

UDC: 159.9-057.875

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-4665-2018-1-16>**Olena Bulhakova,***PhD (Candidate of Psychological Sciences), associate professor,
Department of Psychology and Social Work,
Odessa National Polytechnic University,
18, Pedahohichna Str., Odessa, Ukraine*

STUDENTS' PSYCHOLOGICAL READINESS FOR SOCIAL INTERACTION: SYSTEM AND SUBJECTIVE APPROACH

The paper deals with the issue of students' psychological readiness for different conditions of social interaction. 1527 students of the Odessa National Polytechnic University took part in the study. The following research methods were applied: 16PF Questionnaire by R. Cattell, Self-Attitude Inventory, Self-Confidence Inventory by V. Romek, test-questionnaire by A. Mehrabian, Life-Sense Orientations Test, test questionnaire of formal-dynamic indicators of sociability, a questionnaire for measuring the motivation of affiliation by A. Mehrabian, Emotional Maturity Scale, Communicative Tolerance Inventory, Social Adaptability Scale, test of assertiveness components, Differential Diagnostics of Propensity to Barriers of Public Speeches, Social Intelligence Scale. According to the research outcomes, the students' psychological readiness for social interaction is a systemic phenomenon that has signs of adaptive processes regarding the social environment. This indicates the significance of joining the university environment and, consequently, the phenomena associated with socialization that are determined by the following circumstances: a) an educational system; b) a pedagogical system; c) a psychosocial system; d) an interpersonal system. Thus, psychological readiness of students for social interaction as a systemic phenomenon has signs of educational, pedagogical, psychosocial and interpersonal interaction. As a subjective phenomenon, it reflects the degree of autonomy and effectiveness of students in these interactions.

Keywords: *psychological readiness, social interaction, I-subject, we-subject, social subject.*

Introduction

Under today's conditions of social relations development, the requirements for the social activity of the individual in various conditions of life substantially increase, indicating the importance of the issue of psychological readiness for different conditions of social interaction, whose practical aspect involves creating appropriate psychological conditions for the implementation of interactive contacts, and the theoretical one provides the study of the development of a holistic personality in different situations of social life.

The issue of social interaction is of particular significance in the context of the activity of a higher educational institution in view of taking into account the regularities inherent in it in the process of the implementation of interactive relationships in the system "teacher / teachers - student / students" aiming to form the personality and professional functions of a future specialist. The above is most fully reflected in the concept of psychological readiness of graduates for work in particular, and social interaction, in general.

Aim and Tasks

The paper aims to examine a theoretical concept of "psychological readiness of students for social interaction" on the basis of testing the assumption about its determination by adaptive processes to the social environment, which is higher educational institution space.

The following tasks are set: a) to summarize conceptual ideas of the content of the concepts "readiness", "psychological readiness", and "psychological readiness for social interaction"; b) to substantiate the integral (subjective) concept of students' psychological readiness for

social interaction and its psychological model in the context of the subject-system approach; c) to examine psychological readiness for social interaction in students using appropriate psychodiagnostic techniques; d) to distinguish leading tendencies in the development of psychological readiness for social interaction in university students using a factor analysis.

Research Methods

According to our conceptual model of psychological readiness for social interaction the following research methods were used:

a) "I am the subject" unit (levels: max, med, min): a) general characteristics of a personality (16PF Questionnaire by R. Cattell); b) self-attitude (Self-Attitude Inventory); b) self-confidence (Self-Confidence Inventory by V. Romek); c) achievement motivation (test-questionnaire by A. Mehrabian); d) locus of control (Life-Sense Orientations Test).

In line with the above psychodiagnostic techniques, the psychological readiness for social interaction on the "min - med - max" scale is a function of the I-subject, which, against the background of a positive self-attitude and self-confidence, has an appropriate achievement motivation and controls one's own life.

b) "We are the subject" unit (levels: max, med, min): a) sociability (test questionnaire of formal-dynamic indicators of sociability); b) affiliation (a questionnaire for measuring the motivation of affiliation by A. Mehrabian); c) empathy (empathy scale using the Emotional Maturity Scale); d) tolerance (Communicative Tolerance Inventory).

