

## SCTMG 2020

### International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

## ASSUMPTIONS ON SOCIAL SUCCESS IN YOUTHFUL AGE

Olga Kobzeva (a)\*, Olga Tuzova (b)

\*Corresponding author

(a) Murmansk Arctic State University, Egorova st., 15, Murmansk, Russia, kobzevao@rambler.ru,

(b) Murmansk Arctic State University, Egorova st., 15, Murmansk, Russia, olg.tuzova@yandex.ru

### *Abstract*

The article analyzes ideas about social success in adolescence. The role of social success in the mental development of the individual was described. The role of globalization and transitivity in the formation and development of social success was determined. Particular attention was paid to resilience as one of the basic indicators of individual adaptation in modern society, a category of personality psychology that expands the explanatory potential of the phenomenology of personal development. The authors identified and described possibilities of personality determinants of social success under variability and uncertainty. The study involved 258 respondents (99 boys and 159 girls aged 18–21 years). The purpose of the empirical study was to identify basic characteristics of a successful person, as well as to study the relationship between ideas about social success and the level of resilience in adolescence. To solve the tasks, the methods “Successful person” and “Vitality test” were used. The results of the study showed that according to adolescents, the successful person can be described through such characteristics as determination, intelligence, education, courage, self-confidence and hard work. The social success depends on the level of resilience. In young men with high and medium levels of resilience, the idea of social success is associated with an activity aspect, humanistic orientation and group affiliation. In the group of respondents with a low level of resilience, the idea of social success correlates with the material orientation. The authors determined perspectives for further studies of the phenomenon of social success.

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

**Keywords:** Transitivity, uncertainty, social success, resilience, adolescence, socialization.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## 1. Introduction

Modern processes of globalization, uncertainty and multiplicity affect all aspects of human life. This multiplicity is due to the expansion of the multicultural space. It strengthens cultural, linguistic and social variability, stimulates variability of the social environment. The source of variability is a person. In the transitive environment, the negative impact of frustrating or stressful situations on a person can be reduced through the vitality (Kobasa-Oullette & Di Placido, 2001). It stimulates the development of cognitive processes (Manning & Fusilier, 1999), allows you to feel the fullness of life and its quality (Evans et al., 1993), and determines social success.

For a long time, social success was considered as an integral component in studying the effective communication, the social status, and professional competences. The persistent interest in social success is due to the new space that has changed the world, the search for new, effective motivators for personal development under transitivity. However, in psychology, an unambiguous position regarding the semantic definition of social success, its structural components and diagnostics criteria has not been formed yet.

Social success is an indicator of a social status, which allows a person to develop, overcome difficulties and solve tasks in acquiring social experience (Petruševich & Satov, 2019). It contributes to the full involvement of a person into the system of social relationships, the acquisition of a social status which is a basis for building relationships with other people (Kozhakina, 2016). The criterion that determines social success or failure is emotional intelligence that allows you to control emotional outbursts, make right decisions, and assess difficult situations (Goleman, 2000).

Self-esteem and external attractiveness play a special role in social success (Agthe et al., 2008; Boudreau & Boswell, 2001; Sutin et al., 2009; Tafarodi & Vu, 1997).

It is important to study social success at different stages of socialization. During the initial socialization, it is a stable state of personality based on the positive “I-concept” (Pronina et al., 2017) which depends on the popularity and the ability to adapt to changing conditions (Allen et al., 2005). At the stage of continued socialization, social success depends on the type of a situation (Nezlek et al., 2007) and emotional response to external influences (Greenaway & Kalokerinos, 2017).

Thus, in there are no conceptual approaches. The research is aimed at solving particular problems that cannot satisfy the needs of modern science.

