Elena B. Starovoytenko

MODELS OF THE DIALOGICAL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE I'S SELF-IDENTITY

Elena B. Starovoytenko[1]

MODELS OF THE DIALOGICAL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE I'S SELF-IDENTITY[2]

This paper presents a study in the format of general personology that involves an interpretation of ideas about personality explicated from cultural sources, in psychological concepts, methods of individual self-cognition and empirical approaches. A continuum of personological methods was applied that follows the selected format, including the hermeneutic method, the theoretical modeling method, and the method of constructing reflexive practices. The author puts forward the idea of the I-Other inner dialogue as an essential intrapersonal condition for the development of the I's self-identity. In the concept of self-identity, its "achievement" is emphasized as the way in which the I's tendency to maintain "self" meets the I's challenges to "part with self" and to gain self-identity on a new level. The specifics of the original approach consisted in identifying mutually necessary oppositions that determine the paradoxes of self-identity that are "removed" when it is achieved. These oppositions include: I and the Other, the Real Other and the Inner Other, the I's self-sufficiency and the need for dialogs with others, the attitude to self and the attitude to the Other, self-identity and disdentification of the I with itself, the Other's reflection and "viewpoint", and the I for itself and the I for the Other. The "idea of the opposition" was applied to propose a structure for a developing dialogue focused on the multidimensional reflective disclosure of the I in relation to the Other from the position of the I-myself and from the position of the Inner Other. It is substantiated that such a dialogue (fulfilled by a person) can enrich and strengthen the self-identity of the I through the problematization and synthesis of I-representations obtained from these standpoints. The author's idea was developed in the form of a continuum "hermeneutic model – theoretical model – reflexive model" that can be used in research and implementation of opportunities for the I's self-identity achievement in the inner dialogue.

Keywords: personology, culture, hermeneutics, model, paradox, personality, Self, Other, inner dialogue, self-identity, self-identity, self-identification, reflection.

[1] Doctor of Psychology, Professor, Head of the Center for Fundamental and Advisory Personology, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, National Research University Higher School of Economics, heletstaOS@yandex.ru

1. *The study of the I's self-identity from the standpoint of general personology*.

The study presented in this work has been conducted within the format of **general personology.** General personology was originated by V.A. Petrovsky[3] and E.B. Starovoytenko[4], two researchers from Higher School of Economics. According to this format, ideas on personality explicated from cultural sources (literary, philosophical and reflective texts) are used to develop new psychological concepts, methods of individual self-cognition and empirical approaches (Petrovsky, Starovoytenko, 2012; Petrovsky, 2013; Starovoytenko, 2015, 2018b). Therefore, the hermeneutic method, the theoretical modeling method, and the method of constructing reflexive practices for counselling and research were applied.

The method of constructing the study consisted in interpreting a number of outstanding philosophical and culturological **works** that possess profound references to *personality* that have failed to find a proper development in the psychology of personality. The interpretation was to substantiate and demonstrate the value and operationality of these works for the design of new psychological approaches to the study of personality.

Following **the hermeneutic tradition** (Gadamer, 1988; Ricoeur, 1995) in general personology written works are considered as a "spiritual tool", through which the researcher allows to awaken in themselves what the author talks about. Or to "commit one's own internal act", recreate "the equivalents of the author's states" (Mamardashvili, 1997). In practice this happens in the process of applying the hermeneutic approach (Gadamer, 1988; Ricoeur, 1995) that involves the researcher addressing the phenomena; understanding and interpreting the text as an important part of cultural experience; a dialogue with the author of the text; the researcher's reflection; comprehending the idea of the text, the development of new ideas and opinions; overcoming traditions; productivity and the extraction of meanings to guide further understanding and creativity of researchers; and gaining a "state of new spiritual freedom."

With regard to texts relevant to general personology, or "**personality texts**," we (following the ideas of W. Dilthey, M. Heidegger, J. P. Sartre, P. Ricoeur, and M. K. Mamardashvili) have outlined a number of **aspects of the hermeneutic approach** (Starovoytenko, 2015). This is an activity with a text that belongs to the category of philosophical, psychological, artistic, and reflexive works; this is the interpretation of a text that

---

[3] V.A. Petrovsky - psychologist, author of the conception of oversituation activity, of reflected subjectivity theory, of the models of personal abundance, of the model of personal dimensions of meanings

[4] E.B. Starovoytenko – psychologist, author of life relationships model, of the conception of cultural genesis of idea of "personality", of the models of the personology of life, of the models of the structure and genesis of I of the person, of the dialogical model of I-Other relationships.

is built as a study of a specific **problem of personality**; this is the development and application of an instrumental model to define the procedure for interpretation as a scientific creation; this is the use of various hermeneutic actions with the text; this is the identification of previously unknown text contents related to the research problem. This is the study of the author's experience as being a "practicing phenomenologist", i. e. a person who is able to discover and describe the key phenomena of a personality's life; this is the determination of the place of the text being studied in the continuum of other textual representations of 'personality' and of the problem being studied. This is an intersubjective position of the researcher that implies dialogues with other interpreters of the work; this is a dialogue with oneself as a "co-fulfiller" of the text; this is the researcher's correlation between their understanding of the text and other interpretations, the discovery of their commonality, contradictions and synthesis possibilities. This is the determination of the place of the hermeneutic search in cognition of personality and this is the researcher's development they fulfil based on the results of hermeneutics of conceptual, empirical, practical approaches to solving the problem.

The ideas, facts, extracted from the content of the works become the material for creating a **hermeneutical model** of the previously obtained knowledge on the subject that was problematized by the researcher. This model could the basis for a new **psychological theoretical model** of the subject and of the method to study it; the model would offer an original solution to the problem in the form of a concept, method, practice or their continuum.

Our work is aimed at presenting the results of a personological study of **the self-identity of the I in an inner dialogue with a significant Other**. The study was a continuation of the author's research on the possibilities and genesis of the I, as well as on the I-unknown, in relation to the I – Other, and on the dialogical or non-dialogic nature this attitude may acquire (Starovoytenko, 2013, 2016, 2017, 2018a; Starovoytenko, 2018). During the study of the I in the context of its dialogue with the Other, on the basis of its results, as well as when referring to the outstanding experiences of the existential and phenomenological disclosure of self-identity in personality, questions arose about the **conditions** for the maintenance and development of the self-identity of the I, about the role of inner dialogue as one of such conditions, and about the paradoxical necessity of finding the I in dialogue with the Other in order to gain self-identity. The author proposes this work in response to the questions.