Considering these techniques, psychological readiness acts as a function of the we-subject, which provides

the experience of constructive communication, the establishment of communicative contacts, compassion and empathy, communicative tolerance.

c) “Sociable subject” unit (levels: max, med, min): a) adaptability (Social Adaptability Scale); b) assertiveness and overcoming psychological barriers (test of assertiveness components, Differential Diagnostics of Propensity to Barriers of Public Speeches); c) social and emotional intelligence (Social Intelligence Scale).

From the perspective of these techniques, psychological readiness for social interaction is a function of a social subject based on the experience of joining social circumstances, behavior self-regulation and the success of social adaptation.

Theoretical Study Results

In general theory of psychological readiness, the following concepts are regarded: general readiness, readiness for a particular type of activity (sport, pedagogical, economic, etc.); psychological readiness in general, psychological readiness for activity in general and for work, in particular. These studies emphasize the dependence of readiness both as a condition, and as a general characteristic of the individual on the content of the subject, which reflects the complex changing structure of interrelated internal personal components in accordance with the orientation of the requirements of a particular occupation.

The creation of a theoretical concept about students’ psychological readiness for social interaction in general should be based on established methodological principles of determinism, unity of consciousness and activity, development, according to which determinants of psychological readiness should be distinguished, their specification in the activity of the subject (Ilichev, 1983).

The above is presented, in particular, in the principles of the formation of the individual’s psychological readiness for work in the form of the following modifications: a) taking into account the system of factors that contribute to readiness; improvement of the subject activity of a person as a condition for the development of a high level of psychological readiness (principle of determinism); b) maximum harmonization of technologies of the formation of individual’s psychological readiness for work and its individual characteristics (the principle of unity of consciousness and activities); c) taking into account personality traits and properties, age-specific features in the purposeful development (the dynamics of changes of the representative indicators) (the principle of development) (Tomchuk, 2010).

In general, the “psychological readiness” concept denotes a certain set of subjects’ “internal conditions” necessary to overcome “external circumstances” (S. Rubinstein). “Internal conditions” involve such components as: a) motivational (desire, interests, ideals, worldview, feelings, beliefs); b) cognitive (level of knowledge); c) operational-procedural (practical skills and abilities, psychological cognitive processes); d) emotional-volitional (self-regulation behavior) (Tomchuk, 2010); e) biopsychic and physiological features (properties of the nervous

system, intuitive sensory reflection, general psychophysical activity); f) social and professional activity (activation of spiritual, psychic and physical forces); g) motives of work (orientation, motivation for education, achievements); h) the need for self-fulfillment (Kavunenko).

“External circumstances” involve: a) mega-factors (world), macro-factors (society), meso-factors (region), micro-factors (microsociety); b) system of social actions (Ibrahimova, 2015); c) socio-economic conditions (objective circumstances of the process of professional development); d) leading vocational and professional activities; e) personal training (work on the development of professionally important qualities) (Kavunenko).

The “starting point” in considering the concept of readiness is, in our opinion, an appeal to the notion of the subject, which, as a complex psychological phenomenon in its most general form, reflects the subject essence of a worker.

The concept of the subject in the context of its definitions in the literature is regarded as follows: a) the initial (natural) level of the psyche, receiving mechanisms of self-organization, reflection, socio-cultural self-determination, freedom, self-development in the ontogenesis (Anisimov, 2007); c) the mechanism of “effective opposition of the living system to the environment” (Soloviev, 2007), initially associated with experiencing “basal vital functions” (Yurchuk, 1998), in which two extreme points are manifested – areflexive (natural) and reflexive (the result of the culture).

If we consider self-organization as the main feature of the subject, the concepts belonging to its content form a contextual space in which the process of acquiring properties by the subject, which in aggregate make him/her ready for the implementation of the corresponding functions, is reflected. These attributes include: a) integrated regulation of activities and behavior; b) creation of an individual-personal optimum system; c) purposefulness, consciousness, controllability (23); d) spontaneous ordering; e) nonlinearity, multivariance (Petrovskiy, 1990); e) reflection and modeling of reality; e) the subject’s reflection; g) dependence on specific conditions (Ilichev, 1983).

The above points to the integral nature of readiness, which goes back to the integral nature of self-organization and self-regulation of the subject, which reflects and models the reality. Therefore, the readiness of the subject is based on the simulated reality, in which he or she acts as a person who understands his or her connections with the real environment (see the principle of subjectivity in pedagogy (Pidkasisty, 2002).

