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**Abstract.** The topicality of the problem of authority is determined by its daily presence in interpersonal relations; while the desire to dominate is considered either as a natural universal motivation and a driving force of life, or as a sign of a neurotic personality. The research paper aims to find the patterns of manifestation of authority motivation in professional activity and interpersonal relationships, determining its interrelations with a life position of an individual. The introduction describes the main scientific views regarding the nature of authority as a psychological phenomenon and its importance in structuring social relations. The factors influencing the formation of the authority position and style are formulated. The results of a multidimensional comparative study of groups of the same population but with different level of authority (172 persons performing different functions in the system of professional management education) are presented. The data regarding the value and career orientations and focuses of an individual, individual characteristic of interpersonal behaviour, as well as active attitude to life are collected and summarised. It is shown that the most significant differences in the quantitative indicators of the groups relate to the parameters of behaviour in interpersonal relationships (vectors of domination and benevolence); some differences relate to the structure of the value orientations of the respondents (in general, the expressiveness of the authority motivation and vertical career focuses are reliable indicators of the authority position); to a lesser extent these differences manifest when a person implemented declared values in real social behaviour. At the level of involvement and activity of implementation in life authority position does not demonstrate significant impact.
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**Introduction**

Despite the fact that authority is one of the most common phenomena of interpersonal relations and desire to dominate is one of the main universal motivations, but to speak about it freely is improper or these talks have a negative connotation. Accordingly, in domestic scientific researches there are a big blank spot that concerns psychological mechanisms and internal manifestations of authority-subordination relations.

Adler was the first who paid attention to the significance of authority. He put the inferiority complex in the basis of personality development (inevitable consequence of a child’s lack of authority). That is why the will to authority is manifestation of a bigger constructive motive – aiming at superiority, self-improving, improving own capabilities. Desire to improve is inborn; this is universal need of humanity conditioned by evolutional processes of adaptation to the environment. The purpose of this superiority is personal and unique for each human, it depends on “value that a human gives to life” (Adler 1956). K. Horney, on the contrary, included authority desire in classification of neurotic personality needs (that also includes achievements and success, prestige and recognition. A person who, as a child, has experienced problems caused by culture and was unable to solve them only at the expense of his own personality, can choose complacency or expansion in order to overcome the basic anxiety (Horney 1950).

The greatest pathos of the category of authority was acquired in the works of F. Nietzsche, who considered the will to power as an embodiment of the will to life. In this, “the strongest and highest will to life finds its expression not in the miserable struggle for existence, but in the will to fight, to power and superiority!” (Nietzsche 2005, 14). Corresponding views are common in Western culture. Thus, B. Russell considered power as fundamental explaining notion that combines all social sciences and is equal to the notion of energy in physics (Heckhausen 2003).

Vasiutynskiy emphasises that power-subordinate interrelations are in all human relations as their integral characteristics. “In each case of humans’ interaction the attempts of its participants to condition in a certain way physical, psychic, social activity of a partner are more or less clearly seen.” (Vasiutynskiy 2005). When entering a relation, persons beforehand accept a need of mutual comparison and determination of position, in which one of them should dominate and others should subordinate in different aspects. Such comparisons are a priori perceived and accepted as adequate characteristics of the process of interaction.

The interesting thought of the author that authority as social phenomenon has a certain ceiling and circulates in the human environment (similar to money circulation), transferring from one entity to other, concentrating in certain places, causing different motivations and intentions. Authority prompts people to interact, and its quantity becomes important measure of individual value and influence. In such way, authority as if puts its participants “in places”, define everyone’s position in the general system and structures society (Vasiutynskiy 2005).

Therefore, since power relations are universal psychological fact by nature, they are structured and acquired a character of independent factors of social life: they transform into various power sources and resources, having which means a certain status in society. It manifests the most in the phenomenon of leadership – the process of conscious and purposeful impact on other people in order to achieve specific socially meaningful tasks (but it would be wrong to equate authority and management.). A leader is officially empowered and has a number of resources to implement in within his authority. Leadership in modern society is profession of high demand, that is why mechanisms of managing activity is a subject of study in humanities and economics. The works of domestic psychologists A.V. Slobodianiuk, E.Yu. Korzhova and others thoroughly reveal the theoretical and practical aspects of leadership in various fields (Korzhova 2006; Slobodianiuk 2000).

