economics, Professor Asotsiiruvanyy, Batumi State University of Shota Rustaveli. Faculty of Economics and Business. Managing of the Dept. of business management (Georgia).

14. Volodymyr Ihorovych Hurkovskiy — Doctor of science in Public Administration, First Deputy Director of the NGO "Center of studies of problems of public administration".

15. Nadiia Vasylivna Datsii — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of Management of Foreign Activity and administrative management of the Academy of Municipal Management.

16. Anzor Hemydovych Devadze — Candidate of economic science, Doctor of Economics, professor, Sh. Rustaveli Batumi State University, Dept. of Tourism (Georgia).

17. Svitlana Heorhiivna Denysiuk — Doctor of Political Science, Professor of the Dept. Sociopolitical Sciences of the Vinnitsa National Technical University.

18. Valerii Ivanovych Dovhan — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate

Professor of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local Self – government of Khmelnytsky University of Management and Law.

19. Ivan Oleksandrovych Drahan – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Senior Researcher, Vice-Rector of Research and International Relations of the Academy of Municipal Management.

20. Nataliia Mykhailivna Drahomiretska – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of Philosophy and Social and Political Sciences of the Odessa Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

21. Gargana Zhuleva – Doctor PhD, Executive Director of the Bulgarian government's "Program of access to information" (Bulgaria).

22. Olha Mykhailivna Ivanytska – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. marketing and advertising of Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics.

23. Irvin Studin – PhD, Professor in the School of Public Policy and Governance of the University of Toronto, President of the Institute for XXI Century Questions, and also Editor-in-Chief and Publisher of Global Brief magazine (Canada).

24. Roman Petrovych Kaidashev – Doctor of juridical science, Professor of the Department of public administration of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management.

25. Denis Vasilievich Kislov – Doctor of Science in Public Administration, Associate Professor, associate fellow of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Marketing and Advertising, Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics.

26. Volodymyr Mykolaiovych Kozakov – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of public policy and social development of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

27. Oleksandr Anatoliiovych Kornievs'kyy – Doctor of Political Science, Associate professor, the Head of the Dept. of civil society of the National Institute for Strategic Studies (NISS).

28. Iryna Petrivna Krynychna – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor, Professor Department of Public Administration and Local Self-Government of the Dnepropetrovsk Regional Institute of Pub-

lic Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

29. Oleksii Igorevych Kryukov – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of Political Science and Philosophy of the Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

30. Yurii Oleksiyovych Lytvyn – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor, Head of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local government of the Academy of Municipal Management.

31. Ivan Petrovych Lopushynskyi – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor, Head of the Dept. of public administration and local government of the Kherson National Technical University.

32. Oleksii Yuriyovich Mamichev – Doctor of Political Science, Associate professor, Head of the Department of Theory and history of Russian and international law of the Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service (Russia).

33. Mykola Mykolaiovych Mykolaichuk – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of economic and financial policy of the Odessa Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

34. Edward Vazhayevych Mikeladze – Candidate of Economic Science, Professor, Tbel Abuseridze Hichaurskiy University. Faculty of Economics and Business (Georgia).

35. Oleksandr Volodymyrovych Molodtsov – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local Self-government of the Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas.

36. Raisa Andriivna Naumenko – Doctor of science in Public Administration, Senior Research, Professor of the Dept. of management of the Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics.

37. Svitlana Mykhailivna Naumkina – Doctor of Political Science, Professor of the South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky.

38. Oleksandr Mykhailovych Nepomniashchyi – Doctor of science in Public Ad-

ministration, Academician of Academy of building of Ukraine, Professor of the Department of Public Administration of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management.

39. Larysa Mykolaivna Novak-Kaliaieva — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor, Professor of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local Self-government of the Lviv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

40. Tetiana Vasylivna Novachenko — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Dept. of parliamentary and political management of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

41. Vitalii Mykolaiovych Oluiko — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor, Head of Khmelnytsky regional territorial office of the Antimonopoly Committee of Ukraine.

42. Oksana Ihorivna Parkhomenko-Kutsevil — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Advisor of the Head of the National Agency on corruption prevention.

43. Maria Ivanivna Piren — Doctor of Social Sciences, Professor, Head of the Dept. of the Chernivtsi National University.

44. Ruslan Mykolaiovych Plushch — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local Self-government of the Kherson National Technical University.

45. Oleh Valentynovych Polovtsev — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of Public Administration and Local Self-government of the Kherson National Technical University.

46. Oleksandr Vitaliiiovych Radchenko — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the emergency Pomeranian Academy in Slupsk (Poland).

47. Yevhenii Viktorovych Romat — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Head of the Dept. of marketing and advertising of the Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics.

48. Olha Mstyslavivna Rudenko — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor, Director of the Research Institute of Public Administration and Management of the Chernihiv National Technological University.

49. Anatolii Oleksandrovych Ruchka — Doctor of Social Sciences, Professor, Chief

researcher of the Institute of Sociology of National Academy of Science of Ukraine.

50. Serhii Yehorovych Sahanienko — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of public administration and local government of the Odessa Regional Institute of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine of the National of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

51. Maiia Volodymyrivna Sitsinska — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of Philosophy and Political Science of the National University of the State Tax Service of Ukraine.

52. Alexander Anatoliiovych Slinko — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, Head of the Department of political science and political administration of the Voronezh branch of the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Service under the President of the Russian Federation (Russia).

53. Natalia Ivanivna Sobolieva — Doctor of Social Sciences, senior researcher, leading researcher of the Institute of Sociology of National Academy of Science of Ukraine.

54. Inna Hennadiivna Surai — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Dept. of parliamentary and political management of the of the National of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

55. Olena Volodymyrivna Sushyi — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Associate Professor, head of the laboratory of the Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the National Academy of Political Science of Ukraine.

56. Tadeusz Trocikowski — Doctor of Management Sciences, professor, corresponding member of the Regional Academy of Management, Chairman of the Regional Centre for European Integration (Poland).

57. Larysa Mykhailivna Usachenko — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor, Professor of the Department of Public Administration of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Honored Worker of Science and Technology of Ukraine, Holder of the Order "For Merit III degree," public official of the I rank.

58. Alina Anatoliivna Khaletska — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor, Head of the Dept. of Management of Organiza-

tions and Foreign Activity of the Volyn Institute of Economics and Management.

59. Tetiana Viacheslavivna Filipenko — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management.

60. Iryna Vitaliivna Chaplai — PhD in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Department of Public Administration of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Executive Director of the Presidium of the NGO “Ukrainian Assembly of doctors of science in public administration”.

61. Olha Volodymyrivna Chervyakova — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Department of public administration of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management.

62. Yuriy Heorhiiovych Chernyshev — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, Head of the

Department of Altai State University, Director of the Altai School of Political Studies (Russia).

63. Yuriy Zhanovych Shaigorodskyi — Doctor of Political Science, Associate professor, Chief Research Scientist of the I. F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the NAS of Ukraine.

64. Yuriy Valeriiovych Shpak — Doctor of science in Public Administration, Professor of the Dept. of Economics of the enterprise of the East European University of economics and management.

65. Alina Yuriivna Yakymchuk — Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Dept. of public administration, documentation and information activities of the National University of Water Household and Environment.

