UDC: 351/354

Deliia Oksana Viktorivna,
Candidate of Historical Sciences, associate professor, doctoral student of the Department of Social Development and Public-Power Relations, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Kyiv, Str. Eugena Potie, 20, tel.: +38 (044) 456 13 86, e-mail: oksanadelia@gmail.com
            ORCID: 0000-0001-9806-5328

Делія Оксана Вікторівна,
кандидат історичних наук, доцент, докторант кафедри суспільного розвитку та суспільно-владних відносин, Національна академія державного управління при Президентові України, м. Київ, вул. Ежена Потьє, 20, тел.: +38 (044) 456 13 86, e-mail: oksanadelia@gmail.com
            ORCID: 0000-0001-9806-5328

Делия Оксана Викторовна,
кандидат исторических наук, доцент, докторант кафедры общественного развития и общественно-властных отношений, Национальная академия государственного управления при Президенте Украины, г. Киев, ул. Эжена Потье, 20, тел.: +38 (044) 456 13 86, e-mail: oksanadelia@gmail.com

            ORCID: 0000-0001-9806-5328
            DOI https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.103

ARCHETYPE OF THE PLACE IN ARCHITECTONIC OF THE ENVIRONMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY

Abstract. The review of the concept of public policy environment in the modern public-management scientific discourse is actualized due to the lack of systematic and comprehensive studies on this problem.

The results of consideration of the state policy environment as a place through the application of the archetypal paradigm are presented.

The connection between archetypal ideas about the place and the modern course of state policy is also outlined and highlighted. The evaluation of the environment as a "place" is historically connected with the statement of the existence of a thing or phenomenon and lies in the plane of spatial terminology. The place, within the framework of the approach, is considered as a part of the space occupied by a person or an object, while the place is given the value of the minimum limit, and the space is given a maximum limit. Within the framework of the research, other approaches are highlighted that disclose the category of place in discipli-

nary and interdisciplinary contexts: sociological-behavioral, phenomenological, systemic, etc.

It is noted that the spatial revolution in the structure of cognition determined the analysis of state policy in spatial categories, which substantiated modern interdisciplinary measurements of the environment of state policy. And — the appearance in the thesaurus public policy topological and metric features reality: location periphery, a center, location and interaction "places", theme composition state policy, etc.

Therefore, the category "place" confers on the environment of state policy a social and cognitive entity, which, in particular, is defined in the concept of identity and leads to the emergence of new approaches to the analysis of identity: regional, local identities, identification with a place, environment or residence.

Keywords: public policy, environment, archetype, place, space, identity.

АРХЕТИП МІСЦЯ В АРХІТЕКТОНІЦІ СЕРЕДОВИЩА ДЕРЖАВНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

Анотація. Актуалізований розгляд поняття середовища державної політики в сучасному публічно-управлінському науковому дискурсі, зумовлений браком системних та комплексних досліджень із цієї проблематики.

Подано результати розгляду середовища державної політики як місця через застосування парадигми архетипного дослідження. Також окреслено та висвітлено зв'язок архетипних уявлень про місце із сучасним перебігом державної політики. Оцінювання середовища як "місця" історично пов'язане з констатацією існування речі або явища та лежить у площині просторової термінології. Місце, в межах підходу, трактується як частина простору, зайнята людиною чи річчю, при цьому місцю надається сенс мінімальної межі, а простору, відповідно, — максимальної межі.

У межах дослідження виокремлено інші підходи, які розкривають категорію місця у дисциплінарних та міждисциплінарних контекстах: соціологічно-поведінковий, феноменологічний, системний тощо. Наголошено, що просторовий переворот у структурі пізнання зумовив аналіз державної політики у просторових категоріях, обґрунтування модерних міждисциплінарних вимірів середовища державної політики, які зумовили появу у тезаурусі державної політики топологічних і метричних характеристик реальності: локація, периферія, центр, диспозиція та взаємодія "місць" суб'єкт-об'єктного складу державної політики тощо. Разом із тим сучасний постнекласичний етап посилив суб'єктивний аспект у розгляді категорії місця, тому категорія "місце" наділяє середовище державної політики соціально-когнітивною сутністю, яка, зокрема, дефінується у понятті ідентичності та зумовлює появу нових підходів до аналізу ідентичності: регіональних, локальних ідентичностей, ідентифікації з місцем, середовищем чи з місцеперебуванням.