## 2. Problem Statement

The transitive society poses new challenges and problems, requires constant changes in the situation, self-image, his relations with others, roles in different social groups. Any isolation from a new reality will contribute to a personal and social defeat (Asmolov, 2018). Therefore, the interaction with society provides unique opportunities for gaining social success but creates critical and stressful situations that can cause unexpected emotional reactions. It is necessary to adequately respond to external difficulties, maintain psychological health, self-actualize in various fields, contribute to social success. However, the globalization stimulates the development of a universal transnational culture which solves general evolutionary tasks of the survival of society and the individual, determines the mindset, specific

cultural practices that are characteristic of a particular society at a certain point of time and in a certain place (Oyserman, 2017).

The modified situation of cultural development indicates that the determinants of development are quality of life, communicative competencies, information socialization, and self-expression (Inglehart, 2018; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; Joas, 2010). Social success as a personal determinant is a resource of human actions, which allows to form variables necessary for socialization: obligations and expectations, information channels and social norms (Coleman, 1988).

A new situation of transitivity is characteristic of all generations, but it becomes significant for young men and adolescents.

Youth age is characterized by underdeveloped adaptive resources. Social adaptation occurs mainly due to the activation of personality structures that allow you to reflect on the current situation, develop self-esteem based on conscious reflection, develop an attitude towards various life situations and own attitude to these situations (Kobzeva, 2019). A sufficient level of resilience allows us to overcome stressful situations, maintain an internal balance in unfavorable situations, and adapt in society. The formation of social success begins with the assimilation of norms, values and stereotypes of behavior.

The study of ideas about social success depending on the level of resilience will allow us to determine the specifics of positioning ourselves in objective and subjective personal spaces, understand the mechanisms of socialization in a transitive society.

### **3. Research Questions**

- 3.1. How to represent a socially successful person in adolescence?
- 3.2. What are the components of resilience in adolescence?
- 3.3. Does the idea of social success depend on the level of resilience in adolescence?

### **4. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to identify the basic characteristics of a socially successful person, study the relationship between ideas about social success and the level of resilience in adolescence.

### **5. Research Methods**

The research paradigm has determined the choice of research methods. The psychodiagnostic method, mathematical and statistical analysis and the genetic method were applied.

#### **5.1. Study Sample**

The study was carried out at Murmansk Arctic State University (MASU) in 2019. It involved 258 first-fourth year students, including 99 boys and 159 girls. The average age was 19.8 years. The survey was conducted with the voluntary consent of the participants. To achieve greater sincerity, psychological diagnosis was carried out anonymously. The results of the study were given to the interested parties.

## 5.2. Research Methods

The study used standardized and validated psychodiagnostic techniques. Ideas about the social success were studied using the “Successful Man” method by Khuzeeva, which allows us to differentiate the substantial characteristics of success by such indicators as activity, humanistic orientation, material orientation and group affiliation. For the diagnosis of viability and its structure, the "test of viability" developed by Leontyev and Rasskazova (2006) was used. The method defines vitality as a system of beliefs about oneself, the world, and relations with the world.

Statistical evaluation of the results was performed using the Fisher  $\phi$ -test.

## 6. Findings

The analysis of empirical data by the “Successful Man” method made it possible to single out the main definitions that were put in first place by the respondents. In total, 22 paramount characteristics were identified. Table 01 presents the characteristics of a successful person.

**Table 01.** Characteristics of a successful person according to opinions of the young people (%)

No.	Characteristics of a successful person	Number of selections
1	Purposeful	21,6
2	Smart, educated	16,4
3	Brave, confident	13,2
4	Hardworking	10,4
5	Having a family, loving, beloved	6
6	Sociable	6
7	Happy	5,2
8	Responsible	5,2
9	Independent	4,8
10	Rich, having rich parents	2,8
11	Positive	2,8
12	Stress resistant	2,8
13	Patient	2,8
14	Strong-willed	2,8
15	Objective	0,4

The data showed that the highest share of respondents consider ambitions as the most important factor (21.6 %). Other important indicators of social success are intelligence, education (16.4 %), courage, self-confidence (13.2 %) and hard work (10.4 %).