However, phenomenologically authority is not only in system of organisational management, it crosses through all human relations: fathers and children, pupils and teachers, citizens and representatives of state institutions and etc. From the psychological perspective, the most important question of authority motivation. In general: if it is natural universal need or manifestation of the hidden basal anxiety of man? In specific and practice context: what is behind desire to authority of a specific person? Is authority a goal in itself or maybe a way to achieve other pro-social or pragmatic needs? It is worth noting that modern psychology is far from determination of the most adequate, harmonic characteristics of power-subordinate desires of a personality, advantageous and problem signs of involving a person in power interaction.

Heckhausen selected six parameters of authority motive as personality construct:

* Possession of authority sources (striving for multiplying and increasing sources of power);
* Capabilities (capability to quickly and unmistakable determine motivations of another person to choose the most efficient ways of impact);
* Activity of authority that is defined by getting pleasure from the feeling of possession of it and feeling an impact on other people; giving preference to one or another means of influence;
* Morality of goals, for the sake of which people seek to use power (“noble goal”, tasks of group or organisation, entity of influence, etc.); on this basis there are personality-focused and socio-focused powers;
* Preferences of area of power use (personal, professional, social);
* Fear of consequences of actions of authority: before growing sources of authority, their loss, use of authority, respond to authority use, unsuccessfulness of influence on others (Heckhausen 2003).

T. Shibutani describes a number of characteristics of authorities wherein there are compensation motives: idealized self-concept, dissatisfaction with oneself, desperate search for recognition, ambition, sensitivity to inattention and disrespect (as well as approval and flattery), interest in symbols of status and external signs of success, self-centeredness, compulsivity, non-criticality, vindictiveness (Shibutani 2002).

Despite the big number of researches on psychology of power, its nature and impact on personality development are not explained completely.

**Materials and Methods**

The objective of this article is to find patterns of manifestation of authority motivation in professional activity and interpersonal relations, to determine its interconnection with life position of a person. Tasks of the research implied: 1) organisation of multidimensional comparative research of groups of people who are of one population (carry out various forms and functions of management in system of higher professional education), but have different degree of expressiveness of authority; 2) collection and analysis of data regarding different personality properties that accompany self-realisation of human in the system of power-subordinate relations.

Selection was made by 172 persons who are related to management and pedagogical activities (data collection was made on the basis of the network of higher education institution IAMP that has branches in many Ukrainian cities): representatives of highest levels of administration, heads of department, professors and students. According to the level of authority, we have formed four research groups:

Level 1 – persons with “zero” level of real authority who at the same time have interest and certain capabilities to manage: 105 students of the third and fourth year studying "Management" and "Public management and Administration” (age of respondents is from 20 to 35 years old).

Level 2 – professors who formally are not executives, but as a result of the nature of pedagogic work have dominant position and influence in the system of interpersonal relations “teacher-pupil”: 34 persons of age from 34 to 48.

Level 3 – heads of departments who in addition to teaching manage educational-methodical and have under their authority from 10 to 20 subordinate colleagues (in the structure of higher educational institution management, this position is the lower level of leadership): 18 persons of age from 33 to 45.

Level 4 – representatives of administration of the educational institution of the highest level (heads of regional subdivisions, vice presidents and deputy directors): 15 persons of age from 38 to 52).

To reveal the degree of expressiveness of authority motivation and corresponding behaviour manifestations we used the following methods:

1. *Schwartz’s Method for Studying the Values of a Person* (Karandashev 2004) allows to reveal representation of the category "power" in the value field of respondents. Method consists of two parts (57 and 40 paragraph) that measure 10 basic values on two levels of existence: accepted by a person normative life principles and individual traits and trends of behaviour. Subscale of method is quantitative evaluation of basic universal values (leading motivational types): conformity, traditions, kindness, universality, independence, stimulation, hedonism, achievements, power and security.
2. *Method “Career anchors” by E.Scein* (Chiker 2004) allows determining how authority motivation is fulfilled in professional activity. Method has 41 questions with scale of answers from 1 to 10 points; as a result of data processing we gain correlation of eight main career focuses of a person: professional competence, organisational competence or management, autonomy, stability (work and place of residence), ministry, challenge, entrepreneurship, integration of lifestyles.
3. *Leary interpersonal relationship test* (Sobchik 2008) is 128 laconic characteristics, according to which a respondent evaluates its actual “self”. It determines eight types of behaviour in interpersonal relations: authority/domination, independence, aggression, distrust, controllability, dependence, cooperation, altruism.
4. For psychological diagnostics of personality properties, which, in our view, should be related to influence of phenomenon of authority, we choose method *“Subject-object focuses in life situation” by O.Yu.Korzhova*. The method proposes 21 couples of statements of which a respondent chose corresponding to his or her self-image. Results are allocated by scales – indicators of subjective involvement of a human in life activity: transsituative diffusion, locus of control, learning the world and mobility. The general indicators of subject-object focuses demonstrate an ability of human to realise own internal activity. Subject focus represents persons with active life position, inclined to rebuild the situation for them, to act. They are characterised by psychological flexibility, the internal control locus, reflexive skills, the width of the time perspective and the feeling of "joyful fullness of life." Accordingly, object focus represents humans with passive life activity, inclined to bow to the fate (Korzhova 2006).

