

Iryna Omelchenko

Institute of Special Pedagogy of the National Academy
of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv

ira210781@rambler.ru

The “I–the Other” (“I–the Other Self”) Relation in the Deliberated Communicative Activity Genesis

Stosunek „Ja–Inny” („Ja-Inny Ja”) w genezie uświadomionej działalności komunikatywnej

Summary: The article theoretically substantiates the phenomenology of the “I–the Other” (“I–the Other Self”) relation during formation of deliberated communicative activities. The theoretical and methodological approaches to interpret the communicative “I–the Other” relation as well as transformational potential of the Other for the deliberated communication genesis are defined. The article theoretically proves that any object of a person’s external or internal activities (another personified or impersonal person, an imaginary partner, the cultural Other) can become the Other in human interactions according to the inter-subjective psychological paradigm. The article reveals that this relation evolves into a more complex relationship during the said interactions and mutual penetration of I and objects: “I (the Other)–the Other (I)” and “I (the Other in me)–I (I in the Other)”. Moreover, the Other/Others are positioned not only as an ontological reality, but as epistemological and axiological determinacy.

Keywords: I; the Other; relation; consciousness; deliberated communicative activities; inter-subject; intra-subject; para-social communicative activities; reflection

INTRODUCTION

Studying communicative activities without considering the “Other” phenomenon in the modern information society and post-neo-culture is impossible. There is a risk of dissolving one’s own identity among countless opportunities actualized for a child during continuous communicative practices in not only direct but also indirect communications. Along with this, determination of a role of the Other in communication genesis and formation is an important step in understanding of deliberated communicative activity development.

Therefore, the purpose of this article is to determine the importance of communications with Others in social interactions for personal subjectivity development, for formation of the main vectors of the interactive space in the “I–the Other” mode. This determined purpose puts forward the following tasks: firstly, to review the scientific and philosophical conceptual and methodological approaches interpreting the “I–the Other” communicative relation; secondly, to define the transformation capacity of the Other in the genesis of deliberated communicative activities.

METHODS

Theoretical methods: formal logical analysis of various aspects of the problem, the deductive method, the axiomatic method, descent from the abstract to the concrete.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The “Other” category appeared firstly in the non-classical philosophic discourse. The first author who presented the “Other” category to the scientific community was J.-P. Sartre. This researcher, in his treatise *Being and Nothingness*, outlined the dialectic of subjective consciousness genesis through relationships with various Others, communicative experience with whom can be traumatic for a person¹. However, according to the German scientist B. Waldenfels, the origins of the “Other” category can be found in the ancient mythology and philosophy². J. Kristeva notes that a stranger, an outcast, and a woman are basic images of Others in the European culture³.

¹ Zh.P. Sartr, *Bytieinichto: Opyt fenomenologicheskoy ontologii*, Moskva 2000 [in Russian].

² B. Valdenfels, *Topohrafiia Chuzhoho: studii do fenomenolohii Chuzhoho*, Kyiv 2004 [in Ukrainian].

³ Iu. Kristeva, *Sami sobi chuzhi*, Kyiv 2004 [in Ukrainian].

The basic conceptual approaches to analysis of communicative relations have been developed in the Western philosophical and psychological theories, they are focused on the "I–the Other" relations. Thus, it is important to review these conceptual and methodological approaches.

