TÍTULO: La dialogicalidad en la relación con otros como recurso de posicionamiento social de la personalidad.

AUTORES:

1. Dra. Elena Starovoytenko.

2. Máster. Anastasia Isaeva.

3. Máster. Valeriya Zapekina.

RESUMEN: El artículo se dirige a la investigación del problema de identificar las condiciones psicológicas del posicionamiento social efectivo de la personalidad. El objeto de la investigación empírica es la relación "Yo - el Otro amado", lo cual tiene un alto potencial para alcanzar la dialogicalidad. Se desarrolló y verificó empíricamente un nuevo modelo teórico de representación dialógica y reflexiva de la relación de la personalidad con el Otro. El estudio empírico confirmó la hipótesis sobre la posibilidad de alcanzar una relación dialógica "Yo - Otro" sobre la base de la implementación y reflexión de sus cuatro "dimensiones".

PALABRAS CLAVES: dialogicalidad, posicionamiento social efectivo de la personalidad, el Otro significativo, La relación "Yo – Otro", la relación dialógica, recursos de eficiencia social de la personalidad.

TITLE: Dialogicality of the relationship to other as the resource of social positioning of personality.

AUTHORS:

1. Dra. Elena Starovoytenko.

2. Máster. Anastasia Isaeva.

3. Máster. Valeriya Zapekina.

ABSTRACT: The article is devoted to the investigation of the problem of identifying the psychological conditions of effective social positioning of the personality. The object of the empirical investigation is the relation "I - beloved Other", which have the high potential for achieving dialogicality. New theoretical model of dialogic and reflexive representation of the relationship of personality to Other was developed and empirically verified. The empirical study confirmed the hypothesis about the possibility of achievement of dialogic relationship "I –Other'' on the basis of implementation and reflection of its four "dimensions".

KEY WORDS: dialogicality, effective social positioning of the personality, significant Other, relation "I –Other'', dialogic relationship, resources of social efficiency of personality.

INTRODUCTION.

In this article, we will consider new psychological problems emerged in view of with the development of individual's ability to interact with other people through different social institutions, social networks and social movements. These problems include the problems of achievement of personal effectiveness, satisfaction and existential well-being of developed interaction with others. What are the criteria for the success of personal positioning in society? How is it possible to optimize your individual activity in the social environment without the tension of insoluble conflicts, tiredness from information overloads, and loss of your own resources in collective activities? It is needed to consider these and many other issues at this stage of psychological study of the dynamics of individuality and sociality in the personality.

The research presented in this article is the step towards "creating of the bridge'' between the psychology of interpersonal relations, the psychology of personality, and the psychology of social interaction.

Authors consider the problem of resourcefulness of the specific dialogical relation to the significant Other for broad social positioning of the personality. It is assumed that this resourcefulness depends on the development of personal abilities which is being considered in the context of relation to the Other, including abilities of the personality to perform productive joint working, to impact positively on own representation in the inner world of Other, to communicate to own "inner Other", taking into account his autonomy and subjectivity, ability to consider own self as the subject of external and internal dialogues with the Other.

The values of the being of other people, their freedom, attracting "otherness", the potential of cooperative life, the feeling "We", the prospects to be "continued in others" is formed during the dialogue, directed to the Other. Values band together essential, authentic connections personality with society. Theoretical and empirical prove of the proposed ideas is the purpose of this work. Its conceptual specificity is the theoretical modeling of the dialogical relationship "I-Other" on the basis of fundamental philosophical ideas developed by authors in the context of the psychology of personality. The developed model was refracted in the questions author's research method and ways of interpretation of the obtained empirical data.

DEVELOPMENT.

Based on the interpretation of the relevant philosophical and psychological texts, we have developed the theoretical model of the person in the aspect of its reflection of **dialogic position** in relation to the Other. The content of the model were explained, conceptualized in the context of the problem posed and the systematized ideas of M. Heidegger (Heidegger, 1993), J.-P. Sartre (Sartre, 2002), and M. M. Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1986). We consider the continuum of the following positions forming the intended model:

1. A human becomes **a person through the** achievement of the unity of physical, mental, spiritual, active qualities and ways of life. In their own activity, the personality comes on the "scene of the world", highlights the **importance (valuable things** for **own self),** transforms the existing in the world relations, and throws into question the world. The participation of personality in the world existence denies his present condition, and turns the existing things by new aspects in front of each other. Through the comprehended changes in the world of personality, one gives his own "presence" or "standing in the gleam of being" (Heidegger, 1993), as well as the dynamics of qualities of personality.

2. Personality interacts with the world through acts of sensation, perception, representation, thinking, experience and action. "I" is present directly or indirectly in any act, "collects" the effects, establishes and implements its active **relations to the significant values,** including to the Other. Significant values as the object of the relationship is present for 'I'' by turns in the following forms: the objective (as it is), intrapersonal (as it is given in my consciousness), the translational (as it is really transformed by me), the new reflection in the personality (as it has internally changed for me) and a new existential question to the person (what new life challenge it sends to me).