Ключові слова: державна політика, середовище, архетип, місце, простір, ідентичність.

АРХЕТИП МЕСТА В АРХИТЕКТОНИКЕ СРЕДЫ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

Аннотация. Актуализировано рассмотрение понятия среды государственной политики в современном публично-управленческом научном дискурсе, обусловленное нехваткой системных и комплексных исследований по этой проблематике.

Представлены результаты рассмотрения среды государственной политики как места путем применения парадигмы архетипного исследования. Также определены и отражены связь архетипических представлений о месте с современным ходом государственной политики. Оценка среды как "места" исторически связана с констатацией существования вещи или явления и лежит в плоскости пространственной терминологии. Место, в рамках подхода, трактуется как часть пространства, занятая человеком или вещью, при этом месту придается смысл минимального предела, а пространству — максимального предела.

В рамках исследования выделены другие подходы, которые раскрывают категорию места в дисциплинарных и междисциплинарных контекстах: социологически-поведенческий, феноменологический, системный и др. Отмечено, что пространственный переворот в структуре познания обусловил анализ государственной политики в пространственных категориях, которые обосновали современные междисциплинарные измерения среды государственной политики. Также обусловил появление в тезаурусе государственной политики топологических и метрических характеристик реальности: локация, периферия, центр, диспозиция и взаимодействие "мест", субъект-объектного состава государственной политики и т. д.

Вместе с тем современный постнеклассический этап усилил субъективный аспект в рассмотрении категории места, таким образом категория "место" наделяет среду государственной политики социально-когнитивной сущностью, которая, в частности, дефинируется в понятии идентичности и приводит к появлению новых подходов к анализу идентичности: региональных, локальных идентичностей, идентификации с местом, средой или с местопребыванием.

Ключевые слова: государственная политика, среда, архетип, место, пространство, идентичность.

Target setting. Public policy as any social process and phenomenon can not be conditioned by its environment, by what it forms, surrounds and influences. Continuous explanation of the subject content of public policy, the need for a comprehensive understanding of the context of its preparation and planning, implementation, determine the positioning of the environment for the formation of public policy as an object of scientific knowledge. At the same time, the concept of "public policy of the environment" in the conceptual-

categorical apparatus of the science of public administration occupies a special place, since it is characterized by a wide range of scientific interpretation of its content and fragmented consideration in domestic scientific literature. In addition, the content of the definition is reproduced only within the framework of a large-scale understanding of the state-political process. Understanding of the public policy environment in the context of the ontological measurement of state policy as a key basis for its formation is found in the works of a small group of foreign and domestic researchers.

Analysis of basic research and publication. The theoretical basis of the publication was the philosophical theories of ancient thinkers — Heraclitus, Plato and Aristotle [1]. A separate group composed of cultural and philosophical studies, dedicated to the objectification of the definition of "environment" in the framework of classical, neoclassical and postclassical scientific rationality — J. Deleuze and F. Guattari [2], N. Barsukova [3], M. Heidegger [4] and B. Lepsky [5]. The works of E. Orlov [6], H. Steinbach and V. Elensky [7] and A. Rappoport [8] helped the results of the study. The scientific-methodological basis for the research search was the publication of domestic researchers — V. Tertichka, V. Kupriy [9–11] and A. Antonova [12; 13].

At the same time, a preliminary examination of the state of the problem in the scientific literature makes it possible to affirm, without detracting from the importance of the available theoretical achievements, that there is a lack of systematic and comprehensive research environment of public policy as a place by applying the methodological tools of archetypal paradigm.

The purpose of the article. This actualizes the need for a detailed theoretical and methodological analysis of the concept of "environment of public policy" through the definition of its semantic construct and the identification of methodological approaches to understanding this definition. In this study, we will draw on a broad historical context in which there were close concepts, archetypal worldviews and representations that can be combined on the basis of theoretical assumptions of modern theory of the environment.

The statement of basic materials. The methodology of scientific search causes the decomposition of the concept "environment" with the purpose of describing its essential characteristics. The assessment of the environment as a "place" is historically associated with a statement of the existence of a thing or phenomenon and lies in the plane of spatial terminology.