The self-identity of the I, being one of the fundamental and most complex psychological problems, is studied mainly in the paradigm of 'identity' as the I gaining identity with the 'other', be that culture, society, a group, or specific people; to a lesser extent 'self-identity' is revealed as the ability of the I to coincide with itself, to be myself, to acknowledge itself, and to be identical with itself Andreeva, 2009; Belinskaya, 2018; Leontiev, 2009; Tkhostov,

4

Rasskazova 2012; Zaretsky, 2007; Gallagher, 1992; Jaromowic, 1998). In the field of problems pending there are such issues as the patterns of dynamics and of mutual transitions between identity and the self-identity of a person, as well as those life and personality **conditions** that not only contribute to the stability, multiplicity and unity of identifications of the I with itself, but constitute achieving self-identity, as the way where the tendency of the I to preserve 'itself' meets the challenges the I faces associated with the **disidentification with itself**, with self-change and the identification with self at new levels, in new capacities and properties.

The **self-identity of the I** in a modern, expanded cognitive context can be considered in many complementary **definitions**. In particular, it is the constancy of 'itself' in time the I is aware of. It is the experience of the I-myself being congruent to itself in acts of self-awareness; the opportunity realized by the I-myself to be itself; the changing constancy of self-attribution; the formation of the image of the "I-myself" for itself; the continuity of initiation and integration self-expressions in the central 'point' of the I-myself, etc.

The methods of hermeneutics and theoretical modeling have been applied to put forward and substantiate the idea of **the reflexive dialogue of the I–Other as an essential intrapersonal condition to achieve the self-identity of the I.** The understanding of the role of a dialogue in development of the I, self-consciousness and reflexivity is in line with the works of M.M. Bakhtin, H. Marcel, and H. Hermans (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001; Marcel, 2004; Hermans, 2001).

The specific features of our approach consisted in the identification and synthesis of multilateral relations between **oppositions** of the self-identity genesis. We followed the general scientific principle of analysis, correlation, identification of potential, synthesis of oppositions in the studied objects, which, however, has not find a proper application in personality psychology. Thus, the oppositions determine its **paradoxicality** and are in a relationship of mutual need, coordination, and 'removal' upon the achievement of the I's self-identity. These oppositions include: the I and the Other, the Real Other and the Inner Other, the self-sufficiency of the I and the need for dialogue with others, the attitude to oneself and the attitude to the Other, self-identity and disidentification of the I with itself, reflection and "viewpoint" of the Other, the "I" for itself and the "I" for the Other, variability and stability of the I. And although there are many reflexive expressions of the state of self-identity in culture and language that 'settle' the oppositions and resolve its paradoxes ("I feel I am my true self, when I am with You", "I feel Your viewpoint on me elevates me in my own eyes", "Only when changing, can I discover the unchanged in Myself", "In order to meet Myself, I have to part with myself", "Losing myself, I become myself", etc.), there is no holistic theoretical basis for the 'dialectic' of achieving self-identity.

The main result of the theoretical synthesis that we have undertaken was a **structural model** for a developing reflective dialogue oriented towards the multidimensional self-disclosure of the I in relation to the Other from the position of the I-myself and from the position of the Inner Other. We believe that such a dialogue can enrich, **resolve paradoxes** and enhance self-identity by problematizing, harmonizing and generalizing representations of the I obtained from these standpoints.

The author's idea was developed in the form of a continuum "hermeneutic model – theoretical model – reflexive model" that can be used in empirical research and practical implementation of the dynamics of self-identity in its conditioning by inner dialogue.

2. *The hermeneutic model for achieving the self-identity of the I.*

The main sources for the development of the current hermeneutical model were philosophical conceptions of personality presented in the works of the following authors: existential philosopher G. Marcel (Marcel, 2004); a representative of phenomenological and dialogical approaches E. Levinas (Levinas, 1998); a representative of hermeneutics and phenomenology P. Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 2008). As well as Russian researchers: a well-recognized M. M. Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001), the originator of a theory of dialogical consciousness and self-consciousness, and M. K. Mamardashvili (Mamardashvili, 1997), whose works significantly contributed to existential-phenomenological approach to personality.

The works of the mentioned above authors are characterized by the the in-depth development of ideas about the I of personality: about maintaining its integrity and constancy in time; about constructive and destructive disidentification of the I with itself; about the Significant Other as a factor of strengthening and problematizing the personality's self-identity. And about the inner dialogue with the Other in the form of personality appealing to the I represented in the Other, to the Other presented in the I, and to the Us constituted by real interactions with the Other; about the dialogical nature of maintaining self-identity; as well as about many specific conditions for achieving the self-identity of the I in its relation to the Other and to itself.

The researchers' ideas that are the most valuable in terms of personology, were explicated and supplemented by the results of our previous research, and **systematized** in the **hermeneutical model** that both reflected the oppositions, paradoxes, phenomena and possibilities of achieving the self-identity of the I, and generalized the existing **positions** in its studies.

1. The study of self-identity is focused on the **personality** that actively lives its life in the world. The personality's formation, variability, and dynamic stability is determined by the dual nature

of its being and essence, conflicts and the unity of the oppositions contained in them. A personality is "every one" among many others, and a unique individuality that cannot be compared with others; it is the owner of a body, as in common with all other people, and a unique body that cannot be repeated and passed on to others. It is the I, like all other Is, and the only one, my I-myself; it is the I for itself and the Other for all other people; it is the I-myself and the I as the Other for itself (Ricoeur, 2008); it is the I and the Inner Other in their representations in self-awareness.

2. Personality in the prospect of gaining self-identity is considered to be included in the process of the life realization of **value position** to the world, to the Other and to itself. "To live means to take a value position in every moment of life, to establish oneself value-wise" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 173). When occupying value positions, a personality is focused on maintaining and creating conditions for other people's fulfilling lives of and at the same time for the fulfillment of their own being. In the centuries-old retrospective and relevance of human life, these conditions are the presence of beauty; the search for truth; faith; love for people; the creation and improvement of things existent; a person's self-cognition and caring for themselves; the experience of happiness, meeting and co-being with the Other. This "valuable presence" of life is realized by a person through "semantic relations" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001), such as aesthetic, ethical, cognitive, creative, reflective, and dialogical relation.

