Analysis Of Psychological Influence Forms In Management Of Personality

Murodil Radjabov
Lecturer, Fergana State University, Fergana City, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The owner of both the communication process and the group process - the subject and the object - is actually an individual, a concrete personality. That is why social psychology also studies the problem of personality, considering it from the point of view of being a participant and active performer of these various social processes. When people interact with each other, one of their main goals is to influence each other, that is, to convince each other, motivate, change attitudes and make a good impression. Psychological influence is the ability to influence the thoughts, feelings and behavior of people in various ways.

In this article, from a psychological point of view, methods of psychological influence in managing an individual are studied.

KEYWORDS

Personality, psychology of management, community, culture of communication, manipulation, interpersonal relations, diagnostics.

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of its appearance, humanity continues to feel the need for communication. We meet dozens, hundreds of people every day, every now and then;

from our loved ones to our neighbors - our neighbors, our teammates, our partners, our domestic workers, our leaders and so on - and so on. Thanks to our communicativeness, mutual understanding and full adherence to the norms of human behavior, we express ourselves in various fields of activity.

The main reason why a person is called a product of social relations is that he is always in the circle of people, in the sphere of interaction with them. This indicates that communication is one of the most leading and influential human activities.

Human relations are the processes of interaction in which interpersonal relationships are formed and manifested. Such a process involves the exchange of thoughts, feelings, worries and joys that initially occur between people.

MAIN PART

We have an emotional, verbal, non-verbal impact on our interlocutor, while the culture of interaction plays a key role in influencing a person. There are types of interactions when influencing a person, which are subdivided into: direct or indirect communication, general communication, interpersonal communication, imperative communication (lat. Imperativus [1] - main), manipulative communication. According to V.V. Dementieva, indirect communication is "a complex communication in which the understanding of the spoken word includes meanings that are not in the sentence, and requires additional efforts of interpretation by the addressee" (Dementyev 2001: 3). This can be seen in the Uzbek proverb "I tell you, my daughter, and you listen to me, my daughter-in-law." Manipulation is misleading, not violent. The first and foremost condition for

successful manipulation is that in most cases the interlocutor is advised to look at various messages with suspicion, without explaining the reasons [2]. An important condition for successful manipulation is the elimination of psychological defense, which is based on a person's ability to critically perceive information [3]. Sovereignty based on "open, exposed, coercive force - oppression through coercion, coercion through domination, strict discipline through coercive coercion" is the imperative side of manipulation [4].

The desire to manipulate a person was present in the interactions of any member of society. To this day, manipulation remains a recognized tool (and sometimes a basic condition) for success in a particular activity. Acquaintance with the basic techniques of manipulation and their use in a conversation is the key to victory over the interlocutor. The role of the non-verbal form of communication in everyday interactions has been studied for many years (Gorelov, 2003; Kreidlin, 2002). Non-verbal manipulations include verbal sounds (coughing, wheezing, various noises, sometimes silence, etc.), Mimicry (glance, "gagging with eyes", "expression" of the eyebrows, mouth, etc.), Gestures, body actions etc. In the studied literature, it can often be said that the manipulative effect is built on aggressive desires, and this is largely condemned.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Aim of the study. To study the influence on the addressee through the manipulative method of psychological influence in managing a person.

OBJECT OF STUDY

Diagnostics of methods of psychological influence in the management of personality in interpersonal relationships. The survey involved 374 respondents. They have incomplete higher education, they are all socially secured students, striving to take their place in life.

Based on the purpose of our research, we have identified the place of manipulation as one of the methods of psychological influence on personality control, i.e. as a manipulator, which of the eight factors of the method of diagnostics of "Interpersonal relations" T. Leary were compared using a survey to determine the possibility of influencing the addressees and the correlation of this process was carried out using the Bass-Dark study [6] "Aggressive Situations".

The results of the method of T. Leary diagnostics of "Interpersonal relations" were analyzed mathematically and statistically and are reduced to the state shown in table 1 below.

The results obtained by the factors of the method "Diagnostics of interpersonal relations" T. Leary.

Table 1

№	Factors of the method of diagnostics "Interpersonal relations" T. Leary.	Number of respondents	Respondents per %
1.	AP - domination, autocracy	77	20,58
2.	BS - extreme arrogance, competitiveness	69	18,44
3.	DE - aggressive, enthusiastic	82	21,92
4.	FG - critical, skeptical	43	11,49
5.	HI - humility, humiliation	25	6,68
6.	JK - Conformity (Convenience), Hyperconformity (Very Convenient)	21	5,61
7.	LM - collaboration (communication), hyperafilia	25	6,68
8.	NO - hyper protection, responsibility (sense of responsibility)	32	8,6
Total		374	100

In order to correlate the results of T. Leary's method of diagnosing "interpersonal

relationships", we conducted a survey of Bass-Dark to identify "Aggressive situations". According to him, the obtained results were analyzed mathematically and statistically and brought to the status of Table 2 below.