Space is the defining category of the mythological model of the world. "Mastering space is the first gesture of people and animals, plants and clouds, the fundamental manifestation of balance and stability" [14, p. 63]. Archaic consciousness interprets space in a broad sense as a phenomenon that differs from a geometric space and a physical model. Mythopoietic multidimensionality of space is realized through fragmentation of spatial representations, representation of the image of the world as a separate place of action or place of whose stay (battlefield, residence, etc.). The places indicated in the mythological texts are not tied to the world as a whole or to parts of it.

The mythopoetic model of the world as a space-time continuum is a space filled with things, human and sacral beings, everything that structures and organizes space. The basis for constructing an image of the world is the opposition "space-non-space", "world", "space" as the territory of residence and another world — chaos, alien, unknown, antagonistic. Such opposition interprets the process of relations between man and the world — the world around is hostile, full of danger. The process of transforming Chaos into space through symbols and ritual actions is the process of organizing, shaping the habitat [15, p. 27].

Aristotle's expression: "Things that exist, there is somewhere, and non-existent — nowhere", outlined the problems of place for system analysis [16]. In this thinker's view, a place can exist without binding to the body; it continues to exist when things tied to the place disappear. But the thing changes changing its place. The established correspondence between thing and place is a manifestation of the nature of the object, is amenable to analysis. So, the basis of the first approach is the hierarchical mapping of place and space as part and whole. The place is treated as a part of space occupied by a person or thing, while the place is given the meaning of the minimum limit, and space, respectively, — the maximum limit.

The second approach was the totality of the theoretical constructs of sociological science related to the solution of the problem of the relationship between place and social phenomenon. The place is endowed with a social character, formulated as a focus of certainty, location (P. Bourdieu), in which social ties are concentrated (G. Simmel), any events (T. Makogon) are constructed, what we manage (E. Strecker) [17; 18]. Sociological theories in the studies of "places" strengthened the problem of the space-time aspect of analysis, which was objictified in terms of "locale" and "place of places". The idea of a locale is simultaneously an opposition to the geographical concept of "location" and the concept of "disposition" and involves the use of space in order to form the environment of the course of social interaction, in which space and time are coordinated. The concept of "place of places" (location of the place) is the product of the identification of the place by another subject of social action and the point of intersection of space and time, since it presupposes the idea of movement of bodies, and therefore the use of a time horizon for the separation of events into "before", "now" and "after" [19, p. 78].

Behavioral approach, based on the concept of R. Barker, considers "place" as an exclusively behavioral concept, where a physical environment is organized is a determinant of human behavior. In this context, the place is interpreted as a unit of behavior that is limited in time and space, within the framework of which cyclically repeated actions are performed.

The next approach is characterized by the idea of specificity, systematic and structured "place", a category prediction in a specific coordinate system. The approach is based on an understanding of the geographical space as a territorial unit (taxon — E. Alaev), any portion of the geotropic characterized geographical position and opposed the entire surface of the Earth [20, p. 65]. In

V. Glazychev's place is a "molecule" of the environment and is determined by the interaction of people in the object-spatial environment. The place of the environment, according to J. Gibson, is an extended arrangement that occupies a certain position in the surrounding world [21, p. 46]. G. Schedrovitsky calls the "place" position of a person in a certain system, and its functioning fully corresponds to the requirements of the system. That is, the "person-place" in the system is determined by the links of the structure imposed on it and the processes that occur inside [22]. Phenomenological interpretation of the environment as a "place" is due to the ideas of addressing the meaning and plurality of subjective perception of the social world, which is its part. The representatives of the approach insist on the exhaustive understanding of the place as an objective reality, which is measured. The problems of infinity and the polyvariation of the perception of reality, objectified in postmodern studies, directed the locus of awareness of the subject-spatial reality towards concentration on the subjective states of the "place".

Subjective parameters category "place" was derived from the category of "sense of place", "place of behavior", understanding the relativity of the place, its identification through awareness and through the process of cognition, "events" that reinforce the basic idea — the creation of place. The place is that which matters to a person's life, affects him. The idea of place is connected with the living, the residence.