The value of individual life is established in nature, society, culture, among others, in communication with a specific Other, in addressing oneself. In these multiple worlds, relations emerge as ways of the personality's active, conscious, and self-conditioned "value involvement". Through relationships, a personality masters and overcomes the boundaries of its worlds to acquire and multiply the valuable pillars of self-identity. This is especially true of the world from where the I can be most clearly seen, observed and thought about, the world of the significant Other (Mamardashvili, 1997).

3. The personality is examined as **the I** that implements relations and attains, loses and regains self-identity in the process of life. There are different **forms of the I** (Marcel, 2004; Bakhtin, 1986, 2001; Ricoeur, 2008; Mamardashvili, 1997), which, in our opinion, constitute the oppositions, paradoxicality and unity in the formation of self-identity.

- **the Empirical I**, or real, individual, physical, observable, acting, expressing itself in the world; the I that is "the self-experience and self-awareness of life, and therefore the life's self-expression as something whole that has its own unshakable boundaries, and these boundaries lie in relation to own external body" (Bakhtin, 2001, p. 109);

- **the Absolute I**, or supra-individual, subjectless, non-verbal, deep-down and topmost at the same time, that is not so much knowable rather than comprehensible. This is the "criterion of

evidence", the highest "criterion for the vitality of our states" (Mamardashvili, 1997), the core and foundation of self-identity, the unknown dimension of life, the intuition of "self" as an absolute, borderless being.

- **the I as the Other**, acting in several aspects of life: the I similar to all other Is; the I acting as the Other I for all other Is; the I reflecting the I of another person and having it as part of its own inner world; the I that has discovered its "Otherness" in comparison with itself;

- **the I as I-myself** that has separated itself in self-consciousness from the Other, others and from "itself" in the movement of its own life: the only, autonomous, creative for itself;

Physicality – Absoluteness – Otherness – Self of the I point to those 'layers' of a personality's life, where self-identity is established, loses stability, experiences changes and develops. In these 'layers' the I is in the states of "achieved" and "actual", "present" and "possible", as well as the I-known and the I-unknown to itself (Isaeva, 2013; Starovoytenko, 2018). Achieving the self-identity of the I involves the establishment, retention, flexible changes and the restoration of the unity between these states.

4. The role of a specific significant **Other** in the formation of the I's self-identity is taken into account. It is emphasized that the development of the I occurs in the explicit and implicit presence, in the sight and under the view of specific others, under the internal influence of their knowledge, experiences and ideas about it, when the I meets with others about general subjects of activity, when transferring to it methods, tools and products of practical actions.

The Other is an object of value, semantic relations of personality, it is their internal active 'subject', as well as a mediating principle in the personality's attitude to itself. Each relation and the I as its self-identity subject develop being enriched with a "value excess of vision", a "trans-gradual completion" from the Other (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001) and at the same time they are open for renewal from the part of the I.

The Other, in the context of attitudes toward the I and the I's attitudes towards it, is able to determine the following conditions of constancy and positive dynamics of the self-identity of the I: the I acquires the holistic knowledge of itself; the I creates an image of its physicality and appearance; the I has love and respect to itself; the I doubts the truth of self-knowledge; the I experiences the inner existence of the Unknown I; the I has the mindset for expansion and the integration of itself by engaging in new value relationships in the world with the participation of the Other.

Along with this, the I may have poor and rigid self-representations due to the Other's limited and repeating evaluations; the I may reject itself as a consequence of the Other's persistent emphasis of the I's negative properties; the I's own Double may be formed created by the Other that sometimes causes a drastic disidentification with itself.

5. The achievement of the self-identity of the I is investigated as a process and the result of an **attitude to itself**, in which the I is in some ways linked with the Other and is aware of itself as the 'Other' as a variable object of self-relationship. The Path to self-identity in an attitude to oneself means **many moments of experience** that focus on the I-myself (Levinas, 1998; Marcel, 2004; Mamardashvili, 1997): the experience of primordial loneliness; a feeling of coming out of oneself and returning to oneself; the recognition that "the I is inevitably the I-myself" (Mamardashvili, 1997, p. 44); confinement to oneself; a sense of being free to be oneself; the experience that "I have myself"; continuous co-being with oneself; being occupied with oneself; an awareness of being congruent to oneself; the comprehension of the 'limits of the I' in relation to the capabilities of other people; the discovery of one's individual destiny in the world.

Also we should add that it means staying in solitude; appealing to remembering, perceiving, representing, reflecting of 'self'; the feeling of the vitally continuous belonging of one's body to "this I" and belonging of one's I to "this body"; dialogue with oneself; the I-myself's acceptance and conscious integration of its 'shadow' in the experience of replenishing and transforming itself.

A special role in achieving self-identity belongs to the 'meaning' as the 'Other I' that is assumed by the personality in the future life to be a subjective opportunity and obligation, or the moment of "higher creative seriousness", "pure productivity" of the I (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001). The personality's activity that strives for meaning, or the Possible I (assuming productivity and continuity in others, responses and reciprocal contributions of others), in the movement to self-identity is both a way of necessary 'parting with oneself' and the potential of 'meeting oneself' in the new horizon.

6. The **risks** and **potentials** of the I are revealed when achieving self-identity in an attitude to oneself. The main risk, **and** at the same time the opportunity, on the path to self-identity, is the **disidentification of the I with itself**. This is a discrepancy between the I-myself and the I as an object of self-attitude, as an object of the attitude of the Other, as a subject of the relation to the Other, as a reflection in the inner world of the Other and as a reflection of itself in itself. This incongruity (found intuitively and reflexively), can result in the discovery and recognition of the I or its negative properties, unwanted conditions, its unacceptable desires, its unworthy deeds, self-destructive actions or, conversely, in the discovery of its true strengths, talents, new virtues, unrealized opportunities, and novel life conditions.

A number of **forms** of the disidentification of the I with itself are distinguished, which can have both a developing and a destructive perspective.

- Achieving self-identity in the direction of personality development is a path to oneself that implies meeting with a highly significant **Unknown I**, discovering its essence, setting a

creatively reflective task to fill the Known I, turning the previously unknown I into an active subject of conscious life. However, the Unknown I may be perceived as an area of "its irresistibility" for itself and for others, hence the protection of this "secret of own individuality" (Petrovsky, 2009).