The modern researchers unanimously emphasize the next conceptual and methodological approaches aimed at correct interpreting of the "I–the Other" communicative relation: *phenomenological existentialism*, which reveals the Other from the position of the Self and examines representations of the Other in self-experience (M. Heidegger, E. Husserl, M. Merleau-Ponty, J. Ortega y Gasset, J.-P. Sartre, M. Scheler, A. Schütz and others); *dialogical approach*, which understands these relations as an equal dialogue between two agents (M. Bakhtin, M. Buber, F. Ebner, E. Levinas, F. Rosenzweig, E. Rozenstok-Hyussi, C. Frank and others); *post-structuralism*, which analyzes the "Other" concept and specifies the Other as a structure that enables cognitive activities (R. Barth, G. Deleuze, J. Derrida, J. Kristeva, J. Lacan, V. Podoroga, M. Foucault and others); *hermeneutic approach*, which corresponds somewhat to the post-structuralist ideas and investigates the "Other" concept in the light of understanding, interpretation, communicative activities (H. Gadamer, V. Podoroga, P. Ricœur and others); *constructivism*, which is focused on the mechanisms of social and communicative simulations of the existence in "I–the Other" interactions (P. Berger, P. Watzlawick, T. Luckmann, A. Schütz and others); *transpersonal approach*, which is focused on a deep human Self in relationships with the Other (S. Grof, C. Nalimov, K. Wilber and others); *social-heterologous approach*, which reveal the "Self" and the "Other" from the perspective of the multi-agent sociality, through a prism of social communicative activities (V. Kemerov, T. Kerimov and others).

The psychoanalytic approach outlined directly an Other's role (A. Adler, E. Berne, J. Lakan, A. Freud, Z. Freud, E. Fromm, K. Horney, E. Erickson, and others). The followers of the object-relation theory also emphasized importance of the Other for communicative subjectivity development (J. Bowlby, D. Winnicott, M. Klein, H. Kohut, M. Mahler, R. Spitz, D. Stern, M. Ainsworth and others). Importance of the Other for communicative development is discussed briefly by many other psychological researchers (E. Berne, E. Erikson, R. Laing, J. Moreno, H. Sullivan, G. Mead, V. Kozlov, N. Peseschkian, etc.).

The essential aspects of understanding of the Other are also clarified in the following scientific psychological approaches: *activity* (O. Zaporozhets, V. Davydov, D. Elkonin and others); *subject-activity* (K. Abulkhanova, A. Brushlinskyy, S. Rubinstein and others); *humanitarian and anthropological* (E. Isaev, V. Slobodchikov and others); *system-subjective* (O. Sergienko and others);

subject-existential (Z. Ryabikina); *personological* (V. Petrovsky, O. Starovojtenko and others); *interdisciplinary* (E. Ryahuzova).

Multidimensionality of the “I–the Other” relation was interpreted and substantiated by S. Rubinstein in the category of “life relations”. According to his approach to a personality, he united psychology and ontology and accentuated presence of the Other in a person’s life. “Personality” is understood as an individual case from multitude, as one Other, for whom Others are a necessary condition of a person’s own life and who exists for him/herself only through his/her being for others. A personality incarnates “a collective agent”, “fraternity of agents”, many of common “We”. Self-determined through Others, a personality enters into deliberated “relationships” with them. Personality attitudes to the world and life are implemented in acts of consciousness, self-awareness, reflection, activities, self-activities, and the “I–the Other” relation is renewed continually. Any object of external or internal activities, and thing, person, characteristics, state, process can become the Other for a personality. During interactions and mutual penetrations, this relation evolves onto increasingly complex relationships, “I (the Other)–the Other (I)” and “I (the Other in me)–I (I in the Other)”. An individual life is determined by a growing power of the Other that is activated by generalisation of personal diverse interactions and positions. Due to intra-communications, a personality acquires the characteristics of an “agent” and has attitudes to one’s own life based on the unified Self at every moment “here and now”⁴.

The scientific issue of understanding by a personality of him/herself, or self-consciousness, was formulated by Rubinstein in the context of a relation between the Self and the Other. The scientist rightly noted that the “Self” is a person as a conscious being who understands the world, other people, him/herself⁵. Namely such a sequence of stages of personal knowledge about the Self is the most appropriate. According to Rubinstein, ideas about oneself are based on awareness of others, which leads to awareness of self, so the priority belongs, genetically, to another Self as a prerequisite of self-awareness.