Results for the definition of "Aggressive situations" Bass-Dark

table 2

№	Types of "aggressive situations" according to Bass-Dark	Number of respondents	Respondents per %
1.	Physical aggression (assault)	77	20,59
2.	Self-related aggression	41	10,96
3.	Tendency to anger (anger, resentment)	83	22,19
4.	Negativity	34	9,1
5.	Sadness	31	8,28
6.	Dubiousness	31	8,28
7.	Verbal aggression	44	11,8
8.	Pain of conscience, feelings of guilt	33	8,8
	Total:	**374**	**100 %**

In the process of psychological control of a person with manipulative influence on the addressee, 21.92% of the respondents were aggressive, accusing, quick and indecisive, aggressive, downright critical. According to the Bass Dark survey, the tendency to anger was 22.19%, while respondents reported that they differed from other respondents in such traits as greater stability in communication, a willingness to show anger with a small change in anger. One of the experts in the theory of personality psychology, Theodore Millon, claims that aggressive people are active and independent in interaction with the world around them. In his opinion, such people are ready not to become dependent on others, actively believing that their needs will be met. The author also believes that there are two types of active and independent people: they can adequately adapt their behavior to the rules existing in society; the latter is subject to internal inconsistencies in accordance with the requirements set out in the law [7].

According to T. Leary, the second factor was excessive arrogance, rivalry, arrogance, arrogance, pride. Self-confident, independent, insecure respondents made up 18.44%. Physical aggression (attack) - the result obtained for the use of another physical force was 20.59%. These respondents stated that they cannot extinguish their desire to harm others in time, cannot leave any situation unanswered, and cannot suppress their anger.

Analyzing the respondents' answers to domination, autocracy, ownership, domination, team leadership, stupidity, control, willingness to give advice, people who liked to teach accounted for 20.58%. 11.49% of respondents approved attempts to control the addressee by shouting at the addressee, swearing, hitting the table with a fist, pressure, etc. psychological state (fear, frustration, etc.) of the object through speech. In this case, the appearance of gestures should be associated with non-verbal body movements. Each culture of the world has its own system of gestures (see Jelvis 1997; Sternin 2001), aggressive, threatening, sarcastic, etc., sometimes silence (threatening, sarcastic, protest, etc.), can also be attributed to non-verbal means of expressing aggression.

Criticism, skepticism make up 11.49% of our respondents who use the method of psychological management of a person with skeptical behavior, encouraging complaining, insecure, suspicious, unfriendly actions of others and having a transactional attitude. Negativity was the norm for anti-management behavior; 9.1% of the respondents have this property.

Other factors by T. Leary were hyperprotection, responsibility 8.6%, humility, humiliation and cooperation 6.68%, conformity and hyperconformity 5.61%. The remaining factors on Bass Dark are 8.28% of respondents who were skeptical, complained about their fate and suffered from remorse.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, we can say that in manipulative influences on the personality, in many cases, people use the traits of domination, autocracy, and forced self-expression. In some cases, when a person has some advantage over a certain adversary, they are said to have a strong trait (strong expert, dominant character, spiritual trigger). Conversely, it is believed that a person with certain disabilities has weakness and is unstable to certain emotional or psychological influences. These include adversariality, the ability to use physical force when necessary to protect their rights. It's sad that people tend to get angry. The obvious manipulative effect is associated with such vices as yelling at the addressee, swearing, switching to slapping the table and thus expressing one's opinion, such as boasting, arrogance, pride. Sometimes self-esteem is justified by the fact that there is a tendency towards self-knowledge, if the person is not asked to complete the task assigned to him. But we all know that religious sects and some extremist groups very skillfully use people with self-blame and a sense of guilt for their own ends. Violation of equality of freedom and responsibility lies in the fact that a one-sided victory is on the side of the manipulator [8].

Based on the above, we give the following recommendations for determining the manipulative actions of the manipulator during the interview.

- Break the spatial psychological field, try to communicate, establish communication;

- Do not roll your eyes so as not to blink and not notice, observe, look at events, objects, etc. behind you;
- Try to artificially extend the time for making short-term decisions and thereby set a condition;
- Is very interested in your personal life and spends a lot of time getting to know you (family members, your life, hobbies, health, relationships, thoughts about events, etc.).