66. Jautrite Briede — Dr. iur, Professor, University of Latvia, Faculty of Law (Latvia).

CONTENT

Afonin E. A., Martynov A. Y.		Kozak V. I.	
Archetypes of the sociopolitical conflicts: from modern to postmodern.....	18	Formation of the archetypal paradigm of public administration in the current conflict situation in Ukraine	112
Bielska T. V., Khasanov R. R.		Kozakov V. N.	
Functional institutional behavior of global civil society in conflict zones	33	Ukrainian mentality as archetypal factor of harmonization of social power relations	122
Valevskiy O. L.		Kozlova L. V.	
Institutional and psychosocial analysis of ukrainian reforms.....	43	Psychosociocultural preconditions for overcoming of conflict in the context of the implementation of the decentralization policy.....	131
Vorona P. V.		Kotovska O. P.	
Archetypal strategy for overcoming ideological conflict: of Israel.....	53	Social conflicts in the postmodern era and their influence on the sphere of public administration: archetypal-value approach.....	140
Haharinov O. V.		Lapina V. V.	
The strategy of transformation of the post-soviet state system of Ukraine as a necessary condition for the resolution and prevention of social conflicts (archetypal approach).....	63	Over-consumption archetype globalization as a new source of social conflicts and social tension.....	158
Dovgan' O. V.		Lashkina M. H.	
Understanding the text in the context of neural networks (archetypal approach).....	75	Communicative component of conflict in the modern world: the birth of the archetype of the selfness (Das Selbst).....	167
Evdokimova E. I.		Yaghi Mahmoud Musa, Garnyk L. P.	
Archetypal approach to the study of conflict between the leader and the team	82	Archetypes of economic behaviour and their origins in scientific-philosophic thought of middle Eastern countries.....	178
Zozulia V. O.		Naplyokov Y. V.	
The conflict within the concepts of needs Abraham Maslow and John Burton: archetypal analysis.....	91	Archetypal principles as a basis for non-conflicting decision-making.....	194
Kozhemiakina O. M.			
Language of trust in resolving of social conflicts (archetypal approach).....	102		

Novachenko T. V. Synergetic concept of samoorhanyzation of subjects of social development: archetypal discourse.....	204	the state and society (an arhetypical approach)	306
Ovchynnikova O. V. Violence as a factor of conflict in the family is an archetypal approach	214	Siriy E. V. Social deprivation in contact and mutual condition to mental archetypal factors in the study of the nature of social tension in Ukrainian society: theoretical research	315
Omelyanenko V. A. Archetypal analysis of modern economic conflicts in the context of national security	224	Solovyov Y. V. Value-semantic archetypes of forced migration as a basis for developing of their adaptation ...	328
Plakhtiy T. O. Archetypal model of emergence, escalation and resolution of social conflicts	235	Sudakov V. I. The global determinants of the conflict interactions in the contemporary models of employment (archetypal analysis).....	335
Ponomarenko L. V. National idea as a symbolic prerequisite of the revolutions of the 19 th –20 th centuries and equifinal model of social transformation of the 21 st century ...	249	Urbanova Eva, Mayevskaya Petra, Pasnichenko Viktor Loyalty, reliability and resistance to corruption: psychological aspects of diagnostic options (the experience of the Czech Republic)	343
Romanenko Y. A., Chaplay I. V., Hurkovskyy V. I. Theoretical and methodological identification of the concept of “marketing communications” (archetypal approach).....	259	Tsegelnik O. V. “Investment conflict”: strategy and ways of the resolving of the psychological and social contradictions in the modern world	353
Rybaklycheva O. Z. Archetype strategy for solving social conflicts in work with the personnel of the bodies of the internal affairs of the Republic of Belarus	267	Chernoivanenko A. V. The role of political parties in origin and starting of political conflicts in Ukraine: archetypal analysis	361
Semenets-Orlova I. A. Transformation in education institutions in a context of social conflicts: upon m. Maffesoli’s concept of the “neo-tribalism” archetype	276	Iakushko N. A. Dialectics of leadership in terms of education in Ukraine: archetypal analysis	371
Serdechna L. V. The concept of advertising as a solution to contradiction between social justice and economic efficiency (archetypal approach).....	296	Yaremenko N. V., Kolomiets N. Y. The “divine child” archetype as the matrix of overcoming the crisis of the socio-humanitarian space.....	378
Sychova A. O. Political trust as a resource of cooperation between			



UDC: 351.851:005.332.3

Semenets-Orlova Inna Andriivna,
PhD (Politics), Doctoral Candidate of Education Management Department, National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, 03057, Kiev, Str. Eugene Potier, 20, tel.: (044) 455 69 00, e-mail: innaorlova@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9227-7426

Семенець-Орлова Інна Андріївна,
кандидат політичних наук, докторант кафедри управління освітою, Національна академія державного управління при Президентові України, 03057, м. Київ, вул. Ежена Пот'є, 20, тел.: (044) 455 69 00, e-mail: innaorlova@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9227-7426

Семенец-Орлова Инна Андреевна,
кандидат политических наук, докторант кафедры управления образованием, На-

циональная академия государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 03057, г. Киев, ул. Эжена Потье, 20, тел.: (044) 455 69 00, e-mail: innaorlova@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9227-7426

TRANSFORMATION IN EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN A CONTEXT OF SOCIAL CONFLICTS: UPON M. MAFFESOLI'S CONCEPT OF THE "NEO-TRIBALISM" ARCHETYPE

Abstract. This article analyzes trends neo-tribalism, reflecting the complex of social transformation in modern society. The author examines the characteristic features neo-tribes, performs comparative analysis of modern traditional tribes. In the context of this problem much attention paid to the concepts ethnocentrism and tribalism, regionalism, regional patriotism. The author analyzes educational institutional transformation within the regulatory phase 3rd epochal cycle. On the basis of bias neo-tribalism author proves critical need for successful completion of power decentralization reform, ensuring real autonomy of educational institutions in modern Ukraine, which will create an organic basis for the reform of secondary education and the implementation of other major educational changes.

Keywords: archetypes, neo-tribes, ethnocentrism, educational institutional transformation cycle paradigm.

ДИНАМІКА ОСВІТНІХ ІНСТИТУЦІЙНИХ ЗМІН У КОНТЕКСТІ КОНФЛІКТНОСТІ СОЦІУМУ: АРХЕТИПНИЙ КОНЦЕПТ “НЕОТРАЙБАЛІЗМУ” М. МАФФЕСОЛІ

Анотація. Стаття присвячена аналізу тенденції неотрайбалізму, що відображає складну трансформацію соціальності в сучасному суспільстві. Автор досліджує характерні ознаки неотрайбів, здійснює компаративний аналіз традиційних племен із сучасними племенами. У контексті даної проблематики значну увагу приділено концепціям етноцентризму і трайбалізму, регіоналізації, територіального патріотизму. Автор аналізує освітні інституційні трансформації в межах нормативних фаз 3-го епохального циклу. На основі врахування тенденційності неотрайбалізму автор обґрунтовує критичну потребу успішного закінчення реформи децентралізації влади, забезпечення реальної автономії закладів освіти в сучасній Україні, що створить органічну основу для здійснення реформи середньої освіти та впровадження інших масштабних освітніх змін.

Ключові слова: архетипи, неотрайби, етноцентризм, освітні інституційні трансформації, циклічна парадигма.