Communicative relations with the Other have their specificity associated with a great importance of the Other as a partner and the Other similarity to Self to some extent. Under this condition, the Other can give a feedback and acts as a “face” (by A. Ukhtomsky). Therefore, attitudes to the Other can be different (acceptance, non-acceptance, love, hate, etc.), but the Other cannot be ignored (though it may be perceived like that from the external point of view) because

⁴ S.L. Rubinshtejn, *Osnovy obshhej psichologii*, Sankt-Peterburg 2000 [in Russian].

⁵ *Idem, Chelovek i mir Problemy obshhej psichologii*, Moskva 1973, p. 67 [in Russian].

interactions take place always and, thus, the emotional involvement into common activities becomes a major factor of an attitude to the Other.

Thus, self-recognition appears if a person acknowledges the existence of other people's consciousness through a projection of one's own qualities, states, motives, emotions and other individual and personal characteristics onto the existence, agents and objects of life.

Based on the above, the following aspects of deliberated communication with the Other are analysed: mental (which mental processes and states are used for communication implementation); deliberated (through which self-activities the communication is implemented); activity (what it produces for the world); effective (what it changes in the world); inter-personal (what it means for other people); reflective (what a person finds about him/herself during the communication); spiritual or axiological (which ideals, values and personal meanings the communication is directed on).

The first theoretical model of communication in the real-imaginary-symbolic order was presented in the structural psychoanalytical construct of J. Lacan⁶; this model, in his opinion, represents the main dimensions of a human psyche existence. The psychoanalyst determines the human psyche genesis based on the thesis that *Ego (moi)* is formed not on the base of the reality principle, but after a series of identifications, and imagination is a key function that structures *Ego (moi)* and creates an area of the imagined and a position of the Other.

The Imaginary order is formed at mastering a language by a child, the starting point of which is a so-called mirror stage. It is a formation that can be described as a place of creating by an agent of illusory ideas about him/herself; they are illusory in the sense that they hide the structural foundations. The Symbolic order is presented by the structural order of social exchanges; it describes an agent through that he/she posits for Others. The Real order can be defined as a repressed psychic experience⁷.

Thus, the Imaginary Other category according to Lacan's theory is interpreted as a source of illusory identity and alienated subjectivity; and an inter-subject attitude is estimated in the "Imaginary" register as contradicting, aggressive and intense one, representing the Self like the Other, and the Other as *alter ego*.

The issue of interaction with different types of the Other is important for scientific discourse presented at the object-relation theory, where internalized

⁶ Zh. Lakan, *Stadija zerkala kak formoobrazujushhaja funkciju Ja, kotoraja otkryvaetsja nam v psihoanaliticheskom opyte*, 1939, www.lacan.narod.ru [access: 10.10.2017] [in Russian].

⁷ *Ibidem*.

objects are understood as archetypes or complexes (C. Jung), internal objects, introjects (D. Winnicott, M. Klein), illusory Others (J. Greenberg, S. Mitchell), personalization (H. Sullivan, P. Hayman), aspects of the representative world (E. Jacobson).

H. Sullivan, an American psychologist, posits in his studies not only direct communications with a real Other but also indirect communications with an imaginary Other, he understands real or imaginary interpersonal relations as key determinants of children's mental development and a personality as a hypothetical construct that is the product of such interactions. According to the researcher, if the need for communication is not fully satisfied, children often invent imaginary friends (imaginary playmates), which may be as important for them as actually existing people. Such imaginary friends are a form of idol personifications (eidetic personifications)⁸.

So, the "I–the Other" relation takes place in the real, imaginary and symbolic spaces. The idol personification is not unique only for children, inventing non-existing people or traits to protect their self-esteem. Most adults tend to attribute traits to the people around them that the people do not have in reality, which frequently causes conflicts in interpersonal interactions, when people are assigned with imaginary traits.

In the context of the object-relation theory, psyche is a result of a person's relationships with the outside world and is understood as a system of attitudes. Other people as well as internal mental representations can become an object; these representations are constructed on the basis of these relationships, which, in turn, are closely related to the person's perception of him/herself. So, due to existing internalized object relations, the person experiences him/herself as a whole. Moreover, this theory determines unambiguously the object-relation development: from the symbiotic stage, when an object and an agent are merged without differentiation, to the stage of decoupling and achievement of individualized states, providing complete separation of the agent Self from the object.