The further analysis of the results was based on the main substantive characteristics: activity, humanistic and material orientation, group affiliation. The definitions were counted. It was found that the largest number of characteristics can be attributed to the activity aspect. When describing a successful person, girls and boys point to such qualities as hard work, perseverance, determination, activity, self-confidence, courage, professionalism, and education. The second important substantive characteristic of a successful person was a humanistic orientation manifested in such qualities as sociability, ability to manage, help people, etc. The material orientation and group affiliation were insignificant.

The next stage was the study of resilience in adolescence. Table 02 presents the results of severity of the components of resilience – involvement, control and risk acceptance.

**Table 02.** The results of severity of the components of resilience in the study sample (%)

Resilience components	Levels of Resilience Components		
	High	Medium	Low
Involvement	13	55	32
Control	10	66	24
Risk acceptance	42	42	16

The table shows that for such components of resilience as “involvement” and “control”, the largest share of respondents (55 and 66 %) showed an average level. As for risk acceptance, 42 % of respondents showed high and medium levels.

Based on the results obtained, three groups of respondents were formed according to the levels of resilience. The first group included respondents with a high level – 59 people, the second one – with an average level – 93 people, the third one – with a low level – 106 people.

To identify the dependence of ideas about social success on the level of resilience in youth, a comparative analysis of the indicators of a successful person in groups with different levels of resilience was carried out. In each group, there were characteristics related to different success indicators. Table 03 shows results of the comparative analysis of the occurrence of characteristics for different indicators, which does not give a total of 100 %.

**Table 03.** Indicators of the image of a successful person in young people with different levels of resilience (%)

Indicators of the image of a successful person	Groups with different levels of resilience		
	High	Medium	Low
Activity	100	97	43
Humanistic orientation	81	86	41,5
Material orientation	0	0	80
Group affiliation	8	60	0

The results presented allow us to state that in the group of young men with high and medium levels of resilience, there were characteristics related to activity, humanistic orientation and group affiliation. It is evident that the activity aspect and the humanistic orientation prevail. In the group with a low level, the characteristics related to the material orientation prevail. No significant differences were found between groups with high and medium levels by such indicators as activity, humanistic and material orientation. However, these groups differ from the group with a low level of resilience by the activity aspect ( $\varphi^*_{emp.}=10,5$ ,  $\varphi^*_{emp.}>\varphi^*_{кр.}$  at  $p\leq 0,01$ ), humanistic orientation ( $\varphi^*_{emp.}=5,16$ ,  $\varphi^*_{emp.}>\varphi^*_{кр.}$  at  $p<0,01$ ), material orientation ( $\varphi^*_{emp.}=13,6$ ,  $\varphi^*_{emp.}>\varphi^*_{кр.}$  at  $p<0,01$ ), group affiliation ( $\varphi^*_{emp.}=3,5$ ,  $\varphi^*_{emp.}>\varphi^*_{кр.}$  at  $p<0,01$ ). Thus, young respondents with different levels of resilience have differences in ideas about the social success.

## 7. Conclusion

The study of ideas about social success in adolescence showed that the majority of respondents understand the success as a result of activity that is not possible without an active social position.

Persistence, determination, hard work and mental abilities are key indicators of social success. However, few respondents relate social success to happiness, love, friendship, and family.

A low level of resilience prevails in the youth sample. This fact requires further studies.

The dependence of ideas about social success on the level of resilience in adolescence was established. Respondents with a low level of resilience tend to measure success by material indicators. Respondents with high and medium levels of resilience determine social success through activity and humanistic orientation.

The study showed the versatility of social success as a psychological determinant. Prospects for further research can be age, professional, socio-economic and other aspects of the phenomenon of social success.