- When achieving self-identity in relation to oneself, the experience of oneself as a "**stranger**" to oneself is inevitable (Levinas, 1998). The "gaping difference" of the I and oneself, the incongruence of something that used to be identical, the "internal disunity" of oneself sometimes requires personal appeal to other people who can verify the permanence of the I, and foster the vital connection of the divided, and the I coping with its conflicting parties.

- Also, in its movement towards self-identity, the I can 'be lost' in the **uncertainty of the future**, when the activity that has become the "place of the I's investment" can be completed beyond the far boundaries of the individual life, when the outcome of the case cannot be integrated by the personality into the history of its I. But the intention to "complete oneself" may become for the I the general **meaning** of the active extension of its life in the existence of the world, culture, and others, and turn into the foundations of self-identity.

- The discovery of **the best 'other I'** in the deepest layer of self-relation is the ultimate potential for the formation of self-identity (Mamardashvili, 1997). This discovery is experienced by the person as a breakthrough into the consciousness of its secret life ("I surprised myself"), as "a feeling of overwhelming joy, a feeling of another life, of another self" (Ibid., p. 49). This disidentification does not require overcoming, it causes a desire to keep one's "otherness", but not to dissolve in it; a desire to know it and experience oneself in a renewed existential image.

In relation to oneself, unconscious and conscious, secret and known sources of achieving self-identity, of meeting oneself "in the dark" and "in the light" are equivalent and can be connected. Such equivalence and connectedness cannot be replaced by anything else in the dynamics of congruence to and disidentification with oneself, in resolving their paradoxes.

7. The main **conditions** for achieving the self-identity of the I in an attitude to oneself are as follows:

- maintaining a connection between the I and the person's **body**: meeting and self-recognition in the world is an ontological event in which all the corporeality of a person is expressed (Bakhtin, 1986; 2001);

- the I accepts its fundamental **loneliness** as an unescapable human condition; the realization that "a real human connection is only possible between solitary people" (Mamardashvili, 1997, p. 152); the discovery of opportunities associated with being "in oneself", in **solitude**, protecting the uniqueness of oneself;

- the I entrust itself with **responsibility** for itself as an individuality whose depths are revealed only to itself;

- the establishment of a **reflexive connection** with itself as an internal relationship of the I-subject with its 'double', the I-object, the real I in the world; the doubling of being in "reflection that is far from serene" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001);

- the I's own active **actions** in situations that are always new, uncertain and challenging, the latter become events to affirm the I's sufficiency and independence in the world;

- **creativity**, or the I's productive output into the world; the return of the I to itself when the secrets of being are revealed and in creative achievements; the transition of the I from focusing on itself to a new self-realization in many of its capacities (Marcel, 2004);

- the I's **focus on the meaning**, or a holistic impulse of out-of-itself-toward-its-value; a full realization in this impulse; actions towards a valuable object; recognition by the world and other people of the I's personal contribution into its being; the enrichment of the I with the self-awareness of a fulfilled meaning;

- a **dialogue with oneself** as with "You," a dyadic relationship established consisting in the internal union of the I with itself; beyond the relationship the I "objectifies itself", threatening to destroy self-identity (Ibid.);

- gaining the **love of the Other**, which means the affirmation by the Other of the I's being as it is; the I's awareness of own existence as absolutely unique for the loving Other: "only I and no one else";

- the I committing **acts** of fulfilling its responsibility and obligations to the Other, in which the I experiences and becomes aware of loyalty to itself and the fullness of 'itself';

- the I's **contradictions** revealed in an attitude to itself; they are formed by many an opposition that require balancing, or exclusion, or synthesis by the I in order to maintain self-identity: the activity of self-awareness/weakness of self-awareness, congruence/incongruence of the person's knowledge of oneself and the others' knowledge of it, uniformity/discrepancy of self-esteem and evaluations by others; consistency/misalignment between the I's internal intentions to act and the nature of its external actions; unity/disunity in the internal vision of self, and the perception of self in external life; harmony/separation of the imaginary I and the real I, or the I-present and the I-possible;

- the identity of the I to itself; the I's 'parting' with itself and a new connection to itself is endowed to the personality in **general self-experience**: satisfaction – dissatisfaction with self, confidence – self-doubt, possibility – impossibility to be itself, joy – sadness of self-existence, comprehending – uncomprehending itself acceptance – rejection of self, choice – rejection of self.

8. The self-identity of the I is studied as achieved in the relation of **the I to the Other**: "No one can remain within themselves: a person's being a person and subjectivity is the ultimate responsibility for another person" (Levinas, 1998, p. 239). The individual's attitude to themselves and the achievement of self-identity in the context are impossible without being associated with relations to significant others. The attitude to a Significant Other in the process of formation and active realization by the I-Subject acquires many "value factors" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001) (aesthetic, ethical, intellectual, creative, reflective, and dialogical) to absorb the influence of many value relationships of the personality.

9. A number of **conditions** are identified that are essential for achieving the self-identity of the I in relation to the Other (Marcel, 2004; Levinas, 1998; Bakhtin 1986, 2001); in fact, these are the conditions for constructive resolution of the paradoxes of the mutual necessity between the I and the Other:

- the **reality** of the relationship that the I consciously, creatively, and actively enters, so that the Other's otherness does not absorb and suppress the I;

- the implementation of the **inter-subject connection** in order to cope with one's own existential loneliness and the Other's loneliness;

- the development of the richest **space of otherness**, of the world that is not the I;

- the union of the I with the Other on the basis of an **object** that is equally significant for both, and attracts the activity of each and their productive assistance;

- gaining **equal positions**: one for the other is the same as the other for the one; the experience of intimacy "without intermediaries"'; the I's amplification and strengthening through multidimensional unity with the Other in various "dimensions" of relation to the Other (Starovoytenko, 2013, 2017);

- the **outsidedness** of the I and the Other determined by situations of seeing each other, addressing to each other verbally, subject interaction with each other, and the reflection of external and internal co-presence in each other's lives (the I in the dimension *between-the I-and-the Other*);

- the I taking a **reflexive position** in interaction with the Other to illuminate itself and to 'shade' the reality with itself, which requires the I to immerse into the world of the real Other and return into itself, being 'penetrated' by its being (the I in the dimension *I-in-itself*);