3. Dynamics "I" develops through the specific moments of existence "for myself", or situational "places", positions, states, positions of the personality, given to it in self-awareness and reflection. Actualization, denial and I-acquisition "for self" provide the sustainability, conservation and variability of **"I-in-own self"** (Sartre, 2002), define suprasituational, "capturing" position of "I" in the current difficult life situation (Shmelev, 2015).

4. "I" have a lot of **hypostases,** which point on the variety of ways of connection of personality with himself, with his life and his values. "I" exists as:

➢ the deep, unrecognized, non-verbal, pre-reflective **"Ego",** vaguely caught by intuitive consciousness of the personality.

➢ as a "sign of personality" or a universal cultural means of defining of the sensible bodily and psychic "ego" and self-designation of the center of human consciousness.

➢ "I-corporal", which is formed, felt and signified by the impressions of the personality about the body of others, under influence of cultural images and patterns.

➢ "I-in-action" or subjectively involved in external and internal actions, in comprehension of their results in interaction with the significant values.

➢ "Subject of reflection" in his ability to think about himself, problematize himself, discover new knowledge about himself and integrate this knowledge into a single I-self "to be himself" (Sartre, 2002);

➢ "I-collective", which becomes the effect of the reflexive and unreflexive synthesis of "myself", scattered in the multitude of inner worlds of other people.

➢ "I-ideal" or the image of the best "I-possible" accepted by the world and Other.

5. The personality can be realized in the fullness of hypostases "I" in **relation to Other** as the concrete meaningful person. In this regard, dynamic- for own self involves him into the life of Other, in his life, appears "in-Other" and "for-Other" and becomes his own "for-own-self". The Other allows the personality to understand the basics of "structures of his/her existence".

6. Reflection of personality opens many **forms of existence of the Other**. Other is for the personality a real space-time "object", a concrete fact, the situation in the world, the challenge to life, to which the personality must respond. Other is for the personality a "personal presence", awakening in the personality the experience of own reality, bodily factuality, authenticity of self-existence here-and-now. Other is considered by the personality as the "other side" of his/her existence, where it is reflected by Other and exists in the context of his/her inner world. Quality of the Other as subject or his ability to be an external and internal motivator is opened for the "I". Other is the source of "reflected subjectness" (Petrovsky, 2013), which has a non-reflexive nature in the personal life. During the realization of the relationship to the Other in the dynamics of cultural activity and social interaction, it reveals its "tool" for the "I" showing belonging to the

universe of tools and to the instrumental support of human activities. Other is the "I myself" of personality, who finds and accepts himself in the world of the Other and knows that the Other fills her external and inner existence.

7. Activity of "I" addressed to Other, can assume the character of **dialogical relationship** (Bakhtin, 1986), when socio-cultural, psychological, semantic, and semiotic patterns of dialogue is refracted, in which the personality may come in the contact with each other (Valsiner, 2002, Fogel, 1993, Rubtsova, 2011, Rubtsova, Vasilieva, 2016). Dialogue is the mutual response of personalities on the meeting, a joint generation of opportunities, external and internal exchange, conflict and coordination of acts of consciousness and reflection, impressions and ideas, symbols, texts and actions (Usiaeva et al., 2016, Volchkova, Pavenkova, 2002). The developing effects of the dialogue are the intensification of each I-subject, the greater completeness of their mutual internal representation, the overall and individual productivity.

8. Relation is the transcendence of "I" to the significance, the most important moment **of reflection** "for himself" in the modes: "I have a sense", "I can", "I want", "I know", "I choose", "I act", "I reach". In relation to the Other reflection of his "**four dimensions**" can be updated**:** between I-and-Other, I-in-Other, Other-in-I, I-in-own self (Starovoytenko 2015, 2016). Each of them and their integrity can be realized and "lived" by a personality with different efficiency, determining the level of dialogicality of the relationship and the formation of a "dialogical I" (Hermans, 1996, 2001) as the subject. Controversies between the opposition of relations can arise (Isaeva, 2013, Starovoytenko, Isaeva, 2010, Starovoytenko, Isaeva, 2016). Subjective solution or not-solution of them determine the **genesis of dialogical** relationship "I – Other".

9. "I-Other" relationship is directly or indirectly realized in the wide social environment, involves many "Third people", attracts many views, a lot of consciousnesses and actions. It can influence the external and internal life of numerous other people. Dialogicality in relationship "I – Other" can be the **resource for** effective social positioning of the personality.