ДИНАМИКА ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫХ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНЫХ ИЗМЕНЕНИЙ В КОНТЕКСТЕ КОНФЛИКТНОСТИ СОЦИУМА: АРХЕТИПИЧЕСКИЙ КОНЦЕПТ “НЕОТРАЙБАЛИЗМА” М. МАФФЕСОЛИ

Аннотация. Статья посвящена анализу тенденции неотрайбализма, которая отражает сложную трансформацию социальности в современном обществе. Автор исследует наиболее характерные черты неотрайбов, осуществляет компаративный анализ традиционных племен с современными племенами. В контексте данной проблематики значительное внимание уделено концепциям этноцентризма и трайбализма, регионализации, территориального патриотизма. Автор анализирует образовательные институциональные трансформации в рамках нормативных фаз 3-го эпохального цикла. На основе учета тенденциозности неотрайбализма автор обосновывает критическую потребность успешного окончания реформы децентрализации власти, обеспечение реальной автономии учебных заведений в современной Украине. Это создаст органическую основу для осуществления реформы среднего образования и внедрения других масштабных образовательных изменений.

Ключевые слова: архетипы, неотрайбы, этноцентризм, образовательные институциональные трансформации, циклическая парадигма.

The formulation of the problem: community can state the formation of a new package of socio-anthropological projects in response to which new educational practices are being cre-

ated. The education and the pedagogical activities are always guided by the leading type of sociality. So at the stage of postmodernity, the imperative to “teach everyone everything in the traditional institutions of education” has lost relevance long time ago. During the post-modern period, the way of the “pedagogy of knowledge” to “the pedagogy of research, design, activity”, the teacher (“the one that lays the foundation” [31, p. 137]) mastered the new roles of the coach and tutor — now he does not broadcast knowledge, but he manages the educational search for applicants. According to M. Pyatkov, the substantive basis and law of development of the entire social are placed in a single archetype — the archetype of changes [29]. What will be the direction of the following educational transformations in the era of large-scale, and sometimes unstable social changes?

The condition of modern society is characterized by the disintegration of meta narratives and their replacement by signs, simulacrum, images, symbols that form a new (postmodern) solidarity, create a new “fascination” of the world in the minds of people. “People bring victims for “Deities” of local importance (love, commerce, territory, food, beauty, etc.), which names have changed in comparison with the era of antiquity, but the functions did not,” said M. Maffesoli, when he is describing the “divine social” [24]. The technological development of modernity is suprainnovations, however, as sociologists show, it is impossible without the synergy of archaic elements that define the framework for a complex transformation of sociality. In our time, noted by American sociologists N. Glazer and

D. Moynihan, the tendency of many people in many circumstances to insist on the importance of their group affiliation and originality, and on the rights that follow from this, has significantly increased [5]. This process is named by scientists like “mass retribalization, which emergent is in response to the limited ability of large associations of people and systems of power, the uncertainty of the structural links of modernity, and leads to a looseness of social tissue. There is a growing interest in marginalized groups, minorities, ethnic communities, exotic religions, etc. — as the desire of the modern human to “substantiate their world”. On the grass-roots level of society there is an active generation of new individual and the collective identities are in connection with which the vertical corporatism is increasingly being replaced by a horizontal one.

In the theory of the well-known professor Sorbonne M. Maffesoli, the new sociality emerges through self-organizing and self-directed affective communities that solve the problems of “domestication” of the surrounding, menacingly unstable world, dehumanization of city life, play the role of a defensive association in the conditions of temporary loss of landmarks- neotribal [7, p. 112]. New tribes widely use the network resources of electronic media, providing their flexibility, the speed of response and energy. According to M. Castells, the power of modern network structures becomes stronger than the institutions of political power [22].

Neotribalism is an organic and mass process that demarcates the transformation of the social. If within the individualistic paradigm self-contained

individual a person is the bearer of a certain stable function in society, then the societal paradigm, which is actualized by many modern sociologists, is the basis of a new sociality that determines a person who easily merges with a tribal community, beyond the borders his individuality [1; 2; 7; 12; 13]. In the categories of archetypal methodology, Persona is a social image of a person, a certain generalization of it as a civilized entity, which is ideal from a moral and social point of view. However, within the unbeaten person has the ability to very quickly change their masks, so his role behavior is mega-alternative. The neotraibalism, due to its internal pluralization, blurs the boundaries of imposed schemes of the interpretation of reality. Neotraibs are self-valuable polyfunctional, different-structured microcommunities with free membership, the salutary goal of which is the communication, the play, and the spectacle. According to some scholars, M. Maffesoli tries to declare organization and management of the decentralized communication process in such a way that knowledge from him organically emerges, has the right to life [18, p. 82]. So, for modern tribes the educational function is important. The appearance of ample opportunities for distance education, project activities, teamwork, peer education, participation in webinars, hakatons, lecture rooms, whose offers are received from informal communities, groups in social networks, alternative public associations, the media, gives reason to believe that serious competitors appear in traditional educational institutions. Such dynamics around the educational environment is useful, because it creates

a qualitatively new look at the future of education, the role of its traditional and newest institutions, allows to predict the vector of reforming the system of public education management in Ukraine.

At various stages of social development education served different functions and roles, depending on the context in which its institutions functioned, and the prospective request of consumers of educational services. But one thing has remained constant:

The educated people better understand the complexity of the world, and the presence of a critical mass of well-educated individuals serves as a safeguard for most social conflicts. In that article we will consider three blocks of questions: the problems of non-wrestling, correlation with tribalism and ethnocentrism, the modern co-evolutionary stage of development of the Ukrainian society in the context of the cyclic paradigm and the dynamics of global educational transformations in the context of archetypal methodology, on the basis of which we will make generalizations.

The analysis of the latest publications on problems and the identification of previously unsolved parts of a common problem: The postmodern sociology (works of Z. Bauman [1; 2; 13], M. Maffesoli [7; 24; 25]) fixes the symptomatology of the modernist crisis, its exhaustion by the social crisis, which follows, and the need for reconstruction of sociological discourse. "The sociology of postmodern" (the articles of E. Giddens, J. Habermas), on the contrary, postulates the continuity and incompleteness of the modern project. The French sociologist

M. Maffessoli characterizes the transition to postmodernism as a transformation of the “social” (society, mechanical solidarity) into “sociality” (community, organic (“orgiastic”) solidarity) [7]. The concept of “neotraib” is the neologism of M. Maffesoli and its widespread use

In scientific discourse is just beginning. The basis of the societal paradigm laid down by the works of W. Sumner [9], which, moreover, conceptualized the concept of ethnocentrism, and his student D. Campbell. The problems of network structures and was discovered in the works of the Spanish sociologist M. Castells [22]. In his opinion, modern networks of social composition replace the previous modern forms of personal and material dependence, and this change in the social system leads new forms in systems of stratification, communication, mobilization, and needs a new flexible culture of relationships. The content characteristics of the “urban tribes” were researched by I. Waters. The archetypal paradigm and sociometric studies are represented in the Ukrainian scientific thought by the works of the scientists of the Ukrainian school of archetypes — E. Afonin [12], A. Sushi, A. Bandurki, A. Martynova [23], etc. The analysis of educational transformations through the prism of neo-urbanism has not yet been the subject to Individual research.

The goal of the article is to analyze the manifestation of non-wrestling trends in the modern world, to estimate their significance in the context of attempts to determine the horizon of the institution of education as a model and project, the formation of educational trends.