- the I enters an **inner dialogue** with the Other as an event of creativity that excludes the power of the I and the Other, establishes the equality of their positions, affirms the value of any position of the I and the Other, and excludes the I identifying self with the Other and the Other with the I as such identification makes relations impossible (the I in the dimension *between-the I-and-the Other*);

- the I is immersed in the **Other's external and internal life**, it puts itself in the Other's place and views itself with the Other's eyes to be able to "dispel own obsession with itself for at least a few moments" (Marcel, 2004, p. 42); the discovery of 'self' in the world of the Other (the I in the dimension *I-in-the Other*);

- the I being aware of the presence of the Other **within itself**, not as an invasion from outside, but rather than as a significant inner reality, as "You" that deserves openness and trust (the I in *the Other-in-the I* dimension);

- the connection between the I and the Other, when it does not just cooperate or acts with the I in the world, but acts as an internal **interlocutor** (the I in *the Other-in-the I* dimension);

- the inner approach of the Other that happens to be in the I's circle of **responsibility**, and because of this, something already "goes beyond the limits of decisions freely made by the I" (Levinas, 1998), to weaken, but in the long term to strengthen its identity (the I in the dimension of **the Other-in-the I**);

- the I staying in the "You" otherness for the Other, not lost in it, not falling under its power, avoiding self-distortion, betrayal of self, alienness to self, enslavement to this other, and breaking the closeness with it; transfer of **responsibility** for itself **to the Other** that would allow it to take the place of the I and understand it as its significance (the I in the dimension of *I-in-the-Other*);

- the I returning to **itself**, connecting with self, overcoming the "failure of self" in the otherness of the Other (Ibid.) and coping with the "newness of self" in the acquired closeness to and reflection in the Other and the Other in self (the I in the dimension *I-in-itself*) ;

- the I's focus on the "**background behind its back**" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001) that is not directly accessible to it, but that shows it as a whole when perceived by the significant Other; equally the I's focus on those who stand "behind the Other" and form its ego-identity;

- value **reflections** of the I's attitude to the Other generalized by the I-in-itself in the life and consciousness of other people (the I in the dimension *I-in-the-world-with-Other*).

10. The self-identity of the I is studied as forming in the **reflexive dialogue** between the I and the Other or in self-cognition and articulating of 'self' in internal interaction with the Other, in its representation in the Other and its relative autonomy from the Other. Reflection enables the real significant Other to acquire the quality of a recognized "internal Other", a known "inner interlocutor", the necessary "my Other", dialogue with which becomes a "passionate meeting with oneself" (Mamardashvili, 1997). The reflective dialogue, being one of the forms of inner dialogue, is the most important way to achieve self-identity in unity with the Other and to become a **"dialogical I"** (Hermans, Kempen 1993; Hermans, 2001; Starovoytenko, 2017).

In the movement towards self-identity, the I cannot create itself, "become itself", "be born again", "condense into something whole" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001) only through its own

efforts. On this path, the external and internal connection of the Other is needed to significantly increase the degree of freedom for the I in manifesting itself, in showing its different sides to another person, in receiving feedback from them and an activity in response, in the synthesis of aspects of 'self' multiplied in interaction with the Other. In a reflexive dialogue with the Other and while implementing dialogical positions, the I can consider itself as already accomplished (achieved) and living in reality (present), and as self that is still ahead of self (possible). The I can occupy various positions in the inner dialogue in relation to self and the Other that strengthen its identity with self: "near", "opposite", "together", "between", "in the Other", "with the Other", "instead of the Other", "in itself", and "as the Other". The richness of these positions, as well as dialogical I-positions, allows the experience of self-identity to gain reflective supports that support it in situations of inevitable life changes of the I and the loss of its identity with itself.

The inner dialogue moving in the direction of the **development of self-identity** requires that the I enters the I-Other relationship as a relationship of "internal outsidedness and countersidedness" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001), and that the I is reflectively revealed in the dimensions "between-the I-and-the Other", "the I-in-the-Other", "Other-in-I", "the I-in-itself", and "the I-in-the-world-with-the-Other". The I is amplified by altering the multitude of mental, image-bearing and verbal **I-representations**; by discovering discrepancies or contradictions in the representations of the I and the representations of the Other in different dimensions; by finding and applying ways of the internal and external coordination and synthesis of these representations, resolving their contradictions and the removal of paradoxes in the reflexive path from a relative self-identity to the disidentification with self and to the newly achieved self-identity.

We believe that the strengthening of the I in the inner dialogue can acquire additional intensity via the reflection, not only from the **positions of the I**, but also from **the positions of the Inner Other** to give a greater volume to the dialogue that in each reflective dimension and in their totality receives the subtlety of the definition "for the I – "for the Other". Here self-identity and dialogicity of the I enter into mutually developing relationships: self-identity is fostered by the I acquiring dialogicity; dialogicity is possible for the self-identical I; in the moments of disidentification and loss of dialogicity the I acquires an impetus for a new movement towards self-identity and the realization of the potential of its dialogicity (Starovoytenko, 2017).

The self-identical, dialogical I affirms the existence of a significant Other by holding the Inner Other in the field of active awareness and experience, by adhering to and crossing the boundaries of various dimensions of the attitude towards it, by realizing its internal 'viewpoint' on itself, by returning to the real interaction with it in the world, by "inner-ing" it again, enriched

by the mutual contributions with the I, and by increasing the 'weight' of its productive presence in the I-myself.