The simulated reality is a mental image of reality in which the subject functions both as a doer and an individual, opening to oneself in the image of his or her self as being adequately compliant with the requirements which he/she considers to be most essential in one or another situation of his/her being. This means it is a process of modeling the reality by the subject and the formation of appropriate mechanisms in order to meet its functional requirements as an individual and person that is the main driving force in creating the psychological

readiness of the subject for any sphere of activities. The measure of conformity of the subject to the objective requirements that is reproduced in his/her own self-esteem in the form of the words “always”, “almost always”, “on average”, “sometimes” indicates the experiencing of the measure of his/her own psychological readiness for a certain kind of activity, the features of which are reflected by him/her.

The concept of psychological readiness is interpreted as: a) a mental state of the individual (Druzhinin, 2000; Ivanova, 1995; Korablina, 1990; Liventseva, 2002; Puni, 1973); b) an integrative system of personality formation (Fomin, 2011; Frantseva, 2003); c) a system of psychic features of the subject (Bocheliuk, 2007), a hierarchical system of professionally important qualities and properties of the person (Vetvitskaya, 2014; Sosnovskii, 1993); d) the unity of the internal attitude for the relevant activity and the qualities necessary for it (Tikhomirova, 2014), operational and personal components (Smirnov, 2004); e) attitude for further work (Koptiaeva, 2009).

Our interpretation of the “psychological readiness for social interaction” concept is based on the idea that the subject acts as an “executor” of functions belonging to one or another “scenario” in social interaction.

The above refers primarily to the content of the “social interaction” concept which in our generalized definition appears as: a) the interaction of I-subjects and their transformation into a we-subject in the framework of the task regulated by social-role relations of the social institution and relations between social institutes; b) the interaction of I-subjects in the composition of the we-subject within the social-role task, which has signs of the ability to achieve results, adequate to the logics of the displayed object; to carry out a sequence of “steps” in order to achieve the final result on the basis of self-regulation in accordance with intermediate results; c) subject-subject interaction, whose content aspect is regulated by status-role relations, and the procedural-dynamic aspect – by interaction at the levels of competence, influence, strategies and tactics, ideas about proper and desirable.

Aiming to examine psychological readiness for social interaction in university students, it is necessary first of all to note that the subject psychologically appears in the form of experiencing oneself as Self in self-perception, which, in terms of interactive relationships in social interaction, manifests itself as an experience of oneself as a part of collective We-self (self-perception in the composition of We-self). All this implies the existence of the subject of certain psychological conditions (personal qualities) due to which he/she can move from the position of the I-subject to the position of the I-subject in the composition of the we-subject in which he/she performs certain functions.

Based on the self-concept, we thus point to the conceptual content of the concept of “psychological readiness for social interaction”, according to which a participant in social interaction: a) has positive self-attitude; b) is self-

confident; c) has a high level of achievement motivation; d) has an internal locus of control.

According to our theoretical position, social interaction, as well as interaction in general, occurs under conditions of creation of the we-subject, which can be characterized by the following features: a) sociability; b) high affiliation level; c) high level of empathy; d) tolerance.

If we take into account social circumstances in the life of an individual, in which he/she acts as a I-subject, and as belonging to the we-subject, as well as a society member – a social subject, then the conceptual content of the “psychological readiness for social interaction” concept should be considered by reference to the following features: a) life sense orientations and adaptability; b) assertiveness and overcoming psychological barriers; c) social and emotional intelligence.

Thus, our conceptual model of psychological readiness for social interaction has the following components: a) “I-subject” unit (levels: max, med, min): a) attitude towards oneself; b) self-confidence; c) achievement motivation; d) locus of control; b) “we-subject” unit (levels: max, med, min): a) sociability; b) affiliation; c) empathy; d) tolerance; c) “society subject” unit (levels: max, med, min): a) adaptability; b) assertiveness and overcoming psychological barriers; c) social and emotional intelligence.

If we take into account the idea that social interaction occurs in the space of subject-subjective (interpersonal) relationships, then first of all, one should turn to the issue of a personality who must have personal traits that provide a “combination” of certain subjects.

