

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
СУМСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ
ТА СОЦІАЛЬНИХ КОМУНІКАЦІЙ**



СОЦІАЛЬНО-ГУМАНІТАРНІ АСПЕКТИ РОЗВИТКУ СУЧАСНОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА

**МАТЕРІАЛИ V ВСЕУКРАЇНСЬКОЇ НАУКОВОЇ КОНФЕРЕНЦІЇ СТУДЕНТІВ,
АСПРАНТІВ, ВИКЛАДАЧІВ ТА СПІВРОБІТНИКІВ**

(Суми, 20-21 квітня 2017 року)

**Суми
2017**

It is important to explore this ways in details.

When enterprises include some costs for charity in the price, it is impractical to increase the price because of the high level of price competition. That is why, in fact, companies use for this purpose part of their profits. In this case they can get some benefits by raising the volume of sales through attracting the attention of socially responsible citizens.

The results of modern marketing research show that there is some constant target audience with positive reaction to charitable programs.

They react to slogans like “Buy this product and five percent of the cost will be transferred to the fund on the protection of children with cancer”. Such actions have a short-term character, and they are similar to measures of promoting sales.

On the other hand, commodity producers, who have significant market share, can provide permanent charitable programs to support beneficiaries (pensioners, disabled people, etc.). For example, they offer programs with an increased level of discounts, produce/sell special/specific products. These programs are usually carried out at the expense of the profit, but they are long-term. Normally, program conditions are defined for each fiscal year. Economic interests of commodity producers in such programs are to expand the target audience, increase the number of customers and attract attention to their socially responsible public activities.

Thus, realizing charitable programs through pricing mechanisms is cost-effective, commercially advisable and socially important for modern companies.

MENTAL CAUSATION PROBLEM SOLUTIONS

Ignatenko Dmytro – *Sumy State University, group PhD-63*

Podolkova S. V. – *E.L. Supervisor*

Mental causation is the cause and effect relationship of consciousness and the physical world, in particular, the influence of human consciousness on his/her behavior. In everyday life and scientific practice, the interaction between consciousness and the physical world is taken for granted. The influence of mental states and processes on human behavior is recognized as an established fact in everyday psychology, in scientific psychology, and in the philosophy of psychology. At the same time, in the modern philosophy of mind and cognitive science, the problem of mental causation is the subject of extensive discussions. This is due to the

complexity of explaining the interaction of non-material consciousness and matter in the theoretical framework set by the Cartesianism. Although the overwhelming majority of modern philosophers and scholars reject Cartesian substantive dualism, many of them are still committed to the Cartesian idea of a fundamental difference between the mental and the physical. The main difficulty in solving the problem of mental causation is how to reconcile the principle of the causal closure of the physical world in a consistent manner and the irreducibility of mental properties to physical properties. Mental causation is one of the most important components of the mind-body problem and includes several aspects, including: the connection between consciousness and body; freedom of will; moral responsibility; the problem of causal pairing; law of energy conservation; the causal isolation of the physical world and the exclusion of overdetermination.

Questions related to mental causation are considered in some ancient texts, for example, in the treatise of Plato «The Phaedo» and Aristotle's treatise «On the Soul». However, the actual problem of mental causation is much younger than many other important philosophical problems. This is due to the fact that in ancient and medieval philosophy neither the principle of the causal closure of the physical world nor the principle of conservation of energy were known. The formulation of the problem of mental causation is associated with the onset of physico-mechanical thinking, which has become widespread in European philosophy, primarily thanks to the works of Rene Descartes. He put forward the idea of the existence of two separate substances – the thinking (*res cogitans*) and extended (*res extensa*). This idea, based on the traditional Christian concept of the soul, which continues to exist after the death of the body, was called «substantial dualism». The theory advanced by Descartes was intended to solve a number of philosophical puzzles related to the perception of inner experiences and the external world, and did not include the consideration of psychophysical causality. However, soon after the creation of this theory, Descartes encountered the need to solve the problem of the influence of a thinking substance on an extended substance.

Max Velmans indicates four possible variants of causality involving consciousness and body: 1) the influence of the physical cause on the physical effect. This type of causality is universally recognized in conventional medicine, which uses physical intervention to eliminate physiological disturbances; 2) the influence of the physical cause on the psychological consequence. This type of causality is universally recognized

in psychiatry and serves as the basis for the use of psychoactive drugs, neurosurgical methods, etc.; 3) the influence of the psychic cause on the psychological consequence. This type of causality is universally recognized in many types of psychotherapy, including hypnosis; 4) the influence of the psychic cause on the physical consequence. This type of causality is the theoretical basis of psychosomatic medicine, based on the principle of psychogenesis.

There are also four possible philosophical approaches to solving the problem of interaction between consciousness and body: 1) reductionism is a point of view that identifies consciousness and body; 2) parallelism is a point of view according to which consciousness and body do not exert any influence on each other, while psychic causes give rise only to mental effects, and physical causes produce only physical effects; 3) epiphenomenalism is the point of view according to which the body has an effect on consciousness, but itself does not experience any influences from the side of consciousness; 4) interactionism is a point of view according to which consciousness and body exert influence on each other. Of these four approaches, reductionism, parallelism and epiphenomenalism do not presuppose the existence of psychic causality. In fact, they do not enjoy significant support among modern philosophers of consciousness and scientists. Currently, the overwhelming majority of psychologists are supporters of the interactionist approach, although among the empirical researchers of consciousness there is a very small but gradually growing number of supporters of epiphenomenalism. In the modern philosophy of consciousness, the dominant direction is non-reductive physicalism, which, like interactivity, requires the solution of the problem of mental causation.

Currently, neuroscience and philosophy have come to a standstill in considering the relationship between mental and physical, but for various reasons. Philosophy uses as logical tools logical arguments, thought experiments and conviction, which do not allow to find objective solutions of the mental causation problem. Neuroscience monitors the processes of information processing at the level of neural circuits and using methods that are inadequate for deciphering these processes, since they can not simultaneously measure the number of thousands of neurons belonging to the same chain. In this regard, Peter Ulrik Tse expressed the opinion that the solution of the problem of mental causation can be found by combining the efforts of philosophers and neuroscientists, during which philosophers will begin to formulate falsified predictions, and neuroscientists will begin

to study philosophical literature and conduct experiments aimed at solving profound philosophical questions.

Literature

1. Barry Loewer. *Mental Causation* // *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Volume 6) / General editor: Edward Craig. — London: Routledge, 1998. — P. 307-311. — 894 p.
2. Max Velmans. *Understanding Consciousness*. — Second edition. — London: Routledge/Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis, 2009. — 408 p.
3. Peter Ulric Tse. *The Neural Basis of Free Will: Criterial Causation*. — MIT Press, 2013. — 472 p.

FORMATION OF SERVICE SPHERE COMMUNICATION POLICY

Zhurba T. V. – *Sumy State University, group PhD-63*
Podolkova S. V. – *E.L. Supervisor*

The considerable growth rates of service sphere and competition at the market predetermine the necessity of development and introduction of effective communication policy.

Basic directions of activity, which help to realize communication policy in the working process of any management subject, are marketing (in its various variants), stimulating measures and personal (private) communications.

The base of service sphere communication policy is the formation of public opinion, determining main direction in public relations (PR).

The formation of public opinion is an important factor in the process of actions coordination within the limits of communication policy.

Marketing policy in the field of communications reckons for the creation of certain communication model.

The communication model in the field of services is characterized by 3 levels:

- 1st level: external communications;
- 2nd level: internal communications;
- 3d level: interactive communications.

External communications create a favorable informative environment for management subject, send informative streams to the