10. We argue that the **reflection** of the person, directed to the various "dimensions" of the relationship to Other, which determines its dialogicality, can reflect the following **I-positions** (Starovoytenko 2015):

- I accept the meeting with Other, the impression about the appearance of Other as significant.

- I initiate the variety of mental and practical activities directed on the Other and provoke him to respond concerning important objects.

- I perceive and understand the attitude of Other and its response on my activity in the form of view, gesture, experience, expression, deed, call to action.

- I create the rich inner image of the Other on the basis of the analysis of its activity and manifested qualities of the subject.

- I imagine, I comprehend the image of myself, formed in the Other on the basis of our interaction, achieving "transparency of the body of the Other" for myself.

- I mentally put the real Other in relation to this image.

- I try to understand in what way Other wants to be represented in me and compare this image with the existing image ''Other-in-Self''.

- I mentally stand in the place of a real Other and by "gaze" try to penetrate in his image in my inner world.

- I develop the relationship with my "inner" Other in the direction of strengthening our identity and independence.

- I solve the problem of expanding and enriching of the world of common values and ways of interaction with the Other.

- I clarify what interaction with me and my involvement means in the life of the Other.

- I strive to increase the value presence of myself-in-the-Other for the Other, to make this presence developmental.

- I understand what is done in my life through the Other, what is the contributions to this life.

- I embrace the whole space of the relation to the Other by reflection. I can reach the level of "the reflection of reflection".

- I admit the power of "unknown I" in relation to the Other. I understand that my consciousness, my reflection is "the mystery of existence in full light".

- I start the project of my relationship to the Other. I feel ready to initiate the new cycle of our interaction.

- I discover contributions of my relations to the Other in my own relations with other people, with the environment, with society.

11. **Love** has the potential of the most complete dialogical relation to the Other, which brings to life the maximum of I-hypostases and forms of existence of Other**.** Love is based on value of consubstantiality (Pavenkov, Rubtcova 2016a, 2016b; Pavenkov, Rubtcova, Pavenkov, 2016). Love can help to overcome difficult life situation (Pavenkov O., Shmelev I., Rubtcova M., 2016, Shmelev I., Pavenkov O., 2016). It is necessary for person to get out from himself, his self-individual life to live for other, when opposition between "I" and "not-I" is eliminated and they become consubstantial (Florensky, 1997). Love is powerful intention that elevates every moment of the relationship between "I" and "Other". Love relation to the Other is a freely developing project to give more existence for other person in all "dimensions" of the relationship. "I" -loving, aspiring to a dialogic relationship **achieve yourself** through the adoption of value of beloved person. The relation between "I" and "the beloved Other" can be considered as the "critical type" of the dialogical relationship in terms of its meaning for the social positioning of the personality.

This model can serve as the theoretical basis for the empirical research (see e.g. Pavenkov, Rubtcova 2015). It includes the idea of development of reflexive techniques for psychological research of personality. The structure of the interpretation of empirical data can be based on this model. All these functions of the model were implemented in the study of the interrelationships between the dialogical relation "I-beloved Other" with the peculiarities of the social positioning of

the personality. Presumably, the presence of these interconnections may indicate **the resource of social** relations "I – Other" in the fullness and the specifics of its "dimensions".

Data and Methodology.

Methods and procedure of empirical research.

We conducted the empirical investigation on the basis of the Personal Psychology Department, of the Department of Psychology of the National Research University Higher School of Economics (Russia, Moscow) (Zapekina, Starovoitenko, 2017). The goal of investigation is the verification of developed theoretical model and the prove of assumptions about the social resourcefulness of the dialogical relation "I-Other".

Tools of empirical research are the following:

1. The author's research method focused on the definition of completeness of dialogicality of loving relationship "I-Other".

2. Standardized methods, which have the scales, diagnosing particular social position of the person: adaptation in the society, the need for others and proximity with them, as well as in the attention and acceptance of other people, initiative and activity in interaction, autonomy, the desire for acceptance by others and respect from them, getting the support in other people, internal control, constructive dominance, space for activities, the possibility to use resource of positive loneliness during the interaction.

3. Method of the subjective evaluation of the influence of love relationship on social effectiveness of personality.

The study sample consists of 40 people (28 women and 12 men). Their age is ranged from19 to 33 years old. They belong to the Russian culture. Participants in the study are people who live, according to their evaluation, have a mutual love relationship with the Other.

We used the following **methods** to conduct this empirical study:

- Author's technique "I am in relation to the beloved person", includes the list of interview questions. Method contains 31 questions, each of which updates and direct reflection of the respondent to one of the "dimensions" of the love relationship: between I-and-Other, I-in-Other, Other-in-I, I-in-own self[1].

- Technique "Diagnostics of social and psychological adaptation" created by K. Rogers and R. Diamond (Osnitsky, 2004) includes the following scales: adaptation-disadaptation, acceptance-rejection of own self, acceptance-rejection of others, emotional comfort-discomfort, internal-external control, the dominance-submission.