The personologists, as representatives of the new trend of the modern psychology of personality⁹ examine communicative activities, emphasizing Self and capacities to interact with the Other.

⁸ G. Sallivan, *Interpersonalnaja teorija v psichiatirii*, Sankt-Peterburg 1999 [in Russian].

⁹ V.A. Petrovskij, *Nachala personologii «Ja»: sushhestvuet li ee predmet? Stil myshlenija: problema istoricheskogo edinstva nauchnogo znaniya. K 80-letiju V.P. Zinchenko*, Moskva 2011, pp. 200–215 [in Russian]; *idem*, *Princip otrazhennoj subektnosti v psihologicheskom issledovanii*, «Vopr. psihol.» 1985, № 1, pp. 17–30 [in Russian]; E.B. Starovojtenko, *Vozmozhnosti Ja v otnoshenii k drugomu: germenentika i refleksija* «Psichologija. Zhurnal Vysšej shkoly jekonomiki» 2013, № 10, pp. 121–142 [in Russian].

The Other has a conscious and unconscious subjectivity, therefore, is able to initiate an activity of the Self. The Other is a co-author of self-consciousness, personal life history, and also serves as a personal world, a space of "reflected subjectivity"¹⁰.

Based on the scientific ideas of M. Bakhtin and M. Heidegger, O. Starovoitenko offers a three-dimensional topology of statement understanding that covers the spaces: "between I and the Other", "I in the Other", "the Other in me". At this path, reflection helps implement an intention to speak, and a dialogue means an exchange of statements between the Self and the Other that takes place in the three-dimensional life spaces of each communicative participant. The optimal condition for the development of relations between the Self and the Other is a dialogue with the Other and with the Self. The valuable effect of the statements is generated provided reflecting over different dialogical positions¹¹.

So, in accordance with the personological approach, deliberated communicative activities are implemented in the reflexive spaces: "between I and the Other", "I in the Other", "Other in me", an external and internal dialogue is a prerequisite of such interactions; mastering of different types of communication: inter-subject, intra-subject and para-social is needed for it.

Understanding of deliberated communicative activities is possible with analyzes of different types of interactions (inter-subject, intra-subject and para-social) within the "I–the Other" relations. Knowledge of a person about his/her Self and vision of this Self in another person are never equal. Namely, this idea, determined by V. Petrovsky, stands as one of the conditions of personal development¹².

However, the modern studies performed by S.V. Berezin and N.A. Evchenko¹³, and T. Kerimov¹⁴ advocated an alternative point of view. As for the aspect discussed here, S. Berezin and N. Evchenko¹⁵ point out that this approach is true for the situations when a source of the returned reflection is not an objectively existing "significant Other", but an agent him/herself staying at the position of the Other¹⁶. So, the "reflected subjectivity" phenomenon is transferred from

¹⁰ V.A. Petrovskij, *Nachala personologii...*, pp. 200–215.

¹¹ E.B. Starovoitenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 121–142.

¹² V.A. Petrovskij, *Nachala personologii...*, pp. 200–215; *idem*, *Princip otrazhennoj subektnosti...*, pp. 17–30.

¹³ S.V. Berezin, N.A. Evchenko, *Issledovanie processa otrazhenija subekta v sisteme «Ja-Drugoj Ja»*, «Vestnik SamGU» 2012, № 3/2(94) [in Russian].

¹⁴ T.H. Kerimov, *Gumanitarizacija obshchestvennaja i problema Drugoj v prostranstve komunikacii: sbornik nauchnyh statej*, Kazan 2007 [in Russian].

¹⁵ S.V. Berezin, N.A. Evchenko, *op. cit.*

¹⁶ G. Sullivan, *op. cit.*

the inter-subject relation area to the intra-subject one, from the “I–the Other” system to the “I–the Other Self” paradigm. That is why the ability to personalize and interpret a reflected subjectivity is formed at the early ontogeny stages; then a child creates independently inner images of significant Others or reflects his/her own subjectivity as the Other Self, and, consequently, the mechanism of self-development is launched.