The research was of searching, exploratory nature; our main focus of interpretation was to explain pattern of data allocation in different groups. Multiple comparison of four independent groups of quantitative data we conducted using One-way Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) and the package SPSS 17.00. It is worth noting that critical level of values – 0.0085 – in multiple comparison differs from usual for psychology indicator р ≤ 0.05 (Grzhibovsky 2008).

**Results and Discussion**

In the organisation of the research we proceeded from the considerations that the features of the internal power position and power motives manifest themselves at the behavioural level in certain settings and ways of thinking and decisions, specific acts in power influence. Among factors that influence forming of authority position and, accordingly, style of managing activity of a leader, we select:

* Socially conditioned models that corresponds to social and cultural, professional and implicit ideas of a certain “norm” of leadership;
* Moral and value focuses, etalons of microenvironment, a general life situation (starting from parents’ influence on child);
* Features of organisational culture, level of professional and spiritual development of higher management, character of activity, managing tasks;
* Professional and personal characteristics of subordinate employees (since power-subordinate relation is the one system in which both parties are interdependent);
* The degree of authorities, real and potential levers of influence;
* The level of professional and personal development of personality, leading focus, life challenges and time perspectives, stress managements, ability to take responsibility, etc.

In its turn, managing as a leading activity of grownup is a powerful factor of personality development. In this it is difficult to select preconditions and consequences: almost certainly a personality with certain potentials chooses (sometimes unknowingly) authority as an attractive position of professional activity and then fully shows him/her in this.

*Schwartz’s Method* covers wide spectre of motivational goals that are present as basic, universality values in most cultures of the world. Values of a personality are calculated on two levels: both normative ideals and individual priorities. The first level is stable, it reflects human representations of how to act, thus defining the living principles of behaviour. The second level depends on the external environment, group pressure and correlates with specific actions and social behaviour of a human. Respondents evaluate proposed lists of instrumental and terminal values and corresponding descriptions of behaviour characteristics. Evaluations are allocated by ten scales of method (types of basic values). Then, according to the average score, for each type of values, a rank ratio is established. Each type is assigned with rank from 1 to 10 (rank from 1 to 3 characterises high significance of value type for a respondent; rank from 7 to 10 demonstrates low significance of corresponding values). We conducted the same procedure, but according to average tendencies in a group (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Average and rank positions of basic values (Schwartz’s Method) in the respondent group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Conformity | Traditions | Kindness | Universality | Independence | Stimulation | Hedonism | Achievements | Authority | Safety |
|  | Values at the level of normative ideals | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Students of management specialties (N = 105) | 4  3.59 | 10  2.04 | **2**  4.26 | 8  2.49 | **3**  3.97 | 9  2.35 | **1**  4.58 | 6  3.08 | 7  2.95 | 5  3.21 |
| 2. Professors (N = 34) | 6  4.09 | 8.5  3.43 | **1.5**  4.62 | 7  3.79 | **1.5**  4.61 | 10  2.44 | 8.5  3.44 | 4  4.5 | 5  4.26 | **3**  4.53 |
| 3. Heads of departments, junior executives (N = 18) | 5.5  3.95 | 10  2.96 | **1.5**  5.24 | 7  3.6 | 4  4.92 | 8  3.32 | 9  3.01 | **1.5**  5.25 | 5.5  3.96 | **3**  5.04 |
| 4. Senior executives, administration of the higher education institution (N = 15) | 6  4.45 | 10  3.03 | 4  5.17 | 7  4.41 | **1**  5.63 | 9  3.55 | 8  3.77 | **2**  5.54 | 5  4.73 | **3**  5.5 |
| *Calculated value F* | *2.17* | *0.96* | *0.78* | *14.4* | *8.95* | *1.56* | *0.67* | *6.58* | *6.16* | *9.51* |
| *Level of significance (Sig.)* | *0.011* | *0.098* | *0.195* | ***0.000*** | ***0.000*** | *0.055* | *0.380* | ***0.001*** | ***0.002*** | ***0.000*** |
|  | Values at the level of behavioural priorities | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Students of management specialties (N = 105) | 7  1.65 | 10  0.45 | **3**  2.12 | 8  1.18 | **1.5**  2.48 | 6  1.73 | **1.5**  2.47 | 4  1.95 | 9  0.86 | 5  1.88 |
| 2. Professors (N = 34) | **3**  2.08 | 8  0.58 | 4.5  1.84 | 7  1.11 | **1**  2.5 | 6.5  1.25 | 7  0.97 | 4.5  1.83 | 6.5  1.22 | **2**  2.2 |
| 3. Heads of departments, junior executives (N = 18) | 7  1.75 | 10  1.02 | **3**  2.45 | 8.5  1.46 | **1.5**  2.75 | 8.5  1.46 | 6  1.86 | 4  2.2 | 5  2.07 | **1.5**  2.76 |
| 4. Senior executives, administration of the higher education institution (N = 15) | 8  1.45 | 10  0.83 | 5.5  2.15 | 5.5  2.15 | **1**  3.16 | 9  1.16 | 7  2.05 | **2.5**  2.83 | 4  2.22 | **2.5**  2.86 |
| *Calculated value F* | *0.56* | *1.99* | *0.44* | *1.67* | *0.47* | *0.95* | *6.16* | *3.25* | *7.45* | *0.61* |
| *Level of significance (Sig.)* | *0.648* | *0.073* | *0.715* | *0.195* | *0.701* | *0.091* | ***0.001*** | *0.034* | ***0.000*** | *0.594* |