- Technique "Diagnostics of affiliation" created by A. Mehrabian (Fetiskin, Kozlov, Manuylov, 2002), is directed on determination of the human desire to be socially accepted by others and fear to be rejected.

- Technique "Differential questionnaire of loneliness' experience" created by E.N. Osin and D.A. Leontiev (Osin, Leontiev, 2013), including three scales: "The total experience of loneliness", showing the current level of loneliness experience, "Dependence from communication", reflecting the inability of human to be alone and demonstrating his desire to be with others" and "Positive loneliness", reflecting the experience of loneliness as something positive and giving the support and resource for existence.

- Technique "Test of existential motivations in interpersonal relations" created by E.M. Ukolova and V.B. Shumsky (Ukolov, Shumsky, 2012), based on the A. Langley's theory of four fundamental motivations, contains four scales:

1. "Confidence", which reflects the level of the existing support, necessary living space and security.

2. "Life value", showing the level of relatedness and intimacy of human with other people and the world.

---

[1] **Full list of questions is presented below.**

3. "Authenticity", indicating the presence in the life of human attention from the others, fair relation and recognition of its value.

4. "The meaning of life", which reflects the possibility for activity, which depends on involvement in the relationship with others and focus on the joint existence in the future.

We used computer program IBM SPSS Statistics 22 for the goal of the statistical analysis of empirical data.

Research procedure consists of three stages:

+ At the first stage, reflexive interviews were conducted with respondents. We used author's technique "I am in relation to the beloved person", in order to empirically test the hypothesis that the degree of dialogic love's relationship can be determined by differences in the fullness of realization and reflection four "dimensions".

+ At the second stage of the study, respondents were offered to fill above-mentioned standardized psychological methods. The choice of this methodological tool is to test the hypothesis that dialogical love's relation has the resource of efficient social positioning of the personality. Each of these techniques characterizes the "social" personality with some significant psychological aspect, reflects this or that psychological component of interpersonal interaction with other people.

+ At the third stage of the study, after the first and second stages, the respondents were asked to rate using 10-point scale, in which extent does this relation help to achieve their success in cooperation with many other people.

The interview "I am in relation to the beloved person" includes the following questions:

- How many days, months, and years do you feel like falling in love /beloved person?

- Do you understand what your partner means to you? What are the feelings you experienced in this regard?

- At what moment did you realize that you are important for your partner?

- Are you feeling good in such state? In which words, would you describe your sense of "love"?

- Does your beloved person know your feelings to him?

- What do you think your mutual feelings are? Do you feel beloved and darling by the partner?

- Do you feel dependent on what partner thinks, imagines and doing in your address? What do you think about this feeling?

- What is the main content of your interaction, communication, conversation?

- Are there in your relationship moments of complete understanding, ownership, and empathy? How often does it happen?

- Whether is born what you call "We" in your interaction? What is it exactly?

- Do you consider yourself as the part of internal world of beloved, the part of his "I"?

- What do you think, what are you in the eyes of beloved person?

- What do you feel when your reflection in beloved person one does not coincide with your ideas about yourself?

- How much do you know about your beloved person? Whether is the sphere of unknown about him/her more than sphere of known?

- What is the most important thing for you what you know about him / her?

- What do you feel when your beloved's image does not match with the real beloved person?

- What is symbol or image born to you, when you imagine beloved person?

- What symbol can you label yourself in respect to the beloved person?

- What do you think, if he/she knows about the place which he/she has in your life?

- Would you like to be close to your beloved person? Or do you prefer to keep distance?

- Can you say "I am He, and He is I"?

- What happens to you in his/her real presence? What happens to you in the imaginary of his/her presence?

- Are you free-spoken during conversations with him/her? What you cannot express?

- How do you react when your beloved person is not happy?

- What reaction would expect from the partner when you express dissatisfaction to him/her?

- How often do you feel old self during interaction with the beloved person?

- What are your expectations about your relationship? How you can see you relationship in the future?

- What would you like to change in yourself and in him/her in the context of your relationship?

- Do you feel the inner acceptance with your relationship and with yourself in this relationship?

- Do you agree that your love is the power that can be used for further development and achievements, or do you agree that love demands that of its existence, on the contrary, requires energy and internal resources?

- Do you think that at this stage of your relationship you can say that your love gave some "fruits", results? How do you feel these relations give you a force for development, for achievement of some goals? Is love the support for you?

In order to determine the completeness of the given reflexive givenness and dialogicality of the love relationship, **parameters** of analysis of interview texts were identified for each of its "dimensions". We used techniques of identification of the content of the interview, which is relevant for different "dimensions", their coding and translation into quantitative data. This translation signifies determination, and the average value from 0 to 3 points in all "dimensions" of relation on the basis of their evaluation on the selected parameters. Dialogueness of the relationship was determined based on the following indicators of reflexive expression of its "dimensions":

- 0-1 points – "measurement" is not reflectively expressed.