Based on the provisions on the direct participation of students in social interaction in the university environment as the main determinant of their psychological readiness for it, we believed that such a participation required each of them to have certain personal qualities. In aggregate, these qualities serve as an indication of certain differences in the psychological readiness for the emerging social interaction.

Empirical Study Results

In the carried out empirical study aimed at identifying typical personality traits indicating the peculiarities of psychological readiness for social interaction, formed under the influence of social reality, 1527 students of the Odessa National Polytechnic University took part.

Before conducting work using the selected methods, the students were suggested to fill in a questionnaire whose purpose was to determine the peculiarities of their self-esteem regarding their psychological readiness for social interaction.

The analysis of the results of the survey has shown that the majority of the respondents (55%), both by self-esteem and expert assessments of fellow students, are satisfactorily adapted to different conditions of social interaction, skillfully adapt to some, and with difficulties - to other situations. This is evidenced by the data of primary statistics on the indicators of psychological readiness for social interaction (Table 1). The table shows that on a five-point scale of readiness for interaction, the average

sample values are about 3 points, which almost coincides with the values of the mode and the median of distributions, which further illustrates the fact of the moderate readiness of the subjects for social interaction.

However, there is a certain number of the subjects (26%) who have significant problems in the establishment and termination of this process, which leads to emotional stress and reduces the effectiveness of the interaction in general.

Table 1.

Primary Statistics of Indicators Characterizing Subjects' Psychological Readiness for Social Interaction

	Indicator of Psychological Readiness for Social Interaction		
	Self-esteem	Expert assessment	Integral indicator
M	2.85	2.32	2.58
σ	0.99	0.82	0.89
Me	3	2.94	2.97
Mo	3	3.13	3.07
min	1	1.45	1.22
max	5	4.25	4.63
V	34.95	35.45	34.67

NB: M – mean value; σ – standard deviation; Me – median; Mo – mode; min – minimum value; max – maximum value; V – variation coefficient.

Unfortunately, only 19% of the surveyed have shown ease of joining and adapting to different conditions of interaction, high skills of initiating and regulating this process, and good orientation in different social relationships.

Determination of psychological factors that promote or hinder the development of psychological readiness for social interaction was carried out by means of factor analysis of intercorrelation between the indicators of the applied research methods.

According to the results of factor analysis, a group of students with a high level of self-esteem of psychological readiness for social interaction received a structure consisting of 3 factors, each of which has a certain percentage of the overall dispersion of the studied indicators. All the obtained factors are bipolar, at one pole of which there are indicators that characterize the severity of certain qualities, and on the other one – those that characterize their absence, weakness or opposite quality (see Table 2).

Table 2.

Essence of Factors of Psychological Readiness for Social Interaction

Indicator	Factor weight	Factor; % of general dispersion	Indicator	Factor weight
General indicator of adaptability	0.800	Factor 1; 23.67%	General indicator of assertiveness	-0.549
Indicator of general satisfaction	0.733		Behavior component of assertiveness	-0.549
Readiness for achieving goals	0.654		Regulatory component of assertiveness	-0.499
Ease of communicating	0.651		Affective component assertiveness	-0.382
Breadth of circle of contacts	0.750	Factor 2; 16.77%	Consistency of emotional experience	-0.409
Need for communication	0.702		Propensity to sense of guilt	-0.379
Initiative in communication	0.673			
Expressiveness of communication	0.651			
Self-sufficiency (Q2+)	0.644	Factor 3; 12.14%	Conservatism (QI-)	-0.568
Readiness for overcoming failures	0.531		Social fear (H-)	-0.436
Insight (N+)	0.436			
Readiness for changes	0.430		Desire to make a partner over	-0.359
Achievement motivation	0.351			
Emotional stability (QII)	0.342			

NB: 1. Rotation method – varimax method with Kaiser normalization (8 iterations); 2. Measure of sampling adequacy = 0/726? and according to the Bartlett's test of sphericity analysis matrix is reliable (h<0/01)

The first factor, “Adaptability – Assertiveness”, with the greatest weight, included indicators of adaptability. A positive pole includes indicators that contain information about the ability and desire of a person for social interaction. These

include cognitive, emotional and behavioral indices of adaptability. This indicates that the psychological readiness of students for social interaction is a result of “natural” adaptation to the social environment aiming to meet its require-

ments and, consequently, it reproduces exactly the circumstances that are present in it. In case of success and efficiency, adaptive processes are accompanied by a general positive emotional background, which manifests itself in the appropriate attitude towards oneself and others.