All things of the world, according to M. Heidegger, are located around a place defined as "being here". A concerns determines things in their place, directs things, and arranges a place [23, p. 19–23]. The place is determined by the links of the field, by the gathering of events, by the position in the organizational mechanism [24]. The subjectivism of the place gives rise to meanings that fill human being. Comprehension of meaning is possible only on the condition of awareness of the place. Change of place means the appearance of new meanings. The interaction of space and place as designated and what it means, allows us to combine their axis generation of meanings, that is, to define a common function — the function of generating meanings [24, p. 29]. The increase in the role of social space, the so-called "spatial revolution" in the processes of cognition, conditioned the substantiation of modern interdisciplinary dimensions of the public policy environment. The increase in the role of social space exists among other things in the thesaurus of state policy of topological and metric characteristics of reality: location, periphery, center, disposition and interaction "places" subject-object composition of public policy and the like.

Thus, the popularization of dispositions of various "places" on which the tourism policy of any state is based creates large-scale motivations that motivate people to change their behavior or way of life by demonstrating the attractiveness of staying in this place. At the same time, globalization and electronic technologies, except intensifying tourism, promoted the formation of fundamentally new mental forms of spatial behavior of people — the emergence of groups of "neo-nomad" from top managers to "trailer" travelers. The

paramount importance of the semantic and content orientations of the modern spatial dimension of state policy predetermines the appearance in the state-political process of the problems of "place", its perception, clarification of dispositions of cultural and historical values around which social consolidation occurs. In particular, one of the formal consequences of these processes is the construction of the phenomenon of regionalization in the sense of the emergence of new approaches to the analysis of identity: regional, local identities, identification with a place, environment or residence.

Combinations of such horizontal identities (life spheres) form the basis of social identity in its collective and individual forms, which is reflected socially and cognitively in public policy through the recognition of rights as claims: territorial (ecological, land, relative to the territory as a place of residence), natural anthropological (residential, demographic), spiritual and cultural (beliefs, symbols, culture, language), subject-professional (ownership and production). Social identity encourages actions to protect their rights and interests through participation at the initial stage in public associations and civil actions. This, in turn, ensures the creation of an intermediate social link between people's spheres of life and state policy. So, the conceptualization of the identity policy within the state-political process is conditioned by the attempt of the state to take into account and use the identification of citizens as a non-institutional political resource [26].

Conclusions. Consideration of the category "place" is due to the definition of its context. Understanding the place as a metaphysical phenomenon allows us to divide essence and essential: essence is determined by a set of natural characteristics, and the essential is the comprehension of what is. The essential is assigned to the place. "The environment, on the one hand, is physical facts, on the other — the system of human experience" [27].

Analysis of the category "place" next to the analytical procedures of cognition of the environment as a place of social interaction, a set of phenomena, facts and things determines the semantic component of the process of this awareness. The environment acquires signs of subjective integrity and is formed as a complex system of meanings, fills the empirical-rational reality. In this context, the category "place" gives the environment of state policy a socio-cognitive essence, which, in particular, is defined in the concept of identity.

REFERENCES

1. *Gritsanov A. A., and Abushenko V. L.* (2002), Istoriya filosofii. Entsiklopediya [History of Philosophy. Encyclopedia], Minsk, Belarus.
2. *Delez Zh. and Gvattari F.* (1996), Rizoma [Rizoma]. Filosofiya epohi postmoderna: sb. perevodov i referatov, Minsk, Belarus.
3. *Barsukova N. Y.* (2007), Dyzayn sredy v proektnoy kul'ture postmodernyzma [Design of the environment in the project culture of postmodernism], FGOU VPO RGAU; MSHA im. K. A. Timirjazeva, Moscow, Russia.
4. *Haydegger M.* (1997), Byitie i vremya [Being and Time], Ad Marginem, Moscow, Russia.

5. *Lepskiy V.* "Reflexive active environments of innovative development", available at: http://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/expertize/6728 (Accessed 14.09.2016).

6. *Orlov E.* (2010), "A medium-based approach to modern management", Sovremennaya nauka, vol. 6, p. 152–155.

7. *Shteynbah H. and Elenskiy V.* (2007), Psihologiya zhiznennogo prostranstva [The psychology of living space], Jazyk, SPb, Russia.

8. *Rappaport A.* (1984), "Problems of formation of the environment", available at: http://papardes.blogspot.com/2011/01/blog-post_4054.html?q=%D1%81%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%B4%D0%B0 (Accessed 18.01.2018).