The exposition of the main material of the research: On the model of “The Revolt of the Masses” by H. Ortega y Gasset, the Russian sociologist L. Ionin named his work “The Revolt of Minorities”. In it, the scientist proves that now belonging to minorities becomes a fashion, even a norm [19]. When a person demonstrates the signs of belonging to a minority, it looks prestigious and in a new way [19, p. 5]. For L. Ionin, the Menshinas are: subcultural groups, new religious movements, sex minorities, ethnic minorities, networked minorities. In particular, the latter develop most dynamically, because of their space — virtual space — the sphere of maximum freedom of choice, especially facilitates communication, the simultaneous presence of the individual in many collectives. It is believed that being and responding quickly online is the responsibility of the community member, a sign of virtual courtesy. A secret meeting can be held in a closed group, which, of course, does not replace face to face communication. As futurologist M. Kaiku wrote in *Physics of the Future*: “In constant competition between High-Tech and High-Toch, we want the first and second” [21, p. 33]. That is why in the era of cyberspace, we have still a live theater, tourism. If we are offered photos of the artist and tickets for his concert, we will choose the tickets (High-Toch). This M. Kaiku calls the principle of caveman: for it was not enough that you praise the good hunting. The caveman would have preferred to hold the dead beast in his hands. Our desires, nature and passions for the last 100,000 years have not changed much. We still, having electronic media, pre-

fer to save the paper copies of information. Therefore, the office without paper did not become a reality. And so a digital hologram of a teacher will never completely replace his living analogue.

The more people move physically, the more they tend to create communities in cyberspace and look for a more stable and more permanent place in the virtual world. According to L. Ionnin, this place is the electronic address [20]. However, here it is worth noting the existence of a dual tendency: along with the boundless possibilities of virtual space, a person embraces nostalgia for local, natural. Such a need is also a basis for associations in the modern tribes.

In 1997, the British anthropologist R. Jenkins noted that since the 1960s, the word “tribe” began to change more neutral and such that it is not associated with the colonial era — “ethnic group” [6]. At the same time, the tribute returned to scientific discourse, but in a new sense — M. Maffesoli in 1996 used this term to describe the phenomenon of the growth of the number of geographically dispersed micro-tribal groups based on the matrix of collective emotion, religious spirit, proximity to nature [7, p. 40]. In his article “The Time of the Tribes” M. Maffesoli is rejected from global narratives (for example, the national state), successfully transfers the accent from the society to a community that is once again experiencing the myth “here and now”. Characterizing the current trend, such the predominance of the whole over the individual, concealing depth on the surface of things, M. Maffesoli uses the term “formism”. In his vision, the non-static world is full of social networks,

based on minute and minor everyday situations, emotional excitement with a characteristic catharsis, deep solidarity. The regulators of the sensitivity of neotraits are joint activities, holidays, rituals, that create the community anew, and open the opportunity to feel together, experience the same passion, build on the shared experience and experience of the Other [7].

According to M. Maffesoli, all institutions from micro-groups to the state are an expression of “divine social” [24]. New tribes in the concept of M. Maffesoli are formed both on the basis of a local (territorial feature) and an imaginary (general idea) criterion, as well as style, worldview, and game. These are not subcultures, that is, communities based on a somewhat different style than for the overwhelming majority of the population, these are self-sufficient “micro cultures” — youth groups, bloggers, fans of television series that arise to objectify the idea of “common” as a symbol and space of social life. The social imaginary is cementitious material of neotraits [7, p. 150], in contrast to the rational choice and the universal moral law of the previous period [7, p. 116].

In the scientific research M. Maffesoli develops the ideas of his teacher, the cultural anthropologist J. Durand, that the thinking and the Imaginary of human are equal and connected to processes. In the modern world, as many theorists have noted, even a physical space is often replaced by an imaginary one [11]. From here the problem of territorial identity is concerned.

According to A. Musiydov, territorial identities turn out to be as “natural” (through objective charac-

teristics of the territory), as much as “imaginary” (through the meanings attributed to the territory) [27, p. 27]. In the works of E. Durkheim, French understanding of the “imaginary” can be traced as a landscape of collective aspirations (*imaginaire*).

The famous theorists M. Castells and E. Giddens, to a certain extent, are considering the question of the so-called societal depoliticization. However, as long as this trend is more correctly described as twofold. Individuals, as before, associate themselves with the place, they consider it important to have a connection with it. Let's remember only the names of volunteer battalions which were created in Ukraine in 2014 — Donbass, Kiev, Slobozhanshchina, Azov, Crimea, Krivbass, Kremenchug, Lviv, Lugansk. Of course, some of them were created under the influence of corporate groups, so this name may sound like a simulacrum, but for others this name is a symbol, a manifestation of the fact that territorial identities continue to play an important role in the self-determination of the individual and in the affairs of the whole state. The presence of territorial communities is conditioned by the existence of common interests for their members related to territorial practices (movement to work, shopping, etc.). Therefore, the foundation for the self-awareness of the territorial community is the necessity to protect these interests — the improvement of the territory, the provision of transport, etc.

The concept of “Territorial patriotism” and “territory consciousness” conceptualizing the Ukrainian conservative V. Lipinsky in his work “Let-

ters to brothers-growers”. These issues also acquire the new significance for the processes of decentralization and the creation of joint territorial communities (JTCs) in the modern Ukraine. R. Aron's daughter, sociologist D. Schnaper, refers to the words of T. Parsons that the societal community is a collective organization created in a certain territorial space with a common cultural tradition that relates to “blood” and products of the “contract” [31, p. 179–180]. V. Beck concludes: “Our commitment to a certain region never harms the love of the country as a whole” [3].

According to Musiydov, in this discourse the constructivist position occupies the main place: the community of the territory is a social construct, and the territorial community is “an imaginary community” [27, p. 29]. As B. Anderson writes, any community is imaginary [11, p. 23]. For example, the nation as an imaginary community was “created” by cartographers, printing machines, newspapers. Now the role of “imagination” in defining the connection between society and the territory is easily traced in the massive spread of attempts to design the image of territories-marketing of territories, is also an important problem for the economic activity of JTC in Ukraine.

Concerning the notation sphere of relations of groups formed on the basis of ethnic attitudes, at the beginning of the 20th century. W. Sumner introduced the notion of “ethnocentrism”, considering that in-group relationships (we-group) are always inherent in integration and cooperation, and outgroup (they-group) — competition and hostility [9] (see Table 1). The

The comparative analysis of features of modern and traditional tribes*

Traditional tribes (tribes)	New tribes (Neotribes)
Permanent identification of members	Temporary identification of members
Generic relations as a factor of unity	Leisure, friendly, communal, other connections as a factor associations
Ability to belong to the same tribe	Possibility to belong to many tribes (not limited to)
System-forming is tradition	The desire for the new is system-forming, but in simultaneous synergy with the sensationalisation of archaic
They have historical content	They do not have historical content ("not immortal" in the social sense)
Exist in a uniform cavity time and space	Exist in a non-uniform, "multilayer" time and space
The value of territory is the determining factor	Some revival of the value of the territory
Focus on uncertain judgments about the future and the eternal, abstract, mythical	The emphasis on social experience, all present and natural
Strong on the basis of solidarity, authority center, discipline of members	Strong on the basis of solidarity, weak – on the basis of the authority center or discipline of members
Constant structure and essence	The temporal structure is blurred, the essence is constantly changing depending on the roles that each participant is authorized to perform
A clear demarcation in relations with Others ("we-they"), which is in a sense a self-identifying sign	It is not a general requirement for a clear demarcation in relations with Others ("we-they")
Hierarchical, vertical structure of power	Anarchic and horizontal structure of power
The presence of a totem	The presence of a "situational" totem (which is much less likely to cause situations of manifestation of fascism, xenophobia than in the case of tribes)