The negative pole contains mainly qualitative indicators of assertiveness: general indicator of assertiveness, the behavioral component of assertiveness, the regulatory component of assertiveness, and the affective component of assertiveness. As assertive behavior, in general, can serve as an indication of a person's desire for partnership in social interaction, so far the negative pole can be regarded as an indicator of the absence of not only the attitude for partnership, but also its particular insufficiency in the social environment.

The second factor, conventionally called “sociability – the consistency of emotional experience” is composed of the indicators of sociability: the breadth of the circle of contacts, the need for communication, initiative in communication, expressiveness of communication, as well as self-sufficiency. Among the indicators of the negative pole there are the consistency of emotional experience and propensity to feel guilty.

On the basis of the second factor, we can conclude that the students' psychological readiness for social interaction has signs of psychological readiness for communication, which still lacks the appropriate emotionality.

The third factor called “readiness to overcome failures – conservatism”, contains features with high factor weight that are presented at a positive pole, namely: read-

iness to overcome failures, insight, readiness for changes, achievement motivation, and emotional stability.

At the negative pole, such indicators as “conservatism”, “social fear” and “desire to make a partner over” are concentrated. The data according to the third factor denotes the experience of the students of having partnership relationships in overcoming difficulties, which, however, are affected by signs concentrated at the negative pole.

Conclusions

According to the obtained results, students' psychological readiness for social interaction is a systemic phenomenon that has, first and foremost, signs of adaptive processes regarding the social environment. This indicates the significance of joining the university environment and, consequently, the phenomena associated with socialization which are determined by the following circumstances: a) an educational system (determined by the state education authorities, educational institutions, the state standard of education, the content of education); b) a pedagogical system (determined by the system of organization of training and education in higher educational institutions); c) a psychosocial system (characterized by the functional-role structure of a small group); d) an interpersonal system (expressed in the interrelations of participants in educational and professional activities).

Thus, psychological readiness of students for social interaction as a systemic phenomenon has signs of educational, pedagogical, psychosocial and interpersonal interaction. As a subjective phenomenon, it reflects the degree of autonomy and effectiveness of students in these interactions.

REFERENCES

1. Anisimov, O.S. (2007). Individ, subiekt i lichnost v kontekste tsulostnosti psikhiki cheloveka [Individual, subject and personality in the context of the integrity of the human psyche]. *Mir psikhologii – World of Psychology*, 1 (49), 31-44 [in Russian].
2. Bodalev, A. A. (2002). *Obshchaya psikhodiagnostika [General psychodiagnostics]*. Saint Petersburg: Rech [in Russian].
3. Bocheliuk, V.J. (2007). *Psikhologhiia: vstup do specialnosti. navchalnyi posibnyk [Psychology: Introduction to the specialty. Tutorial]*. Kyiv: Centr uchbovoi literatury [in Ukrainian].
4. Vetrovskaya, S.M. (2014). Printsip integratizma v formirovaniі psikhologicheskoi gotovnosti studenta k profesionalnoi deiatelnosti v sfere zheleznodorozhnogo transporta [The principle of integratism in the formation of a student's psychological readiness for professional activity in the field of railway transport]. *Fundamentalnye issledovaniia – Fundamental research*, 5-3, 597-599 [in Russian].
5. Druzhinin, V.N. (2000). *Psikhologhiia obshchikh sposobnostei [Psychology of general abilities]*. Saint Petersburg: Piter [in Russian].
6. Ibraghimova, K.O. (2015). Model formuvannia hotovnosti do sotsialnoi vzaïmodii bakalavri inzhenerno-tekhničnogho profilii pry vyvchenni psikhologopedagogichnykh dyscyplin [Model of formation of readiness for social interaction of the bachelor of engineering and technical profile in the study of psychological and pedagogical disciplines]. *Pedagoghichna osvita: teoriia i praktyk. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats – Pedagogical Education: Theory and Practice. Collection of scientific works*, 18, 248-253 [in Ukrainian].
7. Ivanova, H.V. (1995). Profesiina kultura maibutniohovchytelia [Professional culture of the future teacher]. *Pedahohika ta psikhologhiia – Pedagogy and Psychology*, 5, 14-19 [in Ukrainian].
8. Kavunenko, N.V. *Vyznachennia zmistu ta struktury osobystnoi hotovnosti do profesiinoi diialnosti [Determination of the content and structure of personal readiness for professional activity]*. Retrieved from: umo.edu.ua/images/content/nashi_vydanya/stud_ [in Ukrainian].
9. Koptiaeva, O.N. (2009). Motivatsionnaia gotovnost pedagogov k innovatsionnoi deiatelnosti [Motivational readiness of teachers to innovate]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Yaroslavl [in Russian].
10. Korablina, E.P. (1990). Stanovlenie psikhologicheskoi gotovnosti k inzhenernoi deiatelnosti u studentov tekhnicheskogo vuza [Formation of psychological readiness for engineering activities at students of a technical college]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Leningrad [in Russian].
11. Liventseva, O. V. (2002). Psikhologicheskaiia gotovnost rukovoditelei srednego zvena k deiatelnosti v neblagopriiatnykh situatsiakh [Psychological readiness of