11. Developing the idea that the reflexive dialogue of the I-myself with its Inner Other as an aspect of the I and at the same time with the Other as an autonomously existing personality reflects and includes **the variety of events** expressed in internal and external I-representations of the subjects of dialogue:

- the interaction between the I and the Other, the joint activity of bodies with their practical, communicative and aesthetic functions;

- the relation of one consciousness to another consciousness specifically as to another – a creative, productive event, "a new bearer, the only and irreversible" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001);

- experiences addressed to each other, which, occurring out of the I in the real Other, possess an "inner appearance" turned to the I that can be contemplated, and, while flowing in the I, appear to the Other as a message that it can read as the "external innerness";

- naming each other's names, inquiring of each other, waiting for each other's answers, significant statements addressed to each other, confirmations, doubts or denials of the other's words spoken about themselves;

- the realization by each other of their value positions that give rise to the meanings in the dialogue narrative that are engaged in the formation of the "forthcoming" life meaning of the I, the main call and challenge for its self-identity;

- the psyche forming into a self-identical I from the outside, by another body, by another consciousness, by the other's text, without which the inner life of the I cannot "be consolidated into some certainty", but is only a "fragmented subjectivity" (Bakhtin, 1986, 2001);

- the formation of 'reciprocity' through the transfer and activity of the image of the Other into the I, by the I discovering the irreplaceable nature of its life in the Other and for the Other, as well as by giving the evaluation of the Other as itself that for the I is equivalent to assessing itself as the Other (Ricoeur, 2008);

- the preservation of external and internal outsidedness in relation to the Other in order to appreciate its autonomy, integrity, and expansion of its boundaries that are well-marked. At the same time, the "confident and justified creation and processing of boundaries (external and internal) of another person and their world presuppose the strength and security of the position outside them, a position in which the subject can stay for a long time, possess all their forces and act freely..." (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 187), in other words, to experience their self-identity;

- understanding of the relativity of the "dialogue" between the I and the Other associated with the fact that "there is always a Third", i. e. others, society, culture that enable the I to realize its

value positions in unity and completeness, which requires to leave a specific dialogue and stand up above it in order to give it an abundant and productive quality as a new I-myself resource.

12. The self-identity of the I is studied in many **phenomena** of experiencing that arise in the experience of individual comprehension, naming and reflection of "coinciding with self" (Marcel, 2004; Levinas, 1998; Mamardashvili. 1997). These phenomena can indicate both self-identity that contributes to the development of the I, and self-identity blocking this development.

In the "attitude to self" and the "attitude to the Other", the phenomena of the **developing self-identity** include: a sense of self inside one's own life; the desire of the I to be that same I; the awareness of own autonomy; the need to be oneself; self-acceptance; consent with oneself; self-control; a sense of intimacy with self; self-respect; love to self; experiencing the potential of the I-unknown in itself; a sense of own continuity; confidence that one can rely on oneself; experiencing the constancy of self; self-satisfaction; self-management; having the meaning of one's own existence; experiencing oneself as the pillar of one's life; a feeling of overcoming one's "not yet being"; the desire to be one's own friend; abandonment of oneself in order to achieve a new I; a sense of the empowered I of the I's potential; experiencing the reality of one's own life; love to self in reflection of the love of the Other; the experience of finding oneself in recognizing the Other's talents; "running from the Other" in order to meet with self; the desire to become oneself, continuing the Other; the replenishment of self with conscious recognition and contributions from the Other; a sense of being in-Other; the discovery of one's I as the creation of the Other; creation of oneself.

Destructive self-identity is associated with the rigid ideas of the I about itself; with the denial of the existence of the I-unknown; with lack of curiosity, doubt and problematization in relation to oneself; with weak reflection; with the substitution of one's own knowledge of oneself with knowledge conveyed by others; with the idealization of oneself that does not allow binarity of one's own properties; and with emphasis on the I's dark sides that exclude a positive look at self. In this case, the phenomena of self-identity may be: self-absorption, isolation on oneself; self-captivity, self-filling, self-confidence; a sense of self-imposedness, self-containedness, self-obsession, and self-grandeur.

13. The achievement of self-identity is considered as a change of states of **congruence** to and **disidentification** with oneself. Disidentification can irreversibly violate the unity of the I-subject and I-object of consciousness; it can cause a complete loss of I-subjectness, the impenetrable boundaries formed between different forms of the I, the dissolution of the I in an external object of projective identification (Grotstein, 2017), the repression of the rejected part of the I. It can entail insurmountable discrepancies of own representations of the I with other people's ideas of

the I, attacks of consciousness on certain aspects of the I, alienation of the part of the I in another person, the denial of own negative properties and loss of self within life's perspective.

However, disidentification can also be a natural effect of a incongruence between the established and emerging properties of the I, a sign of the emergence of developing contradictions between the opposing sides of the I, the need to achieve self-identity. It can be an indicator of new aspects of the I emerging; a way of the I problematizing the achieved level of its development and finding ways to reach higher levels. Here, the disidentification becomes the condition for the transition of the I to a new stage in achieving self-identity and the potential contained in the paradoxes of self-identity.

In the general dynamics of self-identification, various forms of disidentification can be experienced in the **phenomena** of separation from oneself, forgetting oneself, not recognizing oneself, liberation from oneself, renunciation of oneself, struggle with oneself, impossibility to be oneself, non-reconnection with oneself, running away from oneself, withdrawal from oneself, losing oneself, discovering a "stranger self", and meeting oneself as other. The prevalence and subjective reliability of the experience of disidentifying with oneself allows researchers to reflect on the "illusory" and "seeming" qualities of the self-identical I.

The given hermeneutical model substantiates the **paradoxes** of mutual necessity, the equal value and the possibility of a developing synthesis with the oppositions: the I - the-Other, an attitude to self - attitude to the Other, the real Other - the inner Other, the I-in-myself - I-in-the-Other, identification - disidentification of the I with self, reflection from the standpoint of the I - from the standpoint of the Other, in the dialogical achievement of self-identity.

In our study this model finds refraction in **theoretical** and **reflexive** models of achieving the self-identity of the I in the inner dialogue. The conditions for the dialogical achievement of self-identity are highlighted, the structure of the reflexive dialogue is outlined and a model of reflexive practice is created the latter serving to maintain, problematize and resolve the paradoxes of the self-identity of the I.

3. Theoretical and reflexive models for achieving the self-identity of the I in the inner dialogue.

The models are constructed by **focusing the ideas** of the hermeneutic model that justify our approach to the study of the self-identity of the I.

Conditions for achieving the self-identity of the I

- A personality gains self-identity by realizing life relationships, in particular, the attitude to a specific significant Other. Among the many value aspects of this relationship, its reflective and dialogical nature is of great importance.

- A personality, when achieving self-identity in relation to the Other, acts as the I-myself that possesses a number of complementary forms, as the subject and object of self-relation in the context of the relationship to the Other, as the I being the result of a continuous life movement from the I-achieved to I-actual and from I-actual to I-possible. The necessary moments of the life's dynamics of self-identity are states of congruence to self and states of the disidentification of the I with itself in the context of external and internal relations to the Other.

