

ICPE 2018
International Conference on Psychology and Education

**SUBJECT–ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS IN
PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT**

E.S. Aleksandrova (a)*

*Corresponding author

(a) Psychological Institute of Russian Academy of Education, Mokhovaya, 9, 4, Moscow, Russia,
sedova.el@gmail.com

Abstract

In this article problem of interaction in professional environment is considered in subject-environmental perspective. Study of individual features, influencing the ability to join subject-joint interactions will allow to broaden understanding of subject-environmental interactions in professional environment. The results of empirical research of personal qualities of individuals, which influence efficiency of the collaborative activity, are presented. Index of Subjective Unity and Big Five Personality model were used. 480 respondents took part in the research. Significant correlations with personal features were found for two factors “Index of subjective unity”, precisely: “Abandonment of one’s own ambitions”, “Confidence in activity’s success”. The results confirm that personal qualities of individual influence the efficiency of the collaborative activity. Moreover, evidence was found, that capability to integrating in successful subject-joint interactions depends on such individual (personal) abilities as: believe in oneself, emotional mature and responsibility for the common business. Thus that one of the most actual questions in context of further scientific search perspectives is researching the problem of efficiency of personality’s psychological interaction in professional field.

© 2018 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Subject-environmental interactions, personal qualities, subject-joint interaction, professional environment, Index of Subjective Unity, Big Five Personality model.



1. Introduction

Rapid development of modern society, processes of informatization and globalization, expansion of professional activities' fields, changes in socio-economic interactions in society contribute to the actualization of scientific interest towards psychological study of personality's interaction efficiency in professional environment and ways of personal professional development (Tkach, 2013). In this regard the issue of collaborative activities' efficiency is more actual than before, especially within work teams. It leads to the extension of professional field. Nowadays a highly-efficient specialist is characterized by highly developed cognitive and social skills, which improve through group interaction in professional environment. Individual and group work's efficiency depend on high subjectivity, which is expressed, firstly, in active behavior with the aim to achieve a certain result in collaborative activity and, secondly, increment of one's professionalism. Thus, one of the modern companies' features is a shift towards "collaborative" management, which allows to integrate workers of all hierarchical levels in global problems' solving. Such management style leads to the increase of labor's productivity and its efficiency and contributes to the increase of satisfaction level, concerning the labor (Panfilova, 2005). Such organizations often function in a matrix structure, in which coworkers must use their skills and experience in both horizontal and vertical ways. Thus, a specialist can, on the one hand, control a group of subordinate employees and, on the other hand, be a part of specialists from different departments. Such a coworker will require a high individual efficiency both as a leader and as part of the group, participating in group discussions and making collective decisions (Panfilova, 2005). At first glance, efficiency of a group decision making is higher than of an individual one. Firstly, specialists, gathered together, have a bigger amount of needed knowledge and experience, which contributes into analyzing the issue from different points and guarantees the variety of efficient decisions (Panfilova, 2005). Secondly, psychological investigations have shown that trust level is higher in case, if group takes direct part in decision-making. Group discussion allows participants to express their individuality, exteriorize their own point of view and contribute into the common decision-making. As a result, decisions made by group members are perceived as their own. As an example, we have K. Levin's experiments in which American housewives began to cook meat products, which were not popular, in a bigger percent of cases when after discussing the ways of cooking with each other, than after listening to a lecture. However, group decision-making has some disadvantages. Firstly, a group decision requires more time than an individual one. Moreover, during the discussion psychological difficulties occur, which can essentially influence the result of a group discussion. Sometimes the process of group discussion can be influenced by the presence of a mentor – some participants may avoid expressing their opinion especially if it differs from the mentor's one (Andreeva, 2007; Panfilova, 2005). Importantly, group decision's realization in contrast with an individual one, has an uncertain responsibility distribution. If a decision was made collectively then a responsible for its realization is needed. Otherwise during the realization, a group may take a riskier position or, on the contrary, a more discreet one. Among factors, influencing the efficiency of collaborative action, mostly often are named: non-group (physical and social), intragroup (norms, group members' heterogony – homogony, interpersonal relationship, social-psychological climate etc.) and personal (individual psychological features of group members). Herewith the efficiency of collaborative group activity is valued with such indicators as: "excess activity", job satisfaction, social facilitation, social inhibition (Andreeva,

