

PSYRGGU 2019
**Psychology of subculture: Phenomenology and Contemporary
Tendencies of Development**

**THE MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE CONCEPT OF
CONFIDENTIAL RELATIONS OF THE PERSON**

Skripkina Tatiana Petrovna (a)*

*Corresponding author

(a) Russian State university for the humanities 125993, Miuskaya sq. 6, Moscow, Russia, email:
skripkinaura@mail.ru, +7 926-999-33-50.

Abstract

This article describes the main provisions of the author's conception of reliable personality. The essence of the concept is that reliability is regarded as a condition of human interaction with the world, on the one hand, as a condition of subjectivity and identity, on the other. In this context, reliability is interpreted as the ratio of the two-pole setup, which, on one side facing the world, and on the other - in himself. Thus, there are two relatively distinct types of reliability: reliability in the other and reliability in you as a value in its own sovereign entity activity. The level of confidence in itself is always associated with a level of confidence to the other, so that these two types of reliability are only relatively independent value, and there is never one without the other. It is shown that in interpersonal interaction there is a generating effect of interaction, the essence of which lies in the extent of the expression of confidence in themselves and in the other in both interacting subjects. And depending on the measure (amount) of trust addressed to themselves and to the other both interacting subjects, different types of interpersonal relationships are generated, in which trust (or lack thereof) is a background condition (friendship, authority, dependence, etc.).

© 2019 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Trust, trusting relationship of the person, self-confidence, trust in others, generating the effect of interaction.



1. Introduction

Trust as a psychological attitude of a person to various aspects of the world pervades all spheres of human existence, and therefore it is included in the overall process of Human interaction with the World.

This study led to the conclusion that in order to understand the psychological nature of trust it is only necessary to consider the "individual - individual" relationships as a single system, where every individual has a relatively independent value as an autonomous, sovereign subject of activity, because the "individual - individual" system generates a new ontology.

The inner world of each person is relatively closed, and the transmission of information involves the assessment of its content, as well as certain relation to the content of information transmitted by both participants of communication that is important from a psychological point of view. Therefore, the main point is the time of involvement to the inner world, but not the transmission of information. Analysis of literature indicates that such involvement presupposes voluntary involvement of one individual as a compulsory component of genuine trust and decentration of another on the inner world of the first individual. Forced, not voluntary transmission of information is not the fact of trust, and without decentration there is only the fact of transmission and reception of information, i.e. the act of communication, but not the fact of involvement in the inner world of another person.

Thus, we can say that mutual trust of subjects involves relationships that are built on mutual penetration of interacting persons into the senses of each other, which is crucial to the generation of new senses. Therefore, we can assume that the terms of genuine mutual trust will be voluntary involvement, decentration and psychosocial mutual reflection that do not lead to confluence but allow creatively solve the challenges put for interacting individuals and form mutually valuable relationships to each other. Therefore, trust in the relationships involves not so much the knowledge of the other person, as the involvement of the other (or each other) into the inner world in various ways, not only through self-discovery understood as transmission of "confidential" information.

2. Therefore, in addition to the transmission of "confidential information" or self-disclosure, there may be other forms of trust in communication because as Abulkhanova-Slavskaya (1981) notes in one of her works "trust to the other is the original condition for human communication" (p. 231). Thus, on the one hand, every act of communication always has a certain amount or a measure of trust, without which normal communication is impossible, since it only broadcasts the content of any text, and on the other hand, trust acts as the original condition for normal interpersonal relationships without which the relationships become counter-suggestive or confrontational.

Thus, relations between people are possible through trust and therefore the relations between people have the main characteristic of the studied phenomenon, which is the condition (or mode) of "individual -individual" interaction. This is trust which is the strategic factor of "we" community. So, here we find a generating effect of interaction, or the effect of a new reality, new ontology in the process of interaction of one person with another. Regardless whether this connection is a joint activity, jointly solved problems, jointly organized leisure or some other situations. Taking into consideration the tradition of Russian social psychology, we can submit that the activity performed together, on the one hand, is impossible without trust, and on the other hand, it helps to establish confidence in the relationships, which

was demonstrated by several authors, studying interpersonal relations in groups (Petrovsky, 1982; Kon, 1984; Danilin, 1987).