9. *Tertichka V. V.* (2002), Derzhavna politika: analIz ta zdIysnennya v Ukrayini [State policy: analysis and implementation in Ukraine], Osnovy, Kyiv, Ukraine.

10. *Kupriy V. O. and Tertichka V. V.* (2009), "Socio-political environment of state policy. Summary of lectures", available at: //ipas.org.ua/old/doc/du/4_Synopsis.pdf (Accessed 15.11.2017).

11. *Kupriy V. O.* (2007), "Civil society organizations as actors of state policy development", Ph.D. Thesis, Public Administration, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine.

12. *Antonova O.* (2002), "The Problem of the Political Environment in the Analysis of the State Policy", Problemni pitannya analizu derzhavnoyi politiki, Centr ekon. osvity, Dnipropetrovs'k, Ukraine.

13. *Antonova O. V.* (2005), "The medium of development of state policy (theoretical and methodological aspects)", Ph.D. Thesis, Public Administration, Dnipropetrovs'k Regional Institute, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Dnipropetrovs'k, Ukraine.

14. *Barsukova N. Y.* (2007), Dyzayn sredy v proektnoy kul'ture postmodernyzma [Design of the environment in the project culture of postmodernism], FGOU VPO RGAU ; MSHA im. K. A. Timirjazeva, Moscow, Russia.

15. *Eliade M.* (1994), Svyaschennoe i mirskoe [Sacred and secular], Yzd-vo MHU, Moscow, Russia.

16. *Aristotel.* (1981), Fizika. Sochineniya v 4 t. [Physics. Essays in 4 volumes], vol. 3, Myisl, Moscow, Russia.

17. *Burde P.* (1993), Sotsiologiya politiki [Sociology of politics], Socio-logos, Moscow, Russia.

18. *Makogon*, T. I. (2013), "Topology of Local Communities", Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, vol. 3, p. 49–55.

19. *Filippov A.* (2008), Sotsiologiya prostranstva [Space sociology], Vladimir Dal', SPb, Russia.

20. *Alaev E. B.* (1983), Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya geografiya [Socio-economic geography], Myisl, Moscow, Russia.

21. *Hibson DZh.* (1988), Ekolohycheskyy podkhod k zrytel'nomu vospryyatyyu [An ecological approach to visual perception], Progress, Moscow, Russia.

22. *Schedrovitskiy G. P.* (1993), "The system of pedagogical research (methodological analysis), Pedagogika i logika, Moscow, Russia.

23. *Artemenko A. P.* (2011), "The notion of "topos" in ontological and socio-philosophical spheres of research", Gumanitarniy chasopis, vol. 1, p. 19–23.

24. *Haydegger M.* (1997), Byitie i vremya [Being and Time], Ad Marginem, Moscow, Russia.

25. *Kostinskiy G. D.* (1997), "Geographical matrix of spatiality", Izvestiya RAN, vol. 5, p. 20–37.

26. *Volkova O. A. and Kapitsyin V. M.* "Identification as the object of study in political sociology", available at: https://istina.msu.ru (Accessed 2.07.17).

27. *Bratko M. V.* (2014), "Educational environment of a higher educational institution: the search for management strategies", Zbirnik naukovih prats: PedagogIchna osvita: teoriya i praktika. Psihologiya. Pedagogika, vol. 22, p. 15–21.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Грицанов А. А.* История философии. Энциклопедия / А. А. Грицанов, В. Л. Абушенко. — Минск, 2002. — С. 883–887.

2. *Делез Ж.* Ризома / Ж. Делез, Ф. Гваттари // Философия эпохи постмодерна : сб. переводов и рефератов. — Минск, 1996. — С. 6–31.

3. *Барсукова Н. И.* Дизайн среды в проектной культуре постмодернизма / Н. И. Барсукова. – М. : ФГОУ ВПО РГАУ ; МСХА им. К. А. Тимирязева, 2007. — 242 с.

4. *Хайдеггер М.* Бытие и время / М. Хайдеггер; [пер. В. В. Бибихина]. — М. : Ad Marginem, 1997. — 452 с.

5. *Лепский В.* Рефлексивно-активные среды инновационного развития [Електронний ресурс] / В. Лепский. — Режим доступу: http://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/expertize/6728

6. *Орлов Е.* Средовой подход в современном управлении / Е. Орлов // Современная наука. — 2010. — № 2. — С. 152–155.