middle managers to work in adverse situations]. *Candidate's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].

12. Pidkastyi, P.I. (2002). *Pedagogika: Uchebnoe posobie [Pedagogy: textbook]*. 3rd ed. Moscow: Pedagogicheskoe obshchestvo Rossii [in Russian].

13. Puni, A. Ts. (1973). *Nekotorye psikhologicheskie voprosy gotovnosti k sorevnovaniyam v sporte [Some psychological issues of fitness for sports]*. Moscow: Fizkultura i sport [in Russian].

14. Petrovskiy, A.V., Yaroshevskiy, M.G. (1990). *Psikhologiya. Slovar [Psychology Dictionary]*. Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian].

15. Solovev, O.V. (2007). Ob evoliutsionnykh istokakh subiektivnosti i subiektu [On the evolutionary origins of subjectivity and subject]. *Mir psikhologii – World of psychology*, 1 (49), 55-68 [in Russian].

16. Smirnov, P. A. (2004). Dinamika psikhologicheskoi gotovnosti budushchikh iuristov k professionalnoi deiatelnosti v usloviakh iuridicheskoi kliniki [Dynamics of psychological readiness of future lawyers for professional activity in the legal clinic]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Kazan [in Russian].

17. Sosnovskii, B.A. (1993). *Motiv i smysl [Motive and sense]*. Moscow: Prometei [in Russian].

18. Tikhomirova, Yu. M. (2014). Teoreticheskii analiz strukturnykh komponentov psikhologicheskoi gotovnosti k professionalnoi deiatelnosti [Theoretical analysis of structural components of psychological readiness for professional activity]. *Psikhologicheskie nauki: teoriia i praktika: materialy II mezhdunar. nauch. konf. – Psychological Sciences: Theory and Practice: Materials II International. scientific conf*. Moscow: Buki-Vedi [in Russian].

19. Tomchuk, M.I. (2010). Metodologicheskie zasady doslidzhennia ta formuvannia psikhologichnoi hotovnosti do diialnosti [Methodological principles of research and formation of psychological readiness for activity]. *Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo – Psychology and society*, 4, 41-46 [in Russian].

20. Ilichev, L.F., Fedoseev, N.N., Kovalev, S.M., Panov, V.G. (1983). *Filosofskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary]*. Moscow: Sov. entsiklopediia [in Russian].

21. Fomin, A. S. (2011). Problemy formirovaniia psikhologicheskoi gotovnosti k upravlencheskoi deiatelnosti [Problems of formation of psychological readiness for management activity]. *Yuridicheskaia psikhologhiia – Legal psychology*, 1, 14-20 [in Russian].

22. Frantseva, E.N. (2003). Psikhologicheskaiia gotovnost k innovatsiiam v professionalno-pedagogicheskoi deiatelnosti u budushchikh uchitelei [Psychological readiness for innovations in the professional and pedagogical activity of future teachers]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Stavropol [in Russian].

23. *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar po psikhologii i pedagogike [Encyclopedic Dictionary on Psychology and Pedagogy]*. (2013). Retrieved from: <https://disqus.com/home/discussion/channel.../2013/> [in Russian].