2. Problem Statement

Thus, on the one hand, trust as a relatively independent social-psychological phenomenon can be seen and studied as a phenomenon generated, expressed and dynamically changed in the process of interaction between people. On the other hand, trust is an intrapersonal phenomenon, which being generated in inter-individual sphere realizes as confidential stage to a particular person, and then, repeatedly "lifts out" to the sphere of interpersonal relationships, performing the connecting function between people. Trust is formed in the structure of interpersonal relations, and it is implemented and modified in the intrapersonal sphere. Although, communication, interaction and interpersonal relationships are inextricably linked to each other, it is theoretically possible to separate the concept of trust to communication and interaction, where trust is at the phenomenological level, and trust in the intrapersonal (intra-subjective) sphere of man, which is somehow "imposed" outside, performing the relationships between people and on the basis of which it is formed, and the already existing trustful relationships are strengthened or weakened. Trust here acts on its own ontology as an experience of particular relationships as a kind of psychological position (or aim) in relation to the other person. Although these two levels are associated with each other, there is no direct projection between them, because trustworthy relations, trustworthy psychological position is not always congruent between the communication participants, and it is determined by both subjective and objective circumstances, which will be discussed below.

Here we only mention that it is well-known that a person is always focused on his relation to another person, hoping for symmetry and congruence of his preference, in psychology it has been called "the presumption of reciprocity" (Kolominsky, 1976). However, a person hopes for symmetry, which in real life is not always justified, because trustworthy relations are not always congruent, symmetrical between the participants of communication or interaction. A person just assumes that the other feels confidence toward him, or at least he won't let him down, won't betray him, but these assumptions, as it is known, are often denied in the empirical life. In this regard, we figuratively divided the concepts of "I trust" and "trust for me" in order to show that these processes are not always mutual. Besides, the subjects of communication may be aware or not aware of this, and in our opinion, many phenomena are determined by this fact, where trust is a background condition (such phenomena as friendship, credibility, cooperation, manipulation, competition, etc.). This incongruence can be determined by both subjective and objective factors, that is, in some cases incongruity is determined by personal reasons of subjective nature, while in other cases by social, psychological or objective circumstances.

Therefore, trust exists as a subjective personal relation to the other or others in the intrapersonal (intra-subjective) field and its existence "lifts" outside, creating, modifying the qualitative features of interpersonal relationships. However, since this process is reciprocal, the existing level of trust in the act of interaction itself can be modified, strengthened, weakened or it can totally disappear. In addition, the subjects of interaction may not know about it, or they can interpret it in different ways. Thus, if it is proper to speak of trust as a condition of communication, it should assume the existence of trustworthy

relations, which are based on certain motivation of subjects in relation to other people and revealed selectively in relations.

Thus, the relations are formed in the process of communication and interaction (via the "quantity" or projected measure of trust) and the already formed relationships are manifested and changed there.

3. Research Questions

As researches show (Kon, 1984; Petrovsky, 1993), a person entering into communion with other people "filters" information that he addresses to a particular recipient. Therefore, it is correct to speak of the relation of trust as certain willingness (or communication condition) to the manifestation of trust before the act of communication, and the willingness, apparently, is based on past communicative experience with this person, and is determined by social status and social role of the recipient in relation to the communicator and communicator to the recipient. Moreover, the state of readiness features each subject, but this condition may be the same or may be different on the "quantity" or extent of the existing trust. This will largely determine the mutual importance of subjects in relation to each other, as well as the content of confidential information. However, willingness by itself is not enough to show trust, a whole series of conditions for the implementation of this readiness in communication or human interaction is needed.

4. Purpose of the Study

All this suggests the existence of trustworthy relationships between people, which can be interpreted as the internal state of readiness to express trust (prepare), by at least one of the two interacting agents as internal disposition of personality on people in general (then it looks like credulity) and on a certain range of persons in particular. Thus, if any act of communication or interaction between people always has a certain amount of trust (since trust is a condition for any dialogue), then its quantity or measure is a dynamic characteristic that defines the qualitative aspect of communication or interaction, and the higher level or measure of trust in communication and interaction is (provided that it is mutual trust), the more pronounced relationships between people are.