- 1-2 points - a "dimension" is sufficiently reflectively expressed.

- 2-3 points - the "dimension" is fully reflectively expressed.

We used the method of expert estimations for evaluations of the "dimensions" on the selected parameters and scoring of reflexive expression of "measurement".

Analysis of the interviews was devoted to the evaluation of relationship of each respondent on dedicated parameters, to the detection of distinct "dimensions" of positive living love relationship, in determination of the extent of the dialogic relationship, which is expressed in the reflexive coverage of the number of the "dimensions".

Results.

The results showed that the most expressed "dimension" of the love relationship is between-I-and-Other (32 respondents). Interview questions related specifically to this "dimension" provoked the most oratorical and detailed answers:

Table 1. *Reflection of the "dimension" between I-and-beloved person.*

P12: "We talk a lot about history, literature, about people. In our spare time, we travel, we spend time with our families, discuss literature or some of our past life experiences. What I particularly like that it does not matter where we spend time, when we are together. We always and everywhere will be interesting for each other".
P9: "We love just walking. During walking on the streets we are talking, geography is not important. We just go, talking about own things and cannot even notice that we have to come somewhere. We can watch something together, we share common jokes. We can sometimes read even books together in parallel, and then discuss. We discuss future plans. Generally, speaking we can about anything..."

"I-in-own self" was the less expressed "dimension" (7 respondents). It is important to note the following: respondents with a pronounced "dimension" I-in-own self present two extremes. Those who reflexively presented all four "dimensions" of a love relationship-dialogue is referred to one extreme (four respondents). Those whose reflective picture of loving relationship represented only one this "dimension" is referred to second extreme (3 respondents). In the texts of these people, loving relation is strongly problematized:

Table 2. *Reflection of "dimension" I-in-own self.*

The reflective picture of four "dimensions".	The reflective picture of 1st "dimension".
P11: "I believe that this relationship is so important that I sometimes do not know how other people live without it. It seems to me that if I didn't have it, I would not know what I would have done in my life. It's not in terms of everyday life, but in terms of the person with whom I would share my feelings. The girlfriend is on one level, but it is on some different level".	P16: "Actually, I used to be self-confident in terms of my mind. When I met him, I began to feel myself really stupid, not because he somehow manifests itself as a nerd big, because it seems to me to people that requirement is, that they are intellectually at some, and I was suppressed, sometimes I do not want to express his opinion".
P15: "Without this relationship, I would not see the sense to do something. Well, go to work and go, but what's the sense? It can inspire me on drawing. In the summer, I suddenly started to do dance classes".	P26: "I know in my heart that she loves me and respect me, that I am important to her, but on the level of emotions, feelings, there aren't emotions. My emotional state shows me that there is anything, something important, something meaningful for her, but relationship is important... So my mind says she loves me and my emotions: she does not show".

- 17 respondents realized "dimension" I-in-Other, despite of its significant reflexive expression as the result of an active search for answers to the interview questions. The condition of this realization is directed updating of reflection.

Table 3 *Reflection of "dimension" I-in-beloved Other.*

- Do you feel own self like the part of inner world of your partner?   - P21: (pause) ... This interview is useful for me now (smiles). It is interesting to compare by own self.
- What do you think how you are looking in eyes of your partner?   - P32: (Pause) ... Well, it's hard for others to say what they see in the first place. Well, my partner think that I am a smart, economical, little arrogant, especially in relation to other people.

"Dimension" Other-in-I is reflectively well expressed (15 respondents), but analysis showed that emotional experience of loving relationship is performed simultaneously with the emotional experience in the other "dimensions", in particular, "between-I-and-other" and "I-in-own self":

Table 4. *Reflection of "dimension" beloved Other-in-I.*

P35: "Well, let's say, there are things where his opinion is critically important for me. It is the appearance: how am I looking. He should like it. If there are some things that he did not like, I wear at home or do not wear. He quite delicately criticizes. If he does not like the dress, he will offer to put something on top (laugh). He very gently criticizes. And it will be sound not as a remark, but as an idea. Generally, he can find good prove for his point of view. I had learned this very well".
P17: "We have less trepidation in communication, so I can raise my voice at him, or quarrel with him. He responds to a much lesser extent, because he has a different temperament and education. He is a little closed all the times and now too, and he doesn't like to share his experiences".