Note: in the data of comparison analysis, indicators, which prove existence of significant difference between four groups, is highlighted in bold.

We see that the overall structure of value focus is quite different in different research groups. At the level of guiding life principle hedonistic-benevolent focus of students is gradually changing to autonomy-competent focus of senior executives, it is interesting that at the level of behavioural manifestations structure of value is a little bit different from analogical results of the first part of the method: as if structure of value “levels off” – independence is the leading positions in all groups; traditions remain in the last positions.

In addition, table 1 demonstrated that with increasing of authority the general significance of values increases (Schwartz called this phenomenon “biases of answers) – a respondent choose the highest grades in answers that, in our view, demonstrate a bright motivation, which, in its turn, is internal resource of activity and achievement.

Data of variance analysis ANOVA shows that selected groups significantly differs by expressiveness of value ideals: universality, independence, achievements, authority, safety. However, at the level of individual behaviour manifestations, reliable differences are revealed only regarding value types “hedonism” and “authority”.

Among these diagnostic data we are the most interested in *Self-Enhancement* that includes value types “Power” and “Achievement”. The first parameter reflects striving for social status or prestige, control of resources, domination of people and resources (authority, wealth, social power, society image, society recognition); the second – striving for personal success through competency according to generally accepted social standards (that leads to public endorsement). Therefore, both values of authority and values and achievements focuse on social respect, but values of achievement emphasise active manifestation of competency in direct interaction, while motivation of authority emphasises achievements or dominant position within specific social system (Karandashev 2004). In theory of dynamic relations, universality and benevolence confront these base motivations (Schwartz 1992).

Comparison of average indicators and ranks of values of groups has showed that at the level of normative ideals values of achievement are leading for respondents who have regulated power position (heads of departments and administration of higher educational institutions). At the level of real social behaviour, they dominate only for senior executives. Therefore, this type of motivation can be considered as an incentive power to climb the career ladder in the organisation.

By itself authority is not significant in any respondent group (for students-managers this category generally occupies the last positions of the rating of values). However, it is interesting that the executives of different levels who use authority every day to achieve professional goals do not consider it as a key value.

Data by **method “Career anchors” by Scein** allowed clarifying results and finding out how authority dispositions manifests in motives of professional activity. Respondents evaluate importance of proposed statements on a scale of one to ten (from “it is not important at all” – 0 to “exceptionally important” – 10). After processing scale indicators with the key, it is weighted average evaluation of career guidance. Results of diagnostics reflect settings, interests and other socially conditioned incentives for activities characteristic of respondents depending on the level of authority (Table 2).