* *Authoring*

ethnocentrism is a phenomenon of ordinary ethnic consciousness, which can result from the need to protect the ethnos from the foreign influence in the conditions of (disadaptation) of ethnic groups, uncertainty about the positive image of the "we-group", the desire of the indigenous ethnos to protect their territory from migrants (because of their negative attitude towards them),

etc. The emergence of ethnocentrism is connected with the peculiarities of the group as an ethnosocial organism, historically formed, however, certain features of the actual social, economic and political situation can strengthen or weaken the ethnocentric tendencies. In the modern world, the index of national distancing of citizens has increased significantly, by the way, not

because of the deterioration of the situation in a particular nation, in fact, less tolerance for all. In this context, a state strategy is needed to support and facilitate (patronize) interethnic contacts on the part of the authorities, as well as to ensure cooperative interaction between communities in a regional context, which implies the existence of a common goal on the territorial basis (territorial patriotism). Partially in response to these trends in the modern world, the concept of cultural citizenship is being developed as opposed to the legal (formal — juridical) concept of citizenship. Many scientists are not inclined to interpret the citizenship separately from cultural signs (inaculture-blindconcept). After all, the state in this case does not experience inertia needs to be reconciled with society, when before it there is a community of citizens, formally legally identical (have the same rights and obligations) and do not differ on cultural grounds [10].

However, the opposition to minority cultures contributes to the preservation of social conflicts. The model of citizenship, conventionally set up to civilian models of different civilizational spaces determines R. Rosaldo (Stanford University) through the concept of cultural citizenship (culturalcitizenship) [8] with an emphasis on the culture of citizenship as the spiritual and moral value of the individual. In our opinion, a high level of culture of citizenship in that component of its content that, apart from civil, accommodates moral and ethical values, serves as a means of preventing conflicts not only on an ethnocentric basis, but also possible disputes and

clashes between neotrabams in the event of their destructive behavior. The growth of the value of the value bases of the civil service in Ukraine, including the issue of the further culture of citizenship of civil servants, found meaningful expression in the updated legal and regulatory framework for the civil service (2015–2016). However, we will not analyze this aspect within the framework of this research.

If, in the case of the ethnocentrism, ethnic attitudes on the perception of other groups and ethnostereotypes can be either positive or negative, but they are never neutral (which in itself is a significant factor of conflict), for neotribes, as a rule, the need for such a categorical bipolar assessment of others. The re-definition of borders is complicated in today's changing global context of social stress. We can conclude that ethnocentrism and non-wrestling are two different processes that exist in parallel in the modern world and characterize society from several different sides. In our opinion, neotrabalism corresponds to the trends in the development of modern democracy as the movement towards greater freedom, decentralization, the information society, when the limited political democracy to ensure a more equitable arrangement leads the self-organization of citizens themselves. This is about the emergence of a new level of sociality: mobile, ready for quick action when it is necessary, actively protecting the rights of its bearers and not infringing on the freedom of another. This is a sociality that becomes strong due to the variability of situations of privacy, unprofessional creative activity, self-search in conditions of democracy and publicity.

In the information society, individuals not only consume information, but also produce it, supplementing, changing, constructing structures, creating knowledge and information. The flexibility, the fluidity of content and structural characteristics is provided guaranteed the freedom of creativity of their members for, as a rule, the democratic nature of relations, the constant exchange of knowledge, the search for a new, permanent communication, the mutual motivation to improve. When the freedom of creativity is blocked, the society becomes more conflict. The freedom has a positive effect on the development of members of the non-rake and on the culture of the society as a whole, if an encroachment on the freedom of another or violence is excluded as a means of self-affirmation in the activities of the new tribe. In this case, in the middle of neotribal, new requests for education, its new forms and variations are constantly born. However, in the case of lack of developed critical thinking, even the group's unobtrusive position can be fatal, negative. Of course, knowledge have emancipatory character, and postmaterial reproduction is the dominance of creative work. The stimulation of the creativity of the worker and the confidence in his innovative activity, in our opinion, to form a new economic structure under the fourth industrial revolution.

Ukrainian researcher A. Galchinsky in this context issues a new socio-centric reality, when a person is not indirectly (as always), but directly becomes a real system-forming the center of the future [14]. In this context, the logic of social transformation begins to dominate in the economic process.

The richness of human is formed by the social environment of our communion, space communications, and intellectual exchange options. These positions are inseparable attributes of the psyche of the individual.

Neotribes is largely imaginary community than the Tribe. By adding to this the possibilities, provides the information society to the individual towards convenient and comfortable learning in various forms, we can say: the possibilities of educational impact on modern tribes in the case, for example, of the possible use of violence as a symbolic act of action, are quite wide. But as for tribalism (the activity of tribes in the traditional sense), the possibility of education, for example, for the tolerance of different groups more limited. Let us illustrate this with the following situation. The well-known Norwegian anthropologist T. Heyerdahl, who made a historic expedition across the waters of the Pacific Ocean on a raft using the technology of ancient Peruvians, loved to tell a story of how in the eighteenth century a wealthy traveler exchanged the inhabitants of Polynesia for some trivia two children. He honestly educated them in his estate, taught manners and the basics of science. And two years later brought back to their tribe. What a surprise he has, when these children, having just gone ashore, took off their shoes, all their clothes and shoes, and ran to their tribe's members naked and barefoot.

The modern education is not only works for the needs of certain neotribes, but also spreads the information about the modern tribe outside of it, warning probably biased perception

for separate unneighboring of a closed type. However at the stage of post-modern social networks are increasingly being empowered, so there are often cases where, perhaps, one education, as a regulator of the conflictuality of the society, will not be enough (for example, the situation with suicides of adolescents – “Blue Whale”). But the general rule is this: if the level of education of members of neotraybs is higher than the less, there will be the probability of conflicts inside the modern tribe and at the level of relations with other neotrabams. For example, if different neotraybs bind different meanings from one territory, will promote the formation of philosophical horizons members and their understanding of the fundamental importance of the manifold. The first woman – rector of Oxford University L. Richardson believes that the best way to resist the radicalization of young people is to give an opportunity to listen to different points of view. To see ways to solve problems from different sides, to promote a culture of dialogue is important for modern democracy. By the way, many educational projects concerning the support of the policy of multiculturalism have so far been implemented by the efforts of various groups of volunteers – specific unabashed.

The flexibility without disregard excludes the aggressive imposition on society of ideas about life on the part of their members. In general, neotraibs are not often based on deviant norms, they can simply be alternative. The anarchism of neotraybs, as well as of any type of activism, can fit within the framework of the law. In modern society there are different norms that allow

certain minorities to be represented in the discourse, depending on the relevance of the issues they are about. All of this does not lead to a reduction in the differences between the communities. Moreover, modern means of communication not only facilitate the communication of different individuals among themselves, but also demarcate the various existing communities into which they enter. In the intention to get the confirmation of one's own identity, people prefer to communicate and interact within their “own” communities.

To the step of stabilization of the social and economic situation in Ukraine to block the possibilities of education significantly, today can be that in the poor and “hopeless” of neotraybs as a rule, modest educational needs. The educational motivation is much higher in conditions of high socioeconomic status of members of the neotraybs, who will accordingly be in a privileged position regarding the request for educational services. The network reality and ample opportunities for learning in the information age to some extent “equalize” this inequality. Another advantage of network communication and democracy on this basis is the possibility of constant dialogue, including with authorities, with different groups of the public on pondering and the definition of public policy objectives.