2007). Also, one of the key factors of efficient group activity is satisfaction with the activity of group members. But this side of activity is controversial. Several studies show that in some cases such satisfaction increases group's activity efficiency, in other cases – not. Such contradiction is explained by associating efficiency with such an indicator as collaborative group activity, while satisfaction – mostly with the system of interpersonal relationships (Andreeva, 2007). Such factor as satisfaction is broadly studied in positive psychology. This perspective considers positive personal conditions during the whole life and its interaction with environment. In professional activity positive emotions occur more likely when feeling of self-competence, reflecting the value and importance of the done work, professional achievements, inclusiveness in the activity process take place. The job satisfaction is an indicator that reflects the coherence level of the “optimal experience”, i.e. job requirement and worker's capacity relation. For achieving “optimal feeling”, or “flow feeling”, the following conditions are required: the setting of clear goals, the opportunity to get a feed-back immediately, to immerse in activity, to pay attention to the things happening, to learn how to enjoy the momentary experience (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004).

2. Problem Statement

In this research we studied efficiency of joint activity through subject-environmental perspective of psyche's development, in which as basis interaction “individual – environment” and ecopsychological types of interaction between components of this relationship are taken. As such, V.I. Panov distinguishes six basic types of interaction: object-objective, subject-objective, object-subjective, subject-separate, subject-generating and subject-joint (Panov, 2017).

From the subject-environmental perspective to development of psyche, professional environment is understood as a number of spatial-domain, communicative and technological conditions, which provide opportunity for successful performing of professional actions. Accordingly, subject-environmental features of communicating between individuals in professional environment, except for technological actions of its subjects, include communicative interactions and interactions with object-spatial environment. It is especially important for modern types of professional activity, which are characterized with active use of joint activity group methods, when professional group forms so called polysubject of shared activity (Panov, 2014).

Authors E.V. Lidskaja, M.O. Mdivani, O.G. Noskova (Lidskaja, Mdivani & Noskova, 2009) found out that the most productive form of social links is subject-joint type of interaction, which implies partner relationship, which, in turn, has a character of a constructive dialogue, based on the principles of solidarity, mutual responsibility and trust. Each participant's active actions are aimed at achieving a common goal. Sides' influence on each other is constructed, taking features of each participant as valuable subject into account (values, attitudes, ways of action, psychic condition etc), but such an attitude to another doesn't imply and doesn't require changes in one's own subjectivity. In such case we deal with sustainable, though timely limited group with mature division of subjective roles, aimed at the joint solution of joint problem. For this reason, such a small group performs as a collective subject (polysubject) of joint activity, which disintegrates in the process of this action completion (Panov, 2014).

3. Research Questions

We hypothesize that personal features of individual influence capability to integrate in subject-joint interactions.

4. Purpose of the Study

We consider that individual features qualitatively influence the effective task solving in professional environment. Study of individual features, influencing the ability to join subject-joint interactions will allow to broaden understanding of subject-environmental interactions in professional environment.

5. Research Methods

For verifying hypotheses, following methods were chosen: “Big Five Personality Model” (Khromov, 2000) and “Index of Subjective Unity” (Mdivani, 2015).

Big Five Personality Model consists of 75 stimuli statements with opposite sense, characterizing one’s behavior in typical life situations, in which one’s personality traits appear more evidently.

Questionnaire contains 150 phrases, assessments of which are grouped in 5 generalized factors: “Extraversion - Introversion”, “Attachment – Separation”, “Control – Naturalness”, “Emotionality – Emotional continence”, “Playfulness – Practicality”.

Index of Subjective Unity is a questionnaire, consisting of 10 statements, opposite in meaning, fixing subjective phenomenology of subject-subjective interactions during group task solution. Questionnaire allows to calculate individual “Index of Subjective Unity” and five factors, included in it, which characterize successful joint work in group: “Burst of energy”, “Satisfaction from activity”, “Sympathy for the partners”, “The abandonment of one’s own ambitions”, “Confidence in activity’s success”.

480 people of different sex, age, education and experience took part in joint activity.