As shown in table 2, for students – future managers – leading focuses are stable job, working and achievement of organisational competency. Teachers fulfil themselves in profession, guided mainly by the motives of working: the desire to benefit people and society, while observing the positive results of their work. Though they everyday influence on students in an educational process, authority as career focus is in the last place. The most significant motivation in this group is integration of life styles – harmonic combination of work and personal life. Heads of departments have the similar structure of dominant professional motives. The overwhelming majority of "career anchors” of senior executives have a very high degree of expressiveness. We observed similar patterns in analysis of base values by Schwartz method. This confirms our conclusions – senior executives a relatively bigger load of value fields, they are engaged in life and success. Groups significantly differ by career focuses: professional and organisational competency, autonomy, challenge, stable place of residence (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Average significance of career focus (Scein method) in groups and results of variance analysis ANOVA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Professional competency | Management | Autonomy | Stability of a job | Stability of place of residence | Working | Challenge | Integration of lifestyles | Entrepreneurship |
| 1. Students of “Management” specialty (N = 105) | 5.48 | 7.14 | 6.84 | 7.88 | 4.56 | 7.35 | 6.08 | 7.07 | 6.55 |
| 2. Professors (N = 34) | 7.28 | 4.86 | 5.61 | 6.15 | 6.12 | 8.07 | 5.04 | 8.66 | 6.56 |
| 3. Heads of department  (N = 18) | 5.82 | 6.16 | 6.25 | 7.30 | 5.07 | 8.41 | 4.12 | 8.25 | 6.63 |
| 4. Senior executives (N = 15) | 8.21 | 8.12 | 8.17 | 5.33 | 7.15 | 8.25 | 6.85 | 8.05 | 7.54 |
| *Calculated value F* | *25.5* | *28.4* | *6.06* | *2.77* | *4.23* | *0.57* | *7.22* | *1.12* | *1.28* |
| *Level of significance (Sig.)* | ***0.000*** | ***0.000*** | ***0.001*** | *0.043* | ***0.007*** | *0.634* | ***0.000*** | *0.104* | *0.118* |

Results of subscale “Management” reflects focus of a personality on an integration of efforts of other people, full responsibility for final result and connection of various functions of the organisation. According to average indicators of table 2, we see that this career focus is the most strongly manifested by students (most probably as a component of motivation of professional choice) and senior executives. Thus, for these categories the key values and motives are opportunities for leadership, job growth, high income, contribution to organisation success. They find pleasure in managing people, projects, work processes. For them power has significance as awareness of the fact that key decisions depend on them. If for students this focus is probably idealistic, detached from real life and professional experience, for the group of executives this is strong career motivator.

We would like to pay attention to the fact that senior executives demonstrate the highest degree of autonomy, that it, focus on freedom from organisation rules and limitations. This result, at first sight, seems paradoxical, but it is easy to explain by mentioning that executives in domestic tradition of managing act as autocratic persona in space subordinate to them. Senior positions give them an opportunity to “allow themselves” something that is not entitled by regular employees or junior executives. Consequently, in this case authority is the factor that frees a person from social norms and rules (we will discuss this matter again in Results and Discussion).

Style of interpersonal relations according to **Leary interpersonal relationship test** is different in groups by all parameters (Table 3). Average indicators of test results concerning manifestations of interpersonal domination gradually increase according to the level of authority in the comparable groups. However, in this the overall structure of interaction changes too. In parallel the indicators of benevolence of professors and executives (group 2, 3 and 4) increase. This characterises manifestations of domination in relation as such that give a human an opportunity to achieve significant prosocial goals.