In the context of the methodology of epochal cycles, which is developed by Ukrainian archetypalists [12, p. 16], the modern Ukrainian society is in a transitional stage from the normative period of involution to the normative period of evolution and, accordingly, is characterized by unsustainable ba-

lance, horizontal mobility. It can testify that even after the actions of civil protest under the name of the Revolution of Virtue, according to polls of the end of 2016, 72,4 % of Ukrainians agreed that it is difficult for them to understand what to believe [17] (the so-called syndrome of traumatized society). At this stage, social institutional control is weakened, but there is a need to monitor the development of social conflicts.

Within the framework of the cyclic paradigm (see Table 2), the revolution is determined by the initial point of the cyclical development of the social system. Behind it comes the normative phase of involution [12]. The involution is changed by the transitional phase of the cycle- coevolution, within which the imperfection of metatheories and existing scientific paradigms becomes apparent. However, the co-evolutionary period is specific to the emergence of a mass of self-sufficient individuals (the subject "I"), which under the influence of growing innovative waves enhance the synthesis of order and chaos [12, p. 17]. The co-evolution is replaced by the normative phase of evolution, which ends with the transitional period of the revolution as the final point of development of the social system. The revolution is characterized by the appearance of qualitatively new hypotheses and conceptual theories on the basis of the accumulated experimental material at the stage of evolution, the growth of the emotional and volitional activity of individuals and the increase in the field of social freedom [12, p. 17].

Neotraibalism for the Ukrainian society is a new trend, which only claims

about itself. One of the most striking examples of Ukrainian non-spying is corporate groups at the power — Donetsk, Dnepropetrovsk, Kiev, Carpathian, Lviv clan-neotraiby. In our opinion, if the Ukrainian society were characterized by a longer stage in the formation and functioning of modern tribes, in particular by territorial features, the process of decentralization in Ukraine would be much quicker and more successful. In this case, it would be of an organic nature and not semi-artificial, like now. Proceeding from this position, it is possible to explain why until JTC educational process more active in the western regions of Ukraine, where the population is a little less long Soviet past, and the regional landscape has a smaller number of "deserts" of large industrial cities with a "dehumanized cultural space" (an inheritance From the USSR). From here we should also expect that the reform of secondary education, which, in the context of decentralization of power, provides for the creation of support schools and the transfer of authority for their administrative services, strategic management to the level of the communities themselves, in the western regions of Ukraine will be faster than in the east. If on average in 2016 in the central regions of Ukraine there were 4 supporting schools per oblast, at the same time in the Lviv region — more than 30. In our opinion, the hope that here the local communities will be able and responsible to take patronage such a large network of supporting schools and, as a result, provide the population with better educational services.

According to Ukrainian archetypal scientists, modern Euro-Atlantic coun-

Table 2

Regulatory (constant) phases in the cyclical model of the development of science*

The cycle / Phases of cycles	The involution	The evolution
Characteristic features of the phases of the cycle	The fundamentality (universality) of scientific knowledge and encyclopaedism of the system of sciences. The science has little to do with practice. This is, first of all, the period of assimilation of new qualities – the stage of socialization. Order, external control, collectivist morality, subject “We”, social consent, the power of laws. It (being) determines consciousness, simplification of social structure	The development of applied science, the differentiation of science, narrow scientific specialization, comparative and interdisciplinary research, the experimental method, special pluralism and a mixture of research methods. Complicating the social structure, increasing social activity, emancipating the individual, the stability of change, freedom of choice, consensus, strong citizens. The consciousness determines the forms of being, personal interests and passions prevail, the individual determines the social, the complexity of the social structure
1 cycle	The period of ancient Greece	The Period of Ancient (Ancient) Rome
2 cycle	The renaissance	Period of enlightenment
3 cycle	Modern (the basis of socio-historical methodology – objective laws and trends. For scientific knowledge it is characterized by the absoluteization of the fragment)	Postmodern (the priority of “biological components” of a person – the ethnic and national characteristics)
Social characteristics of the phases of the cycle	Extraversion is a “closed society”, the direction of the societal psyche to the material essence. Static, logical activity, irrationality, emotionality, intuition	Introversion is an “open society”, the orientation of the sociocultural psyche to the spiritual essence. The development of social institutions, the formation of dynamic new social qualities, rationality, pragmatism

* Developed on the basis of [12], [23]

tries, in contrast to Ukraine, already come from the stage of evolution in the crisis era of network totalitarianism, to lay the foundation for the normative phase – the involution of the new 4th epochal cycle [12, p. 18]. And in many ways, the realization of the vector of their subsequent development relative to the formation of the subject “We” was prepared by the stage neo-

trabalizu (approximately from the late 60's through the 20th century). Within the normative phase of the evolution of the third cycle – the postmodern. Although in the archetypal scheme, the normative phase of the postmodernism is characterized by dominant of the individualism and a significant influence of the individual in social organization, culture [23, p. 140], we do not think

that the community values of neo-wrestling substantially contradict with such individualistic norms and at this stage coexist with them. For example, Z. Bauman emphasizes the individualistic character, number of storeys and fluidity of neotraybs. According to the scientist, in modern tribes an attempt is made to regain “communities”, but instead it only leads to even greater fragmentation [1]. That is why, M. Maffessoli argues, in the place of individualism in a mass society comes collective individualism in postmodern-neotrabalism [7, p. 84]. In one of his last research M. Maffessoli clarifies three main characteristics of the modern tribal phenomenon: the significance of living in one territory, the commonality of tastes and the return of the figure of the eternal child [25]. Regarding the latter, in our opinion, in this context, we are talking not only about the infantilism of the eternal child and its desire to play (which is emphasized by M. Maffessoli especially), but also about the irresistible desire of every child to learn new things, which, of course, is connected with education.

The modern education is removed from the gravitation to the real space as the building of the school or university walls, this manifests itself in the growing popularity of the family (in the link of the general average) and distance (on the link of higher education). In ancient Greece, Aristotle spent his lectures on walks in the garden. Also in modern developed countries, politicians try to make all the environment in which an individual lives – educational (through the concept of lifelong learning at any age and even place).

The education becomes more sensitive to the life and needs of different communities. This trend corresponds to the modern processes of decentralization of education management and the expansion of the school's autonomy boundaries. After all, in conditions of broad autonomy, the institution of education can react more quickly to the emergence of new local or social needs, requests, timely preventing conflict situations. In Ukraine, education management processes also follow world trends in this direction.

In October 6, 2016 the draft Law of Ukraine “On Education” was adopted by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine in the first reading. According to this document, and is based on the explanations provided in the “Methodological recommendations for the development of regulations on the structural division of education of the executive body of the united territorial community” [26], the management and financing of out-of-school, pre-school, elementary and basic schools (up to the 9th grade) To the level of the united communities, which are now being created in Ukraine. The management of the senior profile school should be at a level higher than the unified community (in Poland it is the level of the county), however, since there are no such counties, in Ukraine, and schools I, II, III degrees are not yet separated – the senior school will be managed by the community as well.