## References

- Agthe, M., Sporie, M., & Forsterling, F. (2008). Success Attributions and More: Multidimensional Extensions of the Sexual Attribution Bias to Failure Attributions, Social Emotions, and the Desire for Social Interaction. *Personality and Social Psychol. Bull.*, 34(12), 1627–1638.
- Allen, J. P., Porter, M. R., McFarland, F. C., Marsh, P., & McElhaney, K. B. (2005). The two faces of adolescents' success with peers: Adolescent popularity, social adaptation, and deviant behavior. *Child Development*, 76(3), 747–760.
- Asmolov, A. G. (2018). The psychology of modernity: challenges of uncertainty, complexity and diversity. In A.G. Asmolov (Ed.), *Mobilis in mobile: personality in an era of change* (pp. 13–28). Publ. House Yask.
- Boudreau, J. W., & Boswell, W. R. (2001). Effect of personality on executive career success in the United States and Europe. *J. of Vocational Behavior*, 58(1), 53–81.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *The Amer. J. of Sociol.*, 94, 95–120.
- Evans, D. R., Pellizzari, J. R., Culbert, B. J., & Metzen, M. E. (1993). Personality, marital, and occupational factors associated with quality of life. *J. of Clinical Psychol.*, 49(4), 477–485.
- Goleman, D. (2000). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam.
- Greenaway, K. H., & Kalokerinos, E. K. (2017). Suppress for success? Exploring the contexts in which expressing positive emotion can have social costs. *Europ. Review of Social Psychol.*, 28(1), 134–174.
- Inglehart, R. (2018). Modernization, existential security, and cultural change: Reshaping human motivations and society. In M. J. Gelfand, C. Y. Chiu, & Y. Y. Hong (Eds.), *Handbook of advances in culture and psychology* (pp. 1–59). Oxford Univer. Press,
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, Ch. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambr. Univer. Press.
- Joas, H. (2010). Value generalization – Limitations and possibilities of a communication about values. In J. D. Rendtorff (Ed.), *Power and Principle in the Market Place: On Ethics and Economics* (pp. 25–34). Ashgate Publ. Ltd.
- Kobasa-Oullette, S. C., & Di Placido, J. (2001). Personality's role in the protection and enhancement of health: Where the research has been, where it is stuck, how it might move. In A. Baum, T. A. Revenson, & J. E. Singer (Eds.), *Handbook of health psychology* (pp. 175–193). Erlbaum.
- Kobzeva, O. V. (2019). *Hardiness and coping behavior in youthful age*. <https://www.futureacademy.org.uk/files/images/upload/PSYRGGU2019F032.pdf>
- Kozhakina, S. O. (2016). The formation of social success of adolescents in the educational environment. *Scientific Review: Humanitar. Res.*, 3, 67–78.
- Leontyev, D. A., & Rasskazova, E. I. (2006). *Test of viability*. Smysl.
- Manning, M. R., & Fusilier, M. R. (1999). The relationship between stress and health care use: An investigation of the buffering roles of personality, social support, and exercise. *J. of Psychosomatic Res.*, 47, 159–173.

- Nezlek, J. B., Schutz, A., Sellin, I. (2007). Self-presentational in daily social interaction. *Self and Identity*, 6(4), 361–379.
- Oyserman, D. (2017). Culture Three Ways: Culture and Subcultures Within Countries. *Annual Rev. of Psychol.*, 68, 435–463.
- Petrusevich, A. A., & Satov, M. K. (2019). Pedagogical support as a means of forming the position of social success of cadets of a military university. *Bull. of the Omsk State Pedag. Univer.. Humanitarian Studies*, 1(22), 120–123.
- Pronina, A. N., Sushkova, I. V., & Yakovleva, I. V. (2017). The relationship of social success and emotional experiences of preschool children. *Bull. of the Novosib. State Pedag. Univer.*, 7(3), 89–103.
- Sutin, A. R., Costa, P. T., Miech, R., & Eaton, W. W. (2009). Personality and Career Success: Concurrent and Longitudinal Relations. *Europ. J. of personality*, 23(2), 71–84.
- Tafarodi, R. W., & Vu, C. (1997). Two-dimensional self-esteem and reaction to success and failure. *Personality and social psychol. bull.*, 23(6), 626–635.