24. Iurchuk, V.V. (1998). *Sovremennyi slovar po psikhologii [Modern psychological dictionary]*. Minsk: Sovremennoe slovo [in Russian].

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Анисимов О.С. Индивид, субъект и личность в контексте целостности психики человека / О.С. Анисимов // Мир психологии. – 2007. – №1 (49). – С. 31 – 44.

2. Бодалев А. А. Общая психодиагностика / А. А. Бодалев, В. В. Столин. – СПб.: Речь, 2002. – 439 с.

3. Бочелюк В.Й. Психологія: вступ до спеціальності. навчальний посібник / В. Й. Бочелюк, В. В. Зарицька. — К.: Центр учбової літератури, 2007. — 288 с.

4. Ветвицкая С.М. Принцип интегратизма в формировании психологической готовности студента к профессиональной деятельности в сфере железнодорожного транспорта / С.М.Ветвицкая, Е.В.Бриллиант // Фундаментальные исследования. – 2014. – № 5-3. – С. 597-599.

5. Дружинин В.Н. Психология общих способностей / В.Н. Дружинин. – СПб.: Питер, 2000. – 368 с.

6. Ібрагімова К.О. Модель формування готовності до соціальної взаємодії бакалаврі інженерно-технічного профілю при вивченні психолого-педагогічних дисциплін / К.О. Ібрагімова // Педагогічна освіта: теорія і практик. Збірник наукових праць. Випуск 18 (1–2015). – С. 248 – 253.

7. Иванова Г.В. Професійна культура майбутнього вчителя / Г.В. Иванова // Педагогіка та психологія. – 1995. – №5. – С.14–19.

8. Кавуненко Н.В. Визначення змісту та структури особистісної готовності до професійної діяльності /

Н.В.Кавуненко // [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступа:

umo.edu.ua/images/content/nashi_vydanya/stud_...

9. Коптяева О.Н. Мотивационная готовность педагогов к инновационной деятельности: автореф. дисс. на соискание ученой степени канд. психол. наук: спец. 19.00.07 «Педагогическая психология» / О.Н.Коптяева. – Ярославль, 2009. – 25 с.

10. Кораблина Э.П. Становление психологической готовности к инженерной деятельности у студентов технического вуза: автореф. дис. на соискание ученой степени канд. псих. наук: спец. 19.00.03 «Психология труда, инженерная психология, эргономика» / Э.П.Кораблина. – Л., 1990. – 17 с.

11. Ливенцева О. В. Психологическая готовность руководителей среднего звена к деятельности в неблагоприятных ситуациях (На примере аппарата управления Буровой компании): дисс. ... кандидата психол. наук: 19.00.03 / Ливенцева Ольга Васильевна. – М., 2002. – 213 с.

12. Педагогика: Учебное пособие / Под ред. Пидкасистого П.И. – Изд. 3-е, доп., перераб. – М.: Педагогическое общество России, 2002. – 640 с.

13. Пуни А. Ц. Некоторые психологические вопросы готовности к соревнованиям в спорте / А. Ц. Пуни. – М. : Физкультура и спорт, 1973. – 113 с.

14. Психология. Словарь / Под общ. ред. А.В.Петровского, М.Г. Ярошевского. – М.: Политиздат, 1990. – 494 с.
15. Соловьев О.В. Об эволюционных истоках субъективности и субъекта / О.В. Соловьев // Мир психологии. – 2007. – №1 (49). – С. 55 – 68.
16. Смирнов П. А. Динамика психологической готовности будущих юристов к профессиональной деятельности в условиях юридической клиники: автореф. дисс. на соискание ученой степени канд. психол. наук: спец. 19.00.07 «Педагогическая психология» / П.А.Смирнов. – Казань, 2004. – 23 с.
17. Сосновский Б.А. Мотив и смысл / Б.А. Сосновский. – М.: Прометей, 1993. – 198 с.
18. Тихомирова Ю.М. Теоретический анализ структурных компонентов психологической готовности к профессиональной деятельности / Ю. М. Тихомирова // Психологические науки: теория и практика: материалы II междунар. науч. конф. (г. Москва, март 2014 г.). — М.: Буки-Веди, 2014. — С. 6 – 9.
19. Томчук М.І. Методологічні засади дослідження та формування психологічної готовності до діяльності / М.І. Томчук // Психологія і суспільство. – 2010. – №4. – С. 41 – 46.
20. Философский энциклопедический словарь / Гл. редакция: Л.Ф.Ильичев, Н.Н.Федосеев, С.М.Ковалев, В.Г.Панов. – М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1983. – 840 с.
21. Фомин А. С. Проблемы формирования психологической готовности к управленческой деятельности / А.С.Фомин // Юридическая психология. – 2011. – №1. – С. 14 – 20.
22. Францева Е.Н. Психологическая готовность к инновациям в профессионально-педагогической деятельности у будущих учителей: автореф. дисс. на соискание ученой степени канд. психол. наук: спец. 19.00.07 «Педагогическая психология» / Е.Н.Францева. – Ставрополь: 2003. – 18 с.
23. Энциклопедический словарь по психологии и педагогике 2013 <https://disqus.com/home/discussion/channel.../2013/>
24. Юрчук В.В. Современный словарь по психологии / В.В.Юрчук. – Мн.: Современное слово, 1998. – 768 с.