REFERENCES

1. Dictionary of foreign words. - 13th ed., Stereotype. Moscow, Publishing House "Russian language", 1979, with changes, 189 p.

2. Kara-Murza S.G. Manipulation of consciousness, Moscow: "Algorithm", 2000, 15 p.

3. Zelinsky S.A. Analysis of Mass Manipulations in Russia. Analysis of the use of manipulative methods of mass control in the study of the destructiveness of the modern era on the example of Russia. Psychoanalytic approach: SCYTHIA; St. Petersburg; 2008 84 p.

4. Kara-Murza S.G. Consciousness manipulation. - Moscow: Publishing house: Eksmo, 2005 .- 43 p.

5. Golovey L.A., Ribalko E.F., Workshop on developmental psychology, St. Petersburg, "Rech", 2002, 683 p.

6. Golovey L.A., Ribalko E.F., "Workshop on developmental psychology" ed., St. Petersburg, "Rech", 2002, 332 p.

7. Millon T. Disorders of Personality, Wiley-Interscience, 1981 -182 p.

8. Dotsenko E.L. Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection. - Moscow: CheRo, Moscow State University Publishing House, 1997. - 146 p.

9. Karimov V., Akramova F. Psychology. Textbook. Tashkent, 2005.

10. Koziev E.G. Psychology of communication. Tashkent, 2001.

11. Dotsenko E.L. Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection. - Moscow: CheRo, Moscow State University Publishing House, 1997 .-344 p.

12. Zhelvis V.I. Battlefield. Profanity as a social problem. Moscow, 1997.

13. Kara-Murza S. Manipulation of consciousness. - Moscow: "Algorithm", 2000, 551 p.

14. Kreidlin G.E. Non-verbal semiotics. Moscow, 2002.

15. Sternin I.A. Introduction to speech impact. Voronezh, 2001.

16. Dementyev V.V. Fundamentals of the theory of indirect communication: Author's abstract. dis. ... doct. philol. sciences. Saratov, 2001.

17. Каримов, У. У. (2017). РОЛЬ СРЕДСТВ МАССОВОЙ ИНФОРМАЦИИ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ. In Перспективные информационные технологии (ПИТ 2017) (pp. 1189-1192).

18. Каримов, У., & Каримова, Г. (2018). ГЕОПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ КОНКУРЕНЦИЯ В ИНФОРМАЦИОННОМ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ. In Перспективные информационные технологии (ПИТ 2018) (pp. 1368-1372).

19. Каримов, У., Хакимова, Д., & Тулкинов, З. (2018). ЗАДАЧИ ПОСТРОЕНИЯ ГРАЖДАНСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА. Теория и практика современной науки, (10), 193-195.

20. Каримов, У. (2017). ИНФОКОМТЕХНОЛОГИИ (ИКТ) ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ДУХОВНЫХ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИК ЛИЧНОСТИ. In Перспективные информационные технологии (ПИТ 2017) (pp. 1160-1163).

21. Abdurakhmonova, M. M., ugli Mirzayev, M. A., Karimov, U. U., & Karimova, G. Y. (2021). Information Culture And Ethical Education In The Globalization Century. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 3(03), 384-388.

22. Каримова, Г. Й. (2018). РОЛЬ КОНСТИТУЦИИ В ПОСТРОЕНИИ ПРАВОВОГО ГОСУДАРСТВА И ГРАЖДАНСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА. Теория и практика современной науки, (2), 161-163.

23. Rajabov, M. J., & Absalamov, E. U. (2020). NLP IN ADVERTISING AND PRINCIPLES OF ITS APPLICATION. In Психологическое здоровье населения как важный фактор обеспечения процветания общества (pp. 355-357).

24. Rajabov, M. J. (2020). MANIPULATION AS PROCESS DECISION MAKING IN ADVERTISING. In Психологическое здоровье населения как важный фактор обеспечения процветания общества (pp. 358-360).

25. Rajabov, M. J., & Rajabova, X. X. (2019). Self-consciousness of students in social and psychological mechanisms. Theoretical & Applied Science, (12), 176-179.

26. Rajabov, M. J. (2020). FACTORS OF MANIPULATIVE EFFECTIVENESS. In Психологическое здоровье населения как важный фактор обеспечения процветания общества (pp. 151-154).

27. Rajabov, M. J., & Sotvoldiev, J. M. (2020). INFORMATION-PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF ADVERTISING AND BUYER MOTIVATION. In Психологическое здоровье населения как важный фактор обеспечения процветания общества (pp. 62-64).