The management of education by the local government of the united community differs significantly from the administration of network of educational institutions on the part of district state administrations? First,

the educational management body of the JTC has the authority, apart from the operational authority (ensuring the current activity of the community educational network), and also on the strategic (planning and forecasting of the education system in the JTC) levels. Secondly. If the head of the administrative service entity is appointed by the JTC chairman in the JTC, who is elected by the JTC community, then the head of the district department of education appoints the head of the district state administration and is appointed, in his turn, by the President (without the participation of the community). Hence, the educational management body, like the whole system of local government in JTC, is primarily accountable to the society, and acts in its interests. Also, the administrative maintenance of the network of educational institutions in the JTC is aimed at maximizing the delegation educational and methodical powers to the level of the educational institutions themselves [26]. That is, it is about expanding the autonomy of schools.

The famous American pedagogue, J. T. Gatto argues that the phenomenon of mass forced school education appeared at the stage of modernity as the extreme manifestation of economic rationality in order to standardize the processes of thinking of the worker in the role of a reliable consumer. To do this, the scientific management quickly spread from factories to schools. According to J. T. Gatto, the great destructive myth of the twentieth century. There was a statement that the child would not receive the proper education in the unique conditions of her own family [15, p. XII]. As his-

tory has shown, the model of rational management of schools has somewhat damaged the roots of a free society, as it defended. The school has evolved as the weapon of the leviathan state.

In the XVIII–XIX centuries. Young Americans have acquired all the necessary skills for life in society and the family. And the teachers were given the wrong place — everyone could teach others and everyone could teach themselves. Secular schools were peripheral institutions that were used for resting the mother. Such system in the early stages of statehood, the US was borrowed in Ancient Greece. In ancient Greece, training was characterized as free, based on self-discipline. For applicants for education, it was important not to test by tests, but to achieve real ideals in the cause provided by the local tradition (participatory democracy). The most famous Athenian school was the Plato Academy, a meeting place of thinkers and seekers, favorable for a good conversation and good friendship, everything that, according to Plato, should be the basis of education.

In the last decades of the XIX century, the American education system has been overridden by the Prussian / Spartan model, whose goal satisfied the needs of business and the state through “accompanying each step of the person with official attitudes”. At the stage of the Enlightenment, the cultivation of the collective social organism, many European philosophers become supporters of the idea of compulsory schooling, because it was tempting to develop the eastern mechanism for transforming the broad masses of the population into a means of realizing the will of the elites, creating a reliable

foundation for easily managing the society. At the end of the first quarter of the XIX century, in large American cities there are Lancaster schools, children from low grades were brought up obedience under the guise of getting the ability to read and count. In these institutions, children were not required to think, only to repeat, so it was easy to learn. The form of compulsory education in the United States was invented in Massachusetts around 1850. Its implementation was opposed, but in 1880 the last resistance was overcome and American children began to go to school under escort. It was turned out not entirely in favor of society – if before 1850. The literacy rate in the state was 98 %, after 1850 – no more than 91 % [16, p. 40]. Compulsory education served as a tool for creating national unity and reflected the fear of ethnocentrism. The level of prosperity in society has grown, but if you look at psychology, you can see an increase in anxiety. We are convinced that the introduction of compulsory schooling with all the attributes that led to the minimization of the space of freedom and creativity of the student, as well as the introduction of school management in the “factory samples”, contributed significantly to the growth of anxiety and depressive moods in the society that lay in the prerequisites for the emergence of neo-urbanism as a phenomenon of modern society.

If before the middle of the XIX century American students could freely choose the model of education that suits them, for example, self-education, for today these options are available only to the most courageous and rich. In the project of law of Ukraine “On Edu-

cation” laid a new status of the home form of education (when the applicant does not need to take a certificate of health or special circumstances to get an opportunity to study at home). And now with any school, not just extramural, parents will be able to conclude an agreement on home schooling for their child and passing examinations for a certificate. The draft Law of Ukraine “On Education” also provides support for various types of schools, in particular public funding for obtaining the general secondary education in a private educational institution in the amount of a financial norm for the budgetary provision of one student. Such changes are fully consistent with the normative phase of postmodernity, it provides for innovation and emergence of the society. The successes of home education in the United States (more than 2,5 million children are covered by this form so far) and various types of schools that are semi-dependent from the state (charter, magnet schools, others) point to an alternative encouraging path of educational change, to which, with some delay, Ukraine is attached.

If before the economy of industrialism could not withstand the generation of young people trained to think critically, postmodernism and the formation of a new 4th epochal cycle are in great need of a generation of enterprising, creative people who will perform work that people can not do. *In a healthy community, the learning function belongs to everyone.* The current trend of neoliberalism contributes to the effectiveness of this norm to a certain extent, while confirming its prospects in parallel. The state is obliged

to help the new network processes in education and to serve them. Also, the society additionally has a need for government programs for the development of basic sciences, laying the foundation for residual knowledge to ensure progress.

In the context of the reform of decentralization of power and the reactivation of the idea of educational districts in Ukraine, in our opinion, it is important to make service to society an indispensable part of schooling. In addition to the experience of selflessness, the participation of the individual in the life of society is the best way to transfer responsibility in the main spheres of life. And the alienation from society turns into indifference to almost everything [16, p. 74]. The local community is not the best fuse for loss of identity. The developed community has certain historical traditions, differs from the mediocre neotraibu — the friendship and loyalty in society are long-term, and for most modern tribes, this is a temporary phenomenon. Therefore, we agree with JT Gatto that the crisis of school education is associated with a serious crisis of local communities [16, p. 40].

For the modern education it is important to keep the scope of work, rather than producing “educated people”. In the near future a new way to be popular is advanced by the humanitarian, ethical, social competence of young people. They will sound new in conditions when 1 billion people can become unemployed, a large number of African children are threatened with death by starvation, the problems of refugees and others become more widespread.

Systemic educational reforms should be preceded by local pedagogical innovations and local efforts, during which local pedagogical experience will be formed [30, p. 23]. The modern model of education — the model of the conveyor — is ineffective. It is the network form of education, in our opinion, that can ensure the content (cultural fullness) of the educational trajectory of the competitor of education — ideas of corporatism, constructiveness, and not consumption of alienated knowledge. Only the collective forms of work and activity will ensure the modern thinking and correct socialization of the individual, even though the personality as an anthropological entity constructs its own way of life.

The modern teacher is the conductor, who initiates the creativity and activity of the competitor of education, his accompaniment, the joint search for solutions, organizes the conditions and scope for creativity. Unfortunately, till now the state managers understand reforms as the organization and reorganization, directed not only on organizational structures, but also on the teachers themselves and students only as a material of transformations. Therefore, it is easy to explain why educational changes are easier to take place at the level of educational institutions (where teachers are self-organizing) and are hindered in the sphere of education management.

Conclusions and prospects for further research: The Postmodernity is characterized by a transition from a modern individualistic paradigm (individual, group) to a postmodern societal paradigm (face, tribal community — neotraybs). It is invisible at

first sight, the potential for influence without forcing on existing traditional educational institutions can not be ignored. The modern networked society differs not only in emphasis on knowledge and information, but in a fundamental change in their role, everyone can join the technology of producing knowledge or symbols that unite in modern tribes. This flexibility, immeasurable creativity is critical for the traditional vertical structures of education management, in the information society we have no time to respond to the rapid circulation of information. The collision of traditional and modern approaches to education that underlies resistance to change and is caused by frequent failures of reforms will be overcome in the case of tracing those framework points of educational requests without disrupting, the analysis of which as a result will help to more accurately predict the development of education and successfully design, introduce the relevant phases of the epochal cycle of educational Change.