Олена Булгакова,

*кандидат психологічних наук, доцент кафедри психології та соціальної роботи,
Одеський національний політехнічний університет,
вул. Педагогічна 18, м. Одеса, Україна*

ПСИХОЛОГІЧНА ГОТОВНІСТЬ ДО СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ У СТУДЕНТІВ: СИСТЕМНО-СУБ'ЄКТНИЙ ПІДХІД

Мета статті полягає у відображенні теоретичного концепту «психологічна готовність студентів до соціальної взаємодії» на основі перевірки припущення про її детермінацію адаптивними процесами до соціального середовища, яким є середовище вишу. Згідно з концептуальною моделлю психологічної готовності до соціальної взаємодії для емпіричного дослідження були відібрані такі психодіагностичні методики: 1) блок «Я-суб'єкт» (рівні max, med, min): а) загальна характеристика особистості (особистісний опитувальник Р. Кеттелла); б) ставлення до себе (тест-опитувальник самоставлення); в) упевненість у собі (тест «Упевненість в собі» В.Г. Ромека); г) мотивація досягнення (тест-опитувальник А. Мехрабіана); д) локус контролю (тест «Смисложиттєві орієнтації»); 2) блок «Ми-суб'єкт» (рівні max, med, min): а) товариськість (тест-опитувальник формально-динамічних показників товариськості); б) афіліативність (опитувальник для вимірювання мотивації афіліації А. Мехрабіана); в) емпатійність (шкала емпатії опитувальника «Діагностика емоційної зрілості»); г) толерантність (методика «Комунікативна толерантність»); 3) блок «Соціумний суб'єкт» (рівні max, med, min): а) адаптивність (тест-опитувальник соціальної адаптивності); б) асертивність та подолання психологічних бар'єрів (тест-опитувальник компонентів асертивності, методика «Диференціальна діагностика схильності до бар'єрів публічних виступів»); в) соціальний інтелект та емоційний інтелект (методика «Соціальний інтелект»). Згідно із отриманими результатами, психологічна готовність студентів до соціальної взаємодії є системним явищем, що має, у першу чергу, ознаки адаптивних процесів щодо соціального середовища. Це вказує на значущість для них «входження» у соціум університетського середовища і, отже, явищ, пов'язаних із соціалізацією, процеси якої визначаються обставинами: а) *освітньої* системи (визначається державними органами управління освітою, закладами освіти, державним стандартом освіти, змістом освіти); б) *педагогічної* системи (зумовлюється системою організації навчання і виховання у вищому навчальному закладі); в) *соціально-психологічної* системи (характеризується функціонально-рольовою структурою малої групи); г) *міжособистісної* системи (виражається у взаємозв'язках учасників навчально-професійної діяльності). Отже, як системне явище психологічна готовність студентів до соціальної взаємодії має ознаки освітньої, педагогічної, соціально-психологічної та міжособистісної взаємодії. Як явище суб'єктне, вона відображає міру самостійності та результативності студентів у названих інтеракціях.

Ключові слова: психологічна готовність, соціальна взаємодія, Я-суб'єкт, Ми-суб'єкт, соціумний суб'єкт.

Submitted on December, 13, 2017

Reviewed by Doctor of Psychology, prof. L. Velytchenko