Theoretically, we can distinguish at least three parameters that will guarantee symmetry or congruence, i.e. correlation of trust between people. This is mutual significance of the content of information discussed, mutually valuable attitude of people communicating with each other, as well as the alleged similarity of opinions or judgments in relation to the information discussed.

5. Research Methods

Theoretical analysis of interpersonal trust

In fact, the assumptions about the similarity of the selected parameters may not coincide with reality. Various combinations of all the derived parameters of confidentiality result in mismatch (or incongruence) of confidence level of each of the participant of interaction in relation to each other. As we have shown, incongruence of social and psychological relationships can be defined objectively, i.e. from the outside, by the situation or difference in social status of the participants of interaction. However, this

does not mean that there is confidence in the relationships. These circumstances are objective grounds for the existence of the phenomena of interpersonal interaction, where trust exists as a necessary background condition.

Thus, trust may be treated as an internal state of readiness to demonstrate trust, at least one of the two interacting agents, which "is lifted out" to approximately individual space in the process of communication and interaction. Being lifted out to inter-individual space, this state "meets", contacts with state of another member of communication, and while interacting, they together give rise to different phenomena of interpersonal interaction in each case.

It should be emphasized that the basis of trust will also be safety (reliability) of partners to each other.

According to our hypothesis, security is provided by subjective, personal level of relationships of people interacting with each other. Relation to the other as to the subject of activity involves positive attitude to personal incompleteness, i.e. predict future behavior as safe to the personality of the one who trusts. That is why trust is always a risk of forecast mistake.

The assumption that one person refers to the other as to the subject, as to the person, and in this sense, as to himself serves as a guarantor of security in establishing trust. In the process of social and psychological interaction, simultaneous appeal of a person to the world and to himself has an important theoretical and methodological importance, because along with value of the other person, every individual has a similar motivation in relation to himself, which is called credibility. Credibility is a relatively independent personal phenomenon associated with person's value to himself, his own subjectivity. Human's actions are determined not only by valuable attitude to other people, they are determined by valuable attitude of a person to himself. That presupposes how much a person can rely on himself, can bear responsibility for himself, his life and his behavior. Therefore, credibility acts as a subjective phenomenon of personality.

In general, credibility is manifested in the ability of an individual to "go beyond" himself, his experience, or a particular situation without conflict with himself (his own valuable ideas of himself). Credibility, as well as trust to another may not be the same in all situations of human life. In some situations of life, a person can have formed credibility, but in other situations, this credibility is not formed. Everything depends on how the person rates his own chances, how adequate his self-esteem and level of aspiration are, what is his self-attitude and how are his basic social needs satisfied (need for achievement, need for love and acceptance, need for influence and, finally, for trust). Credibility is only a relative constant. Credibility is one of the person's individual attitudes, directed at him, and it includes a cognitive component (knowledge about himself and his abilities and merits), attitudinal component (self-assessment of possibilities, self-acceptance – non-acceptance, love – hatred to himself), and behavioral component, expressed in human acts, which he allows himself in different situations.

6. Findings

Thus, trust should be seen and studied as a two-pole orientation – relation, associated with the trustworthy relationship of an individual to himself, on the one hand, and to particular aspects or fragments of the world on the other. Only such a vision prism enables to include trust in the process of

integral interaction between man and the world, in a single ontology of man and the world, on the one hand, and to understand the fundamental role of trust in the fundamental effect of interaction of interpersonal relationships of people on the other.

So, as it was already mentioned, the appeal of one person to the world is focused on the subjective world of the other person, on his values and meanings, and the man reflects in each moment in another only that, what is important and situational to him, what is meaningful and valuable. When people interact, there is mutual reflection (understanding) of meanings and values relevant for both, which creates not only commonality, it creates something that is called phenomena of interpersonal interaction in the social psychology - from a sincere genuine dialogue to game interaction and cynical manipulation. Everything depends on the valuable psychological positions held by each of the interacting agent both with respect to each other and in relation to himself. In other words, if, as we have shown, the essence of trust is limited by the experience of actual importance (value) and a priori safety of the proposed object of interaction, the social and psychological interaction tells about the importance of one's own personality, own subjectivity and safety of own activity and the importance of partner's individuality in interaction and the perceived safety of his future activity. The essence of generating synergy of interaction is reduced by various correlations of the mentioned psychological positions of each of the partners, both in relation to him and to the other. This approach allowed us to build models of all types of interpersonal relationships where trust or lack of it is a background condition.