The modern era is characterized by the fact that along with the creation of new forms of social life, the old ones are also reproduced. Many opposite tendencies coexist or are twofold. However, through monitoring the grassroots level of society it is possible to track which trend vector will be more relevant in the near future. After all, in conditions of freedom of functioning of the structures of the grassroots level of society as close to natural, local, it will be reflect the real symptomatology of society. Virtual, affective tribes are alternative forms of organization, communication, interaction, where a person finds himself again. The basis

for the new sociality is the emotional dimension of social life, backed up by media activity in social networks. The vector on the formation of the collective subject "We" in the modern Euro-Atlantic countries within the normative phase of the evolution of the 3rd cycle - the postmodern, accompanying their probable transition to the normative phase of the involution of the 4th cycle, is largely not possible due to the phenomenon of neotribalism (started here approximately From the late 60^s of the 20th century and prepared the necessary prerequisites for such a transition).

Tribes of the modern world are formed on the basis of the diversity of individual acts of self-determination. The multiplicity of membership contributes to the creation of a more complex personality orientation than just ethnocentrism. A person who deeply feels himself a member of various groups can develop the ability to compare, understand the conventionality of certain positions. The possibilities of education as a regulator of social conflict in the society are unrivaled much more and more variably than at the stage of the modernism.

The assistance in the development of civil society (non-inflexes can form public organizations to enter into a dialogue with the state), the decentralization of power and further democratization and the formation of a new quality-fully correspond to the trends of postmodernity and contain a significant potential for preventing social conflicts. At the stage of non-urbanization, the state should support the desire of individual communities to make education more approximate to re-

gional needs, to promote the diversity of forms of education and to stimulate creative principles at its basis. Now the components of collective consciousness archetypes are used by separate groups artificially as an instrument of hi-hume technologies (humanitarian forms of point manipulative influence by human behavior). We are convinced that it is possible to warn such a manipulative action in the conditions of a developed culture of life of the community (public, Gromad culture), because of the large volume of live, open, daily communication between its members.

The neotrayb is a simple means for an individual to fulfill his desires and protect himself from the demands of other modern tribes. For today neurairabs are relatively successful in performing the educational function. This problematic aspect of interdisciplinary research is promising for further analytical work.

The content of education differs in relation to various types of sociality. And the type of sociality, in turn, is a sign of the curriculum of actual educational transformations. This is one of the strategies for preventing and resolving conflicts in the modern world through educational changes respond to social changes, accompany them with appropriate educational influences, thus contributing to the organic logic of the cyclical development of society.

REFERENCES

1. *Bauman Z.* Intimations of Postmodernity. — L.: Routledge, 1992.
2. *Bauman Z.* Liquid modernity. — Malden: Polity Press, 2000.
3. *Beck U.* Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. — L.: Sage, 1992.
4. *Durand G.* Wyobraznia symboliczna. — Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1986.
5. *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience* / Ed. N. Glazer and D. Moynihan. — Cambridge, 1975.
6. *Jenkins R.* Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations. — L.: Sage, 1997.
7. *Maffesoli M.* The Time of the Tribes. The Decline of Individualism in the Mass Society. — London: SAGE Publications; Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, 1996.
8. *Rosaldo R.* Cultural Citizenship and Educational Democracy / R. Rosaldo // Cultural Anthropology. — 1994. — Aug. — Vol. 9. — № 3. Further Inflections: Toward Ethnographies of the Future. — P. 402–411.
9. *Sumner W. G.* Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals [internet Resources]. — Ginn, 1906. — 692 p. — Mode to access: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/Folkways.html?id=dX9qAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
10. *Volpp L.* The Culture of Citizenship [Internet Resource] / L. Volpp // Theoretical Inquiries in Law. — 2007. — July. — Vol. 8. — № 2. — P. 571–602. — UC Berkeley Public Law Research Paper No. 1015142. — Mode to access: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1015142
11. *Anderson B.* Imaginary communities. Reasoning about the origin and spread of nationalism / Trans. Znogorskogo and V. Morozov. — Moscow: Criticism, 2001. — 272 p.
12. *Afonin E. A.* Great co-evolution (global problems of the present: socio-historical analysis) / E. A. Afonin, A. M. Bandurka, A. Yu. Martynov. — Moscow: Parapan, 2002. — 352 p.

13. *Bauman* J. Philosophy and Postmodern Sociology // Questions of Philosophy. — 1993. — № 3.
14. *Galchinsky* A. The world unfolds on the left — in the Biklodins [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: http://gazeta.dt.ua/macrolevel/anatoliy-galchinskiy-svit-rozvertayetsyalivoruch-u-bik-lyudini_.html/
15. *Gatto* J. T. The Hidden History of American Education. Deep study of the prison of modern school education / Trans. From English M. Plesak. — Kharkov: "Publishing house" Dior-To", 2016. — 448 p.
16. *Gatto* J. T. The hidden program of compulsory school education. Stupid / Trans. From English A. Litvinyak. — Lviv: Annals, 2016. — 100 p.
17. *Golovaha* E. About "phenomenon of immoral majority" [Electronic resource] // Day. — Access mode: <http://m.day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/podrobyci/pro-fenomen-amoralnoyi-bilshosti>
18. *Zayats* D. Indie-rock sociology of Michel Maffesoli // Sociology: theory, methods, marketing. — 2011. — № 3. — P. 74–83.
19. *Ionin* L. The Rise of Minorities. — Moscow: University Book, 2013. — 240 p.
20. *Ionin* L. Parade of minorities [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: <http://lifeinbooks.net/chitat-online/parad-menshinstv-leonid-ionin/>
21. *Kaiku* M. Physics of the Future / Trans. From English A. Kamenets. — Lviv: Annals, 2013. — 432 p.
22. *Castells* M. The formation of a network society. In the book: A new post-industrial wave in the West. Anthology. — M.: Academia, 1999. — P. 492–505.
23. *Martynov* A. Historic Sociology (cyclic paradigm). — Moscow: UAD "Rada", 2004. — 228 p.
24. *Maffesoli* M. Wizardry of the World or the Divine Social // SOCIOLOGOS. — Moscow: Progress, 1991. — P. 274–283.
25. *Maffesoli* M. Man postmodernity / Translation of the article, included in the collection "L'Homme postmoderne", Paris, Bourin éditeur, 2012 [Electronic resource]. — Access Mode: <http://syg.ma/@marisya-prorokova/mishielmaffiesoli-chieloviek-postsovriemiennosti-pierievod-stativoshiedshiei-v-sbornik-lhomme-postmoderne-paris-bourin-editeur-2012>
26. *Methodical* recommendations on the development of the regulations on the structural division of education of the executive body of the united territorial community. [Electronic resource] / Letter of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 1 / 9-633 dated 30.12.2015. - Access mode: <http://osvita.ua/legislation/other/49450/>
27. *Musyzedov* A. territoriality of modern society // Sociological Journal. — 2013. — № 4. — P. 21–34.
28. *Postmodernism*: the encyclopedia / Pod. Sci. Ed. A. Gritsanov, M. Mozheiko. — Minsk: Interpresservice, 2001. — 1038 p.
29. *Pyatkov* N. Archetype of change: its place and role in archaically mythological thinking // Izv. The Urals. State. University. — 2008. — № 57. — P. 101–114.
30. *Rozin* V. Education in conditions of modernization and uncertainty: Concept. — Moscow: The Book House "LIBROKOM", 2013. — 80 p.
31. *Schnaper* D. Community of citizens. About the modern concept of the Nation / Trans. With the French R. Mardier. — Kharkov: Folio, 2007. — 223 p.