The results of the scoring characterizing the relation "I – beloved Other'" expressed by the number of "dimensions" of relationship indicated the level of dialogueness, are the following:

Table 6 *Options of reflective givenness of "dimensions" of love relationship.*

The amount of the expressed "dimension" of relationship.	A combination of "measuring" the relationship I - love each.	The number of respondents.
0		4
1	- "between I and beloved Other". - "I-in-own self".	6
2	- "between I and beloved Other " and "beloved Other -in-I". - "between the I and beloved Other" and "I-in- beloved Other".	14
3	- "between I and beloved other", "beloved Other-in-I", "I-in-love others".	12
4	- "between I and beloved friend", "beloved other-in-I", "I-in-beloved other", "I-in-own self".	4

The research showed that the texts of the interviews of those respondents in whom three and more "dimensions" of a love relationship (16 respondents) are reflexively expressed, that is, the relation is sufficiently dialogical, proved to be more meaningful, holistic, deployed and highly charged than texts of other participants. On the base of the results of correlation analysis of the obtained data, which was made by the author's research technique and standardized techniques, we revealed the following resource of "sociality" contained in concrete "dimensions" of a love relationship "I – Other" and in the fullness of their dialogic implementation:

- respondents experienced loving relations in all "dimensions" of relationship, demonstrated the higher level of internal control and the tendency to dominate. Also, these people don't have fear of rejection; they experience their lives as the lives where subjectively there is a place for fair relation for yourself from other people and opportunities for future action:

TABLE 7. *Statistically significant correlation coefficients between the indicators of fullness of "dimensions" of loving relationship and indicators of technique's scales.*

		Ext. Control	Domination	Submission	Fear rejection	Fair relation	Opp. for activity
Completeness of the "dimensions" of love relationship	Pearson's correlation	482 **	460 **	-, 565 **	- 346 *	438 **	422 **
	Value (Two-tailed)	002	003	, 000	, 029	005	007
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two-sided).

- respondents, for whom dominant experience of love relationship in "dimension" between-I-and Other is characterized by higher indicators of adaptation level, internal control and domination. These people realize the availability of the required space for the activities:

Table 8. *The statistically significant correlation coefficients between indicators of experience of loving relationships in "dimension" between I-and-Other and indicators of technique's scales.*

		Adaptation	Internal control	Domination	Submission	Space
"Between I and other"	Pearson's correlation	491 [**]	, 622 [**]	442 [**]	- 386 [*]	501 [**]
	Value (Two-tailed)	001	, 000	004	, 014	001
	N	40	40	40	40	40

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two-sided).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-sided).

- people, who are actively experience of loving relation in "dimension" I-in-Other, demonstrated the lack of desire to be accepted by others, but the fact of the attention from other people is important in their lives:

Table 9. *The statistically significant correlation coefficients between indicators of experience of love relationship in "dimension" I-in-Other, and indicators of technique's scales.*

		Internal Control.	Desire to be accepted.	Attention from others.
"I-in-Other"	Pearson's correlation	409 **	- 330 *	482 **
	Value (Two-tailed)	0,009	, 038	002
	N	40	40	40

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two-sided).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-sided).

- respondent's experience of relation to beloved Other in "dimension" Other-in-I connected in them with the lack of experience of feelings of positive loneliness. However, these people are characterized by trust and relatedness to others, and the world in general, as well as significant opportunity for the activity at a high level of significance:

Table 10 - *The statistically significant correlation coefficients between indicators of experience of the love relationship in "dimension" Other-in-I and indicators of technique's scales.*

		Positive loneliness	Space	Confidence	Interrelationship	Opportunity for activities
"Other-in-I"	Pearson's correlation	- 356 *	469 **	, 484 **	460 **	609 **
	Value (Two-tailed)	, 024	002	002	003	, 000
	N	40	40	40	40	40

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two-sided).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-sided).

- respondents experiencing of loving relation in the space, "I-in-own self", demonstrated the non-acceptance of others, desire to dominate with the lack of desire to be accepted by others, common experience of loneliness, lack of attention and closeness from other people:

Table 11. *The statistically significant correlation coefficients between indicators of experience of the love relationship in "dimension" I-in-own self and indicators of technique's scales*

		Adoption of others	Non-acceptance of others	Domination	Submission	Desire to be accepted	Common Experience of loneliness	Closeness	Attention
"I-in-own self"	Pearson's correlation	-, 430 **	, 498 **	449 **	-, 435 **	-, 381 *	325 *	- 331 *	- 333 *
	Value (Two-tailed)	006	001	004	005	015	, 041	, 037	, 036
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two-sided).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-sided).

- dialogically experienced loving relation in "dimensions" between-I-and-others, I-to-Other, Others-in -I is connected with the resourcefulness of social relation. Respondents experienced loving relation exclusively in the "dimension" I-in-own self doesn't have such interconnection.