- The inner dialogue of the I-Other as a way of realizing the relationship to the Other possesses significant possibilities for achieving the self-identity of the I and resolving its paradoxes. In this dialogue self-determination of I as a subject of the dialogue occurs, the I is 'borrowed' from the Other, the I masters the Inner Other and gains the authenticity in relative freedom from the Other; the Other is assumed to be a free subject of the dialogue within the "Us" and dependent on being reflected in the I.

- The I's attitude to the Other has a number of complementary dimensions also typical for the space of inner dialogue. These are dimensions between-I-and-Other, I-in-the-Other, Other-in-I, I-in-myself, I-in-the-world-with-the Other. The formation of the self-identity of the I can be facilitated by the reflexive amplification of the I through appealing to self and the representation of the I in each and all dimensions of the inner dialogue. This refers to the reflection of the I – between-I-and-Other, the I – I-in-the-Other, the I – Other-in-I, the I – I-in-myself, and the I – I-in-the-world-with-Other. The inner dialogue acquires the quality of being "reflective" to give rise to many an effect of self-cognition (**I-representations**) in various dimensions and to become the space for their synthesis.

- I-representations can be opposing on the grounds of knowing self – not knowing self, expression – lack of expression of certain forms of the I, high/low value saturation, positivity – negativity of self-experience, productivity – unproductivity, satisfaction - dissatisfaction with self in the aspect of intentions to self-change. The congruence, unity and consistency of the contents and qualitative characteristics of I-representations in different dimensions of the dialogue testify to the personality's orientation towards maintaining self-identity and resolving the paradoxes of its achievement.

- The possibilities of achieving self-identity in the reflexive dialogue of the I-Other can be multiplied by the implementation of reflective actions in different dimensions of the dialogue from the positions of I-myself and from the position of the Other, that is, through the generation

of binary I-representations "for the I" and "for the Other" and their integration. This is a way for the volume of dialogue to be enlarged or increased with a corresponding growth in the potential for strengthening and problematization of self-identity with the subsequent creative development of the I.

The structural model of binary I-representations in the dialogue

<div align="center">

I-Other

</div>

I-representations from the   *I-representations from the*

  standpoint of I-myself   *standpoint of the Other*

between-I-and-the-Other-for-I	----	between-the-I-and-the-Other-for-the-Other
I-in-the-Other-for-I	----	the-I-in-the-Other-for-the-Other
The Other-in-the-I-for-the-I	----	the-Other-in-the-I-for-the-Other
The-I-in-myself-for-the-I	----	the-I-in-myself-for-the-Other
The-I-in-the-world-with-the-Other-for-the-I	----	the-I-in-the-world-with-the-Other-for-the-Other

Based on the presented reflexive model of the dialogue I-Other, particular, complementary **reflective practices** can be designed that develop, trial and problematize the I's self-identity. They can actualize the reflection, experience and intuition addressed to certain dimensions of the inner dialogue. They are able to emphasize self-cognition from the perspective of I-myself or the Other, and appeal to different contents and qualitative characteristics of self-cognition. When they are used, the I can become an object and a subject that is revealed deeper and more deeply and realizes many internal actions, being their source. Opportunities are created for expanding the space of self-identity, where the fullness and unity of I-myself are constantly challenged by the I in its external and internal relation to the Other, to which the I responds by finding beautiful solutions to problems and overcoming the paradoxes of self-identity.

<div align="center">

Model of the reflective practice

</div>

Reflective practice can be oriented toward I-representations in an inner dialogue I-a close Other, in the dimension of I-in-the-Other, from the position of I-myself and from the position of the Other; the representations reveal knowing – not knowing self, satisfaction – dissatisfaction with self, productivity – unproductivity in self-change. The reflection is modeled in the form of a continuum of the I's questions to itself that cause verbal I-representations, including:

Is there a person in my life whom I can call my Closest Person? Who is he/she?

Do I have an experience in internal communication with him/her? Do I see my Closest Person as my constant internal interlocutor?

Am I experiencing my significance for my Closest Person, do I feel his/her attention to my inner life? Does he/she know and understand me?

What do I know about my Closest Person's thoughts and feelings toward me? What do I not know about this?

What, in the opinion of my Closest Person, do I know and do not know about his/her thoughts and feelings concerning me?

Am I satisfied with the idea of my Closest Person about me?

Am I, from the point of view of my Closest Person, with his/her ideas about me?

Do I succeed in changing my Closest Person's ideas about me?

Do I alter, in my Closest Person's view, his/her ideas about me?

Do I feel that I am true to myself in this inner communication with my Closest Person?

When answering the questions, I, for example, say that the Other sees in me extraordinary abilities and is confident that I can achieve a lot, but it seems to me an exaggeration. At the same time, I do not want him/her to think differently, and I shall try to look at myself as the Other sees me, having found support and incentive in myself for my own actions at a higher level.

In this case, the conflict is to be settled between the I-representations in the dimensions of the I-in-the-Other and I-in-myself, and the paradox of the need for the Other to strengthen the I is to be resolved in order to "be oneself" in a new way.

The presented model can be used as a part of a more complete model of reflection focused on individual self-cognition or an empirical study of self-identity.

Summarizing, we shall emphasize that the general personology format of studying self-identity enables (starting from the traditions of the research in philosophical culture) the discovery of new conceptual and methodological constructions in personality psychology. The reflective, dialogical practice of actualizing and achieving self-identity, proposed on the basis of hermeneutic and theoretical models, is aimed at expanding the I's possibilities for new encounters, for the search and discovery of self.

References

Andreeva, G. M. (2009) Lichnost' v poiskakh identichnosti v global'nom mire//Sotsial'naya psikhologiya segodnya: poiski i razmyshleniya [Personality in search of identity in the global world//Social Psychology Today: Search and Reflection]. M.: MPSI Publishing House.

Bakhtin, M. M. (2001) Avtor i geroy. K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk [The author and the hero. To the philosophical foundations of humanities]. SPb.: Azbuka.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva [Aesthetics of verbal creativity]. M.: Iskusstvo.

Belinskaya, E. P. (2018) Sovremennyye issledovaniya identichnosti: ot strukturnoy opredelennosti k protsessual'nosti i nezavershennosti [Modern studies of identity: from structural certainty to processuality and incompleteness]//Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Psikhologiya i pedagogika [Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Psychology and Pedagogy]. Vol. 8. Issue 1. P. 6–15.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1988) Istina i metod: osnovy filosofskoy germenevtik [The truth and the method: foundations of philosophical hermeneutics]. M.: Progress.

Grotstein, James S. (2017) Rasshchepleniye i proyektivnaya identifikatsiya. M.: Institut obshchegumanitarnykh issledovaniy [Splitting and projective identification]. M.: Institute for General Humanitarian Research.

Hermans, H. J. M. (2001). The dialogical Self: Toward a theory of personal and cultural positioning. // Culture and Psychology, *7*(3), P. 243–281.

Hermans, H. J. M. & Kempen, H. J. G. (1993). The dialogical Self: Meaning as movement. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Husserl, E. (1999) Idei k chistoy fenomenologii i fenomenologicheskoy filosofii [Ideas for pure phenomenology and phenomenological philosophy]. Vol. 1. M.: Dom intellektual'noy knigi [House of intellectual books].

Zaretsky, Yu. P. (2007) Samoidentifikatsiya ili "modelirovaniye Ya". Postklassicheskiy kontsept sub"yektivnosti v istoriografii//Sotsial'naya identichnost' srednevekovogo cheloveka [Self-identification or "modeling of the I". the postclassical concept of subjectivity in historiography//Social identity of a medieval person]. M.: Nauka.

Isaeva, A. N. (2013) Znayemoye i neznayemoye Ya v znachimoy zhiznennoy situatsii [The known and unknowable I in a significant life situation]//Mir psikhologii. Nauchno-metodicheskiy zhurnal [The World of Psychology. Scientific and Methodological Journal]. Vol. 74, # 2. P. 85–96.

Levinas, E. (1998) Vremya i Drugoy [Time and the Other]. SPb: Vysshaya religiozno-filosofskaya shkola [Higher religious and philosophical school]. St. Petersburg.

Leontiev, D. A. (2009) Labirint identichnostey: ne chelovek dlya identichnosti, a identichnost' dlya cheloveka [The labyrinth of identities: not a person for the identity, but the identity for a person]. Filosofskiye nauki [Philosophical sciences], # 10. P. 5–10.

Mamardashvili, M. K. (1997) Psikhologicheskaya topologiya puti [The psychological topology of the path]. (M. Prust «V poiskakh utrachennogo vremeni [M. Proust, In search of lost time]). SPb.: Russkiy Khristianskiy gumanitarnyy institut [Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute].

Marcel, G. (2004) Opyt konkretnoy filosofii M.: Respublika [An experience of concrete philosophy]. M.: Respublika.

Petrovsky, V. A. (2009) Individual'nost': samoregulyatsiya i sostoyatel'nost' [Individuality: self-regulation and possibleness]//In the book: Psikhologiya individual'nosti: novyye modeli i kontseptsii [Psychology of individuality: new models and concepts]/Scientific ed.: V. D. Shadrikov, E. B. Starovoytenko. M.: MPSI. P. 219–266.

Petrovsky, V. A. (2012) Ya v mysli i ya nayavu: kak vozmozhno sushchestvovaniye Ya? [The I in thought and the I in reality: how is the I's existence possible?]//In the book: Problema Ya: filosofskiye traditsii i sovremennost' [The Problem of the I: philosophical traditions and the present time]/Ed.: V. N. Porus. M.: Alpha-M. Ch. 2. P. 195–223.

Petrovsky, V. A. (2013). "Ya" v personologicheskoy perspektive [The I in the personological perspective]. M.: The Publishing House of the Higher School of Economics.

Petrovsky, V. A., & Starovoytenko, E. B. (2012). The science of personality: Four projects of general personology. *Psychology. Journal of Higher School of Economics, 9*(1), 21–39.

Ricoeur, P. (1995) Konflikt interpretatsiy: ocherki o germenevtike [Conflict of interpretation: essays on hermeneutics]. M.: Medium.

Ricoeur, P. (2008) Ya-sam kak drugoy [I-myself as the Other]. M.: Publishing house of humanitarian literature.

Tkhostov, A. Sh., Rasskazova, E. I. (2012) Identichnost' kak psikhologicheskiy konstrukt: vozmozhnosti i ogranicheniya mezhdistsiplinarnogo podkhoda [Identity as a psychological construct: possibilities and limitations of an interdisciplinary approach]//Psikhologicheskiye issledovaniya [Psychological research]. Vol. 5, # 26. P. 2.

Starovoytenko, E. B. (2016). Genez Ya v otnoshenii k Drugomu. Psikhologicheskiye issledovaniya lichnosti: istoriya, sovremennoye sostoyaniye, perspektivy [Genesis of the I in relation to the Other. Psychological studies of personality: history, current state, prospects]. Ed. M. I. Volovikova, A. L. Zhuravlev, N. E. Kharlamenkova. Moscow: Izd-vo "Institut psikhologii RAN" [Publishing house The Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences]. P. 117-135.

Starovoytenko, E. B. (2013) Dostizheniye sebya v otnoshenii k Drugomu [Achieving oneself in relation to the Other]//Mir psikhologii. Nauchno-metodicheskiy zhurnal [The World of Psychology. Scientific and Methodological Journal]. Vol. 74, # 2. P. 71–85.

Starovoytenko, E. B. (2015). Personologiya: zhizn' lichnosti v kul'ture [Personology: the individual's life in culture]. M.: Akademicheskiy proyekt [Academic project].

Starovoytenko, E. B. (2017). Produktivnost' dialogichnogo otnosheniya Ya - Drugoy [Productivity of the dialogical relation I-Other]// Psikhologiya. Zhurnal Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki [Psychology. Journal of Higher School of Economics]. Vol. 14. № 3. P. 408-432.

Starovoytenko, E. B. (2018) Ya-neizvestnoye v otnosheniyakh lichnosti k sebe i Drugomu [The I-Unknown in the person's relationship to themselves and to the Other]//Mir psikhologii. Nauchno-metodicheskiy zhurnal [The World of Psychology. Scientific and Methodological Journa], # 3. P. 35–49.

E. B. Starovoytenko, Doctor of Psychology, Professor, Head of the Center for Fundamental and Advisory Personology, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, National Research University Higher School of Economics, heletstaOS@yandex.ru