Staying at the similar positions, T.H. Kerimov, a specialist in social heterology, concludes that the other focus of the “I–the Other” relation is a prevalence, surplus of the Self, and any external assessment is refracted through such a prism. The researcher proves impossibility to understand the Other, inability to achieve such a degree of transcending beyond the Self when a merge with the Other is possible¹⁷.

So, no matter which position is used (a prevalence of the Self or the Other in self-perception), the Other and the Other Self can be understood as synonyms, despite the fact that the Self and the Other remain autonomous. In the first case, an agent creates an inner image of the Other, evaluates and perceives him/herself on the basis of this introjection (including the Other Self). In the second one, unable to obtain reliable external information about him/herself, but badly in need of feedback, an agent him/herself becomes its author from the position of the Other Self.

I.H. Titov¹⁸ has made interesting conclusions based on scientific ideas of O.L. Kononko¹⁹, V. Slobodchikov (1995), V. Tatenko (1996), D. Feldstein (1994) about the role of the subjective Other in the evolution of deliberated communicative activities as a holistic combination of agent-active, meaning and reflective functions. The researcher notes that presence of the subjective Other (a real or imaginary companion) in the context of gaming, communicative and other interactions can help a person understand him/herself as an agent of his/her own spiritual life. Being aware of the own Self among Others, a child tends to put him/herself to the other person's place, to elaborate reflective decentration, to look at the world and him/herself “through another person's eyes”, to determine this person from the axiological point of view, and this process is always linked to imagination²⁰.

¹⁷ T.H. Kerimov, *op. cit.*, pp. 7–21 [in Russian].

¹⁸ I.H. Titov, *Psyhholohichni osoblyvosti subiektynosti dytyny doshkilnoho viku*, «Psyhholohiia i osobystist» 2016, № 2(10), part 1 [in Ukrainian].

¹⁹ O.L. Kononko, *Psyhholohichni osnovy osobystisnoho stanovlennia doshkilnyka*, Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis. Akad. ped. nauk Ukrainy, In-t psyhholohii im. H.S. Kostiuksa, Kyiv 2001 [in Ukrainian].

²⁰ I.H. Titov, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

Thus, at the meaning level of communication, a child, as an agent of various types of interactions – inter-subject, intra-subject, para-social – views his/herself with help of assessing judgments of the subjective Other, represented imaginary in the subjective space; that allows the child to discover, experience and understand his/her own Self. At the reflexive level of communication, the regulatory function of interactions is implemented when a preschooler becomes able to anticipate own actions and actions of the Other, to reveal meanings (especially in controversial and uncertain social and communicative situations), feelings of the Other. The regulatory communicative function is supported by full mastering of symbolic methods for mediation and by the ability to integrate these methods into an emotional-perceptive complex of self-regulation during creation of an attitude to a situation or a person.

The role of the Other in the preschooler's communicative and personal life genesis is outlined by O.L. Kononko. The psychologist shows that a preschooler with adults' help unfolds his/her personal life via various activities during holistic interaction with the world. The fixed "I am in the world" position reflects a child's commitment to his/her own needs and opportunities and, at the same time, to demands from child's environment. The psychologist's study shows that preschooler's personal development is characterized by a combination of two important and oppositely directed trends – socialization and individualization, the balance of which guaranties child's communicative competence. However, a preschooler's personal being cannot be closed on the preschooler him/herself; it is a form of coexistence with adults and peers and is determined by the dialogical nature of the Self. An opportunity to appeal to someone, to meet another position, to accept or reject it is the integral aspect of preschooler's communicative and personal development²¹.

Based on the above, the socialization is implemented through inter-subject interactions with Others, and the individualization is done through intra-subject ones; para-social relationships are a special type of communication in the modern network society that are the synthesis of outwardly- and inwardly-directed activities and are simulated not only in the virtual space, but transferred to the chronotope of child's interaction with respected adults and reference peers.

It may be noted within such conceptual vision that detailed written speech in the structure of communicative acts is disappearing in the information society. The text is being displaced with technically sophisticated images. Accordingly, the importance of non-verbal communicative methods is dramatically increasing. The audio range, intonation, movement plastic, breathing rhythm, etc.

²¹ O.L. Kononko, *op. cit.*

determine the content of child's social and personal formation. Correlation between operative (acting) and value (observing) consciousness is becoming more systematically mediated.

Thus, meanings and contexts of communicative activities with the Other in the information society are grouped in another space – the audio, kinaesthetic and “videogame” space²², displacing the semiosphere²³.

We agree with the post-non-classical interpretation of deliberated and meaningful communicative activities at the level of interactions and relationships with Others in the information society proposed by E.V. Rjaguzova²⁴. Based on E.B. Starovoitenko's scientific ideas, the author argues that the value foundations of co-existence with the Other in the modern world are being changed, so, it is important to study the phenomenology of inter-subject “I and the Other” communication activities, where the role of the Other can be played by any object of personal external or internal activities (another personified or impersonal person, an imaginary partner, the cultural Other); and, in the course of these interactions and mutual penetrations, the Self and the activity objects, existing relations evolve into more complex relations, “I (the Other)–the Other (I)” and “I (the Other in me)–I (I in the Other)”. Thus, the Other/Others are positioned not only as an ontological given, but as epistemological and axiological determinacy²⁵.

Proposing such scientific substantiation of the studies of communicative activities of preschoolers having typical development and developmental delay, we believe that it is necessary to use the typology of personal representations of “I–the Other” interactions substantiated by Rjaguzova. The researcher, in fact, singled out the subject-spatial modes of existence of the Other in the structure of deliberated and meaningful communicative activities: “I–the Other in society (the real Other)”, “I–the Other in culture (the symbolic Other)” and “I–the Other as a part of me (the personalized Other)”²⁶.

Thus, such understanding of communicative activities shows that a person, in co-existence with the Other, not only reveals and makes closer the world but also he/she perceives it and Others, cognizes him/herself, assimilates and

²² V.A. Shkuratov, *Fazy paradigmy (jeskiz psihologo-istoricheskoj jepistemologii)*, Ch. 2, «Rossijskij psihologicheskij zhurnal» 2007, № 4(3), pp. 35–48 [in Russian].

²³ I.M. Omelchenko, *Operationalization of the study of the “chronotope of communication activities of children with developmental delay” concept*, “TILTAI/BRIDGES/ BRÜCKEN” 2015, vol. 72(3), pp. 105–118 [in English].

²⁴ E.V. Rjaguzova, *Socialnaja psihologija reprezentacij vzaimodejstvija «Ja-Drugoj»*. Saratov, [b.i.], 2014, http://elibrary.sgu.ru/uch_lit/844.pdf [access: 10.10.2017] [in Russian].

²⁵ E.B. Starovoitenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 121–142.

²⁶ E.V. Rjaguzova, *op. cit.*

appropriates the norms, values and conventions of the society where he/she lives, builds a common interpersonal space where the Other is needed in order to know and understand all life structures.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the above, we believe that it is necessary to distinguish the following modes of interaction with another agent in the structure of the deliberate communication characteristic for the information society: "I–the Other in society (the real Other)", "I–the Other in culture (the symbolic Other)", and "I–the Other as a part of me (the personalized Other)". In this case, adults and peers can become a real Other, a favourite toy or an imaginary companion plays as a personalized Other, and a symbolic Other appears in preschooler's interactions with animated characters²⁷. Communication with adults and peers means inter-subject communicative activities, one with a favourite toy or an imaginary companion does as intra-subject communicative activities, communication with animated characters is a kind of para-social communicative activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berezin S.V., Evchenko N.A., *Issledovanie processa otrazhenija subekta v sisteme «Ja-Drugoj Ja»*, «Vestnik SamGU» 2012, № 3/2(94) [in Russian].
- Kerimov T.H., *Gumanitarizacija obshhestvoznaniija i problema Drugoj v prostranstve kommunikacii: sbornik nauchnyh statej*, Kazan 2007 [in Russian].
- Kononko O.L., *Psykhologichni osnovy osobystisnoho stanovlennia doshkilnyka*, Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis. Akad. ped. nauk Ukrainy, In-t psykhologii im. H.S. Kostiuka, Kyiv 2001 [in Ukrainian].
- Kristeva Iu., *Sami sobi chuzhi*, Kyiv 2004 [in Ukrainian].
- Lacan Zh., *Stadija zerkala kak formoobrazujushhaja funkciju Ja, kotoraja otkryvaetsja nam v psihoanaliticheskom opyte*, 1939, www.lacan.narod.ru [access: 10.10.2017] [in Russian].
- Lotman Ju.M., *Semiosfera. Kultura i vzryv. Vnutri mysljashhiv mirov. Stati. Issledovanija. Zametki (1968–1992)*, Sankt-Peterburg 2010 [in Russian].

²⁷ I.M. Omelchenko, *Sutnisni modusy katehorii «komunikatyvna diialnist» u dyskursi postneklasychnoi psykhologii*, «Psykhologii i osobystist» 2017, № 1(11), pp. 25–40 [in Ukrainian]; *eadem*, *Prostir intrasubiektnoi komunikatyvnoi diialnosti z Inshym doshkilnykiv iz zatrymkoiu psykhichnoho rozvytku: operatsionalizatsiia kontseptu doslidzhennia*, «Aktualni problemy pedahohiky, psykhologii ta profesiinoi osvity» 2016, № 1, <http://journals.uran.ua/apppfo/article/view/73083/68406> [access: 10.10.2017]; *eadem*, *Operationalization...*, pp. 105–118.

- Omelchenko I.M., *Operationalization of the study of the "chronotope of communication activities of children with developmental delay" concept*, "TILTAI/BRIDGES/BRÜCKEN" 2015, vol. 72(3) [in English].
- Omelchenko I.M., *Prostir intrasubiektnoi komunikatyvnoi diialnosti z Inshym doshkilnykiv iz zatrymkoiu psykhhichnoho rozvytku: operatsionalizatsiia kontseptu doslidzhennia*, «Aktualni problemy pedahohiky, psykholohii ta profesiinoi osvity» 2016, № 1, <http://journals.uran.ua/appf/article/view/73083/68406> [access: 10.10.2017].
- Omelchenko I.M., *Sutnisni modusy katehorii «komunikatyvna diialnist» u dyskursi postneklasychnoi psykholohii*, «Psykholohiia i osobystist» 2017, № 1(11) [in Ukrainian].
- Petrovskij V.A., *Nachala personologii «Ja»: sushhestvuet li ee predmet? Stil myshlenija: problema istoricheskogo edinstva nauchnogo znanija. K 80-letiju V.P. Zinchenko*, Moskva 2011 [in Russian].
- Petrovskij V.A., *Princip otrazhennoj subektnosti v psihologicheskom issledovanii*, «Vopr. psihol.» 1985, № 1 [in Russian].
- Rjaguzova E.V., *Socialnaja psihologija reprezentacij vzaimodejstvija «Ja-Drugoj»*. Saratov, [b.i.], 2014, http://elibrary.sgu.ru/uch_lit/844.pdf [access: 10.10.2017] [in Russian].
- Rubinshtejn S.L., *Chelovek i mir Problemy obshhej psihologii*, Moskva 1973 [in Russian].
- Rubinshtejn S.L., *Osnovy obshhej psihologii*, Sankt-Peterburg 2000 [in Russian].
- Sullivan G.S., *Interpersonalnaja teorija v psihiatrii*, Sankt-Peterburg 1999 [in Russian].
- Sartr Zh.P., *Bytieinichto: Opyt fenomenologicheskoi ontologii*, Moskva