Table 12 - *The statistically significant correlation coefficients between indicators of experience of loving relations in different "dimensions" and the common resource of social positioning.*

		Between I and the Other	I-in-Other	Other-in-I	I-in-own self	Completeness experience
social resourcefullness	Pearson's correlation	, 589 [**]	448 [**]	490 [**]	259	, 429 [**]
	Value (Two-tailed)	, 000	004	001	106	006
	N	40	40	40	40	40

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two-sided).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-sided).

- statistically significant inverse correlation coefficients of correlation between human age and the number of "dimensions", in which he experiences love relationship to the Other. Personality with the increase of years starts to experience loving relationship in the smaller number of "dimensions":

Table 13 - *A statistically significant inverse correlation coefficient between the number of "dimensions" of experience of loving relationship and human's age.*

		Age
The number of the spaces of experience of loving relationship	Pearson's correlation	-, 573 [**]
	Value (Two-tailed)	, 000
	N	40

**. Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two-sided).

Third stage was directed on subjective respondent's evaluation of the influence of love relationship on the effectiveness of social positioning. 24 respondents think that love relation experienced by them gives them strength and act as the pillar and support for them. They are able to communicate effectively with many other people (they assigned score of 5 and above on the scale from 1 to 10) by virtue of this pillar and support. Other respondents (they assigned scores of below 5 on the scale from 1 to 10) didn't agree that love relationship is the resource for social interaction of personality. Subjectively this resource could be found by people who experience loving relation in concrete "dimensions" of relationship (between I-and-other, I-in-Other, Other-in-I), as well as in their unity.

CONCLUSIONS.

For the purpose, deeper analysis of hidden relation between "I - beloved Other", it is possible to apply method of multisemiotic analysis (Shmelev I., Rubtcova M. V. (2017)). Based on given results, we can make the following conclusions.

1. New theoretical model of the dialogicality and reflexive representation of the relationship of personality to Other was developed and applied.

2. The theoretical model of the relationship "I-Other" was verified in the empirical research directed on the identification of dialogicality of given relation on the example of loving relation to beloved Other.

3. Results of empirical research confirmed the hypothesis that person can achieve the dialogic relationship "I-Other" on the basis of implementation and reflection of his "dimensions".

4. Research has shown that the implementation and reflection of "dimensions" of relationship "I – Other" is connected with the various manifestations of the personality in society, and that dialogical relation to Other in his interconnections with positive social manifestations of personality acts as the resource of individual life in society.

5. According to results learned and reflected concrete "dimensions" of the relationship "I – Other" have specific resources of social efficiency of personality. Based on these results, we can point out the importance of directional development of each "dimension" in unifying structure.

6. The results of research of relation to beloved Other have shown that the dialogical-reflexive activity of loving person produces positive dynamic and the social perspective of his love.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Bakhtin M. M. (1986) Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva. Moskva: Iskusstvo.

2. Fetiskin N.P. Kozlov V.V., Manuylov G.M. (2002) Sotsial'no-psikhologicheskaya diagnostika razvitiya lichnosti i malykh grupp. Moskva. Pages: 95-98.

3. Florensky, P. (1997) The Pillar and Ground of the Truth. Translated and annotated by Boris Jakim. Princeton, New-York.

4. Fogel A. (1993) Developing through relationships: Origins of communication, self, and culture. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

5. Heidegger M. (1993) Vremya i bytiye. M.: Respublika.

6. Hermans J. M. (1996) Opposites in a dialogical self: Constructs as characters. Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 9:1. Pages: 1-26.

7. Hermans J. M. (2001) The Dialogical Self: Toward a Theory of Personal and Cultural Positioning. Culture Psychology, 7. Pages: 243–281.

8. Isaeva A. N. (2013) «Printsip oppozitsiy» v personologicheskom poznanii. Psikhologiya. Zhurnal Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki. T. 10. № 1. Pages: 135-149.

9. Osin Y.N. Leont'yev D.A. (2013) Differentsial'nyy oprosnik perezhivaniya odinochestva: struktura i svoystva. Psikhologiya. Zhurnal Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki. T. 10, № 1. Pages: 55–81.

10. Osnitskiy, A. K. (2004) Opredeleniye kharakteristik sotsial'noy adaptatsii. Psikhologiya i shkola. № 1. Pages: 43-56.

11. Pavenkov, O.; Pavenkov, V.; Rubtcova, M. (2015) The altruistic behavior: characteristic of future teachers of inclusive education in Russia. International Conference Psiworld 2014 - 5th Edition. Volume: 187 Pages: 10-15. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.003.

12. Pavenkov, O., Rubtcova, M. (2016a) Love as a Concept in the Religious Philosophy of Pavel Florensky. Anales del Seminario de Historia de la Filosofía, Vol. 33 Núm. 1. Pages: 163-180. DOI: 10.5209/rev_ASHF.2016.v33.n1.52293.