Table 01. Models of interpersonal relationships phenomena where trust is a background

| No. | S ₁ | | S ₂ | Generation effect | Phenomena of interpersonal relationships |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 1 | Credibility = trust to the other | = | Credibility = trust to the other | Dialog, Sense generation | Cooperation, collaboration, mutual interaction |
| 2 | Credibility > trust to the other | = | Credibility > trust to the other | Game | Competition, confrontation |
| 3 | Credibility < trust to the other | = | Credibility < trust to the other | Need for self-disclosure | Risk of self-loss |
| 4 | Credibility = trust to the other | > | Credibility > trust to the other | Manipulation | Extortion |
| 5 | Credibility = trust to the other | < | Credibility < trust to the other | Authority | Influence |
| 6 | Credibility > trust to the other | < | Credibility < trust to the other | Manipulation | Dependence, extortion |

At the base of generating synergy of interaction, there is a degree of reciprocity of measure of trust in oneself and in another of interacting agents. This vision prism allows us to understand why trust or its absence is in the heart of many types of interpersonal relationships.

Based on a combination of indicators of measure of trust reciprocity and correlation of trust in relation to oneself and to another, six different types of interpersonal trust were identified (Fig. 1).

The first type of trust occurs when both interacting subjects equally trust themselves and their partners (the partner is important and potentially reliable, as well as I am important, and my own actions

are reliable). Interaction based on such relationships contributes to friendship and it is a condition for personal and genuinely dialogic communication.

The second type of trust occurs when each of the interacting subjects trusts only him and does not trust the other. As far as everyone values only himself, the results of this interaction, as a rule, are competition and confrontation. Here it is the lack of trust.

The third type of trust occurs when both partners in cooperation trust each other more than they trust themselves. This type of trust is risky for both and is accompanied by shifting responsibility to each other. Finally, this leads to irresponsibility and unsaturated need for trust.

The fourth type of trust occurs when one partner of interaction trusts in equal measure to himself and to the partner and the second trusts only himself. These relationships lead to manipulation and extortion on the part of the one who trusts only himself.

The fifth type of trust occurs when one partner in interaction trusts in equal measure to himself and to the partner and the second trusts more to the first than to himself. This combination creates genuine authority of the first partner.

7. Conclusion

Of course, this model is only the most common option that allows explaining the generating effect of human interaction. This model can be developed, for example, a lot will depend on whether the subjects of interaction realize the internal position of each other, or what the status of each interacting agent is, etc.

Thus, trust should be seen and studied as a two-pole orientation – relation, associated with the trustworthy relationship of an individual to himself, on the one hand, and to particular aspects or fragments of the world on the other hand. Only such a vision prism enables to include trust in the process of integral interaction between man and the world, in a single ontology of man and the world, only this position allows you to understand the essence of eternal current, extremely dynamic, situationally determined relations between people, based always on trust, or its lack.

References

- Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, K.A. (1981). The personal aspect of communication. In B.F. Lomov (Ed.), *The problem of communication in psychology* (p.p.218-241). Moscow: Institute of psychology: USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Danilin, K.E. (1987). The perception of interpersonal preferences in a small group. In G.M. Andreeva (Ed.), *Communication and optimization of joint activities* (pp. 124-152). Moscow: Moscow State University.
- Kolominsky, Ya.L. (1976). *Psychology of relationships in small groups*. Minsk: BSU.
- Kon, I.S. (1984). *In search of oneself: personality and identity*. Moscow: Politicized.
- Petrovsky, A.V. (1982). *Personality, activity, team*. Moscow: Politicized.
- Petrovsky, A.V. (1993). *Personality: phenomenon of subjectivity*. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix.
- Skripkina, T.P. (2000). *Psychology of trust*. Moscow: "Academy".