To verify the first hypothesis correlations with the help of Spearman-criteria were analyzed.

6. Findings

Significant correlations with personal features were found for two factors “Index of subjective unity”, precisely: “Abandonment of one’s own ambitions”, “Confidence in activity’s success”.

“Abandonment of one’s own ambitions” positively correlates ($p < 0,001$) with personal factor “Attachment – Separation”. It means that ability to view group interests higher than one’s own, work for the common result are developed within people with expressed factor “attachment”. Such people understand others, have a need to be with others, feel personal responsibility for well-being of others, are tolerant towards their disadvantages, support collective events and feel responsibility for the common deal.

Interacting with others, they try to avoid disagreements, don’t like competitions, prefer to collaborate with people instead of competing.

Moreover, factor “Abandonment of one’s own ambitions” correlates negatively ($p < 0,005$) with personality factor “Emotionality – Emotional Restraint”. Thus, people, confident in their abilities, emotionally mature, calm, not vulnerable for occasional mood fluctuations, not hiding their own disadvantages, saving composure and calmness in the most adverse situations, are ready to abandon from their own ambitions and contribute to the common business, as far as their inner emotional stability doesn’t require external reinforcement.

Subjective unity factor “Confidence in activity’s success” correlates positively ($p < 0,001$) with personal factor “Controlling – Naturalness”. People of such type are characterized with responsibility, commitment, exactness and accuracy in business. Such people like order and comfort, they are persistent in their activity and usually achieve high results in it. High fairness and conscientiousness are usually accompanied by good self-control, by tendency to affirm universal human values, sometimes damaging personal ones. Such people believe in themselves, are responsible for their doings, can get along with others, that leads to confidence in success of joint activities.

Moreover, “Confidence in activity’s success” negatively correlates ($p < 0,001$) with personal factor “Emotionality – Emotional Restraint”. As already mentioned, such people believe in themselves, are emotionally mature, keep composure and calm in difficult situations, don’t panic, don’t fuss, believe in themselves and in common success. The results, described above, confirm the hypothesis that personal individual features influence the ability to integrate in subject-joint interactions.

Obtained data show that ability to integrate in subject-joint interactions depends on personal features of individual. People, who believe in themselves, are emotionally mature, understand other people, support collective events, feel responsibility for the common business, are more capable for successful collaborative interaction.

7. Conclusion

In our research, basing on the subject-environmental types of interaction, we found out that personal qualities of individuals influence capability for integrating in subject-environmental interactions in professional environment, in the sense that people, who believe in themselves, who are emotionally mature, who understand other people, support collective events, feel responsibility for common business, are more capable to successful joint interaction during managing with professional tasks.

Moreover, evidence was found, that capability to integrating in successful subject-joint interactions depends on such individual (personal) abilities as: believe in oneself, emotional mature and responsibility for the common business.

Thus, we argue, that one of the most actual questions in context of further scientific search perspectives is researching the problem of efficiency of personality’s psychological interaction in professional field.

References

- Andreeva, G.M. (2007). *Social psychology*. Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2004). *Good business: Leadership, flow, and the making of meaning*. New York: Penguin.
- Khromov, A.B. (2000). *Five-Factor personality questionnaire: Manual*. Kurgan: Publishing Kurgan state university.
- Lidskaja, E.V., Mdivani, M.O., Noskova, O.G. (2009). Interview method in ecopsychological investigation of professions (on the notary work data). *Digest of Materials of the 5th Russian conference for ecological psychology*, 255-276.
- Mdivani, M.O. (2015). Index of subjective unity: towards the method developing. *Materials of the 7th Russian Conference of ecological psychology*, 322-326.
- Panfilova, A.P. (2005) Brain storms in collective decision making: Manual. St. Petersburg. IVESEP, «Znanine».

- Panov, V.I. (2017). From Ecopsychology to subject–environmental interactions. *Materials of the Russian scientific conference with international participation “Man and society in the context of modernity”*, 457-464.
- Panov, V.I. (2014). *Ecopsychology: Paradigm search*. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Psychological institute of the RAE; Nestor-Istoriya.
- Tkach, T.V. (2013). Methodological bases of psychology of professional development. *Theoretical and applied problems of psychology*, 3 (32), 264-268.