7. *Штейнбах Х.* Психология жизненного пространства / Х. Штейнбах, В. Еленский. — СПб. : Язык, 2007. — 207 с.

8. *Раппапорт А.* Границы времени и сред [Електронний ресурс] / А. Раппапорт. — Режим доступу: http://papardes.blogspot.com/

9. *Тертичка В. В.* Державна політика: аналіз та здійснення в Україні / В. В. Тертичка. — Київ : Основи, 2002. — 750 с.

10. *Купрій В. О.* Соціально-політичне середовище державної політики. Конспект лекцій [Електронний ресурс] / В. О. Купрій, В. В. Тертичка. — Режим доступу: http://ipas.org.ua/old/doc/du/4_Synopsis.pdf

11. *Купрій В. О.* Організації громадянського суспільства як суб'єкти вироблення державної політики : автореф. дис. ... канд. наук з держ. упр. : спец. 25.00.01 / В. О. Купрій ; Національна академія держ. управління при Президентові України. — Київ, 2007. — 20 с.

12. *Антонова О.* Проблема політичного середовища в аналізі державної політики / О. Антонова // Проблемні питання аналізу державної політики / уклад. В. Є. Романов. — Дніпропетровськ : Центр екон. освіти, 2002. — С. 13–21.

13. *Антонова О. В.* Середовище вироблення державної політики (теоретико-методологічні аспекти) : автореф. дис. ... канд. наук з держ. упр. : спец. 25.00.01 / О. В. Антонова; Дніпропетровський регіональний ін-т держ. управління Нац. академії держ. упр. при Президентові України. — Дніпропетровськ, 2005. — 20 с.

14. *Барсукова Н. И.* Дизайн среды в проектной культуре постмодернизма / Н. И. Барсукова. — М. : ФГОУ ВПО РГАУ ; МСХА им. К. А. Тимирязева, 2007. — 242 с.

15. *Элиаде М.* Священное и мирское / Мирча Элиаде ; пер. с фр., предисл. и коммент. Н. К. Гарбовского. — М. : Изд-во МГУ, 1994. — 144 с.

16. *Аристотель.* Физика // Сочинения в 4 т. / Аристотель. — М.: Мысль, 1981. — Т. 3. — С. 59–262.

17. *Бурдье П.* Социология политики / П. Бурдье ; пер. с фр. Н. А. Шматко. — М. : Socio-logos. 1993. — 251 с.

18. *Макогон Т. И.* Топология местных сообществ / Т. И. Макогон // Вестн. Томского гос. ун-та. — 2013. — № 3. — С. 49–55.

19. *Филиппов А.* Социология пространства / А. Филиппов. — СПб. : Владимир Даль, 2008. — 285 с.

20. *Алаев Э. Б.* Социально-экономическая география / Э. Б. Алаев. — М. : Мысль, 1983. — 290 с

21. *Гибсон Дж.* Экологический подход к зрительному восприятию / Дж. Гибсон. — М. : Прогресс, 1988. — 464 с.

22. *Щедровицкий Г. П.* Система педагогических исследований (методологический анализ) / Г. П. Щедровицкий // Педагогика и логика. — М., 1993. — С. 16–200.

23. *Артеменко А. П.* Поняття "топос" в онтологічній та соціально-філософській сферах дослідження / А. П. Артеменко // Гуманітарний часопис. — 2011. — № 1. — С. 19–23.

24. *Хайдеггер М.* Бытие и время / М. Хайдеггер ; [пер. В. В. Бибихина]. — М. : Ad Marginem, 1997. — 452 с.

25. *Костинский Г. Д.* Географическая матрица пространственности / Г. Д. Костинский // Известия РАН. — 1997. — № 5. — С. 20–37. — (Серия географическая).

26. *Волкова О. А.* Идентификация как объект изучения в политической социологии [Електронний ресурс] / О. А. Волкова, В. М. Капицын. — Режим доступу: https://istina.msu.ru/ (Дата звернення: 02.07.17).

27. *Братко М. В.* Освітнє середовище вищого навчального закладу: пошук стратегій управління / М. В. Братко // Педагогічна освіта: теорія і практика. Психологія. Педагогіка : зб. наук. пр. — 2014. — № 22. — С. 15–21.