**Table 3.** Average values of interpersonal characteristics (Leary test) in groups and results of variance analysis ANOVA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | autocratic | selfish | aggressive | distrustful | docile | dependent | friendly | affectionate |
| 1. Students of management specialties (N = 105) | 4.12 | 3.08 | 5.64 | 3.32 | 6.12 | 6.81 | 7.15 | 5.65 |
| 2. Professors (N = 34) | 441 | 3.45 | 4.04 | 3.45 | 5.68 | 5.17 | 7.01 | 4.63 |
| 3. Heads of department  (N = 18) | 8.77 | 4.82 | 5.56 | 4.12 | 6.42 | 5.58 | 8.30 | 3.96 |
| 4. Senior executives (N = 15) | 9.80 | 9.56 | 7.81 | 6.23 | 9.85 | 7.12 | 9.24 | 9.45 |
| *Calculated value F* | *22.5* | *19.7* | *9.15* | *11.5* | *8.74* | *4.12* | *4.10* | *12.3* |
| *Level of significance (Sig.)* | ***0.000*** | ***0.000*** | ***0.000*** | ***0.000*** | ***0.000*** | ***0.008*** | ***0.008*** | ***0.000*** |

Increase of average indicators by vector of domination proves clear (and fulfilled) striving of executives for leadership in communication. Simultaneous increase of results by vector “friendly” reflects desire to cooperate for a shared goal.

The following measurement concerns features of life attitude of a person. It was conducted using *“Subject-object focuses in life situation” by O.Yu.Korzhova.* None of the scales describing the manifestations of subjectivity in life situations have any meaningful differences in the groups. Consequently, power impacts the least on the characteristics of a life position (Table 4).

**Table 4.** Average values of subject-object focus of groups and results of variance analysis ANOVA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Overall indicator of subject-object focuses | Transsituative diffusion | Transsituative locus of control | Transsituative learning the world | Transsituative mobility | Transsituative creation |
| 1. Students of “Management” speciality (N = 105) | 9.74 | 3.49 | 3.36 | 2.45 | 2.51 | 6.32 |
| 2. Professors (N = 34) | 9.58 | 3.24 | 3.62 | 2.22 | 2.01 | 5.13 |
| 3. Heads of department  (N = 18) | 9.54 | 3.11 | 3.48 | 2.38 | 2.41 | 6.05 |
| 4. Senior executives (N = 15) | 9.41 | 2.75 | 3.50 | 2.33 | 2.83 | 6.36 |
| *Calculated value F3, 168* | *0.099* | *1.904* | *0.295* | *0.286* | *1.475* | *3.794* |
| *Level of significance (Sig.)* | *0.960* | *0.131* | *0.829* | *0.835* | *0.222* | *0.011* |

Thoughts of Vasiutynskiy regarding interrelation of authority and freedom are useful in processing obtained data. From the one side, it is obvious that the bigger an amount and intensity of authority the higher a degree of discretion and freedom of actions of a person. At the same time, big authority almost certainly increases a number of duties that, in its turn, limit discretion. From the other side, compensation of authority failure, even if it is successful, causes a feeling of a certain imperfection, so this person cannot feel free. In such way, subject of authority and subjects of freedom do not have many common characteristics. Another important pattern is that to gain a power over a place a person must have power over herself/himself – to obey certain goals and conditions in different forms of self-regulation. Therefore, freedom transforms into non-freedom. Monopolization of both external and internal authorities creates the inevitable restriction of person freedom. On the contrary, real psychological freedom in power-subordinate relations may be in presence of a certain alienation of the individual, more or less distinctly disconnected attitude to the relationship of ownership. Rejection of authority narrows a range of subjective manifestations in social environment that encourage a person to become an object of subordination or to apply subjective capabilities to himself/herself (Vasiutynskiy 2005). Also, it is worth remembering that moral norms and social values are the integral characteristic of authority. It is known that “ways of dominating” depends on the cultural environment, they have the cultural basis as traditions, norms, stereotypes of behaviour (Slobodianiuk 2000). These thoughts clarify and explain differences between value and career focuses in groups.

**Conclusion**

In such way, after comparing results of personal diagnostics of four groups with different level of authority, we have revealed that the most significant differences concern manifestations of behaviour in interpersonal relations (interconnected measures of domination and kindness). Individual intergroup differences concern structure of career needs and value focuses of respondents (in general, expressiveness of authority motivation is the reliable indicator of power position, but it is often masked by the category of achievements. Even less these differences manifest when a person implemented declared values in real social behaviour. At the level of involvement and activity of implementation in life, authority position does not demonstrate significant impact.

Features of the manifestation of the psychological phenomenon of power in groups of persons whose professional activity is directly related to the influence on other people were explained. In this, respondents have different positions in managing structure of one branched organisation. Obtained results allow concluding that authority position based on completely internal incentives and implemented in activity is most clearly manifested in the external behaviour. In the sphere of interpersonal relations, peculiar features and properties that distinguish an authority person from a subordinate or disconnected from authority person are formed.
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