13. Pavenkov, O., Rubtcova, M. (2016b) The concept of love in the religious philosophy of Nikolay Lossky. Argumentos-Revista De Filosofia Issue: 15 Pages: 227-234.

14. Pavenkov, O.; Rubtcova, M.; Pavenkov, V. (2016) The doctrine of love in Latin Patristics of the IV-V centuries: a literature review of Russian approach. Synesis, Vol. 8, n. 2, Pages: 167-181.

15. Pavenkov, O.; Shmelev, I.; Rubtcova, M. (2016) Coping behavior of orthodox religious students in Russia. Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies. Vol. 15. No. 44. Pages: 205-224.

16. Petrovskiy V.A. (2013) «YA» v personologicheskoy perspektive. M.: Izdatel'skiy dom NIU VSHE.

17. Rubtsova, M. V. (2011): "Governmentability in interactions of subjects. Traditional and new practices". Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya, No. 2, pp.46-53.

18. Rubtsova, M. V., Vasilieva, E. A. (2016): "Conceptualization and operationalization of notion «trust» for applied sociological research". Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya, No. 1, pp. 58-65.

19. Sartre J-P. (2002) Bytiye i nichto. Opyt fenomenologicheskoy ontologii. M.: TERRA – Knizhnyy klub; Respublika.

20. Shmelev I.M. (2015) Za predelami «dramaticheskogo treugol'nika»: Ovladevayushcheye YA». Psikhologiya. Zhurnal Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki», T.12, 2. Pages: 133-149.

21. Shmelev I., Rubtcova M. V. (2017) Multisemiotic analysis of latent discrimination against feminist coaches. Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación Política y Valores. Volume: 4, Issue: 3.

22. Shmelev I., Pavenkov O. (2016) Coping Behaviour and Difficult Life Situations of University Students in Russia. Societal Studies. Vol. 8. No. 1. Pages: 63-77.

23. Starovoytenko E. B. (2016) Genez YA v otnoshenii k Drugomu. V kn.: Psikhologicheskiye issledovaniya lichnosti: istoriya, sovremennoye sostoyaniye, perspektivy. Moskva: Izd-vo IP RAN. Pages: 117-135.

24. Starovoytenko E. B., Isayeva A. N. (2010) Rol' protivorechiy v zhizni lichnosti. Mir psikhologii. Nauchno-metodicheskiy zhurnal. № 2. Pages: 230-241.

25. Starovoytenko E.B. (2015) Personologiya: zhizn' lichnosti v kul'ture. Moskva: Akademicheskiy proyekt.

26. Starovoytenko E. B., Isaeva A. N. (2016) Hermeneutics of loving relationship "I - Other" // Uncanny. Philosophy and Cultural Studies Journal.. No. 4. Pages: 51-68.

27. Ukolova E. M. Shumskiy V. B. (2012) Test ekzistentsial'nykh motivatsiy v mezhlichnostnykh otnosheniyakh: razrabotka i aprobatsiya. Ekzistentsial'nyy analiz. № 4. Pages: 187-202.

28. Usiaeva, A. et al. (2016) Sociological Diagnostics in Staff Competency Assessments: Evidence from Russian Museums. International Journal of Production Management and Engineering, No. 4(1). Pages: 29-33.

29. Valsiner J. (2002). Forms of dialogical relations and semiotic autoregulation within the self. Theory and Psychology, 12. Pages: 251–65.

30. Volchkova, L.T., Pavenkova, M. V. (2002). Sociology of management. Theoretical principles. Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya, No. 3. Pages: 141-144.

31. Zapekina V.V. Starovoytenko E.B. (2017) Refleksivno-dialogichnaya kartina lyubvi. Mir psikhologii. Nauchno-metodicheskiy zhurnal. № 2. Pages: 109 – 123.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Elena Starovoytenko. PhD in psychology (Institute of psychology RAS), Doctor of Psychological Sciences (Kiev's state university). Diploma of specialist in psychology (Yaroslavl's state university), Professor and Head of Personality Psychology Department, Faculty of Social Sciences, National Research University Higher School of Economics. Courses taught in the university: psychology of personality, theory of personality, models of personology, etc. Email: helestaos@yandex.ru

2. Anastasia Isaeva. Master in Psychology and Bachelor in Psychology (both at National Research University Higher School of Economics). Senior lecturer of Personality Psychology Department, Faculty of Social Sciences. Courses taught in the university: psychology of personality, psychology of self-consiousness and self-regulation of person, models of personology, etc. E-Mail: aisaeva@hse.ru

3. Valeriya Zapekina. Master in Psychology (National Research University Higher School of Economics) and Diploma in Psychology (Belarus' state university in Minsk). Postgraduate student of the Department for Personality Psychology, Psychological Department, Faculty for Social Sciences, National Research University Higher School of Economics.

E-mail: vl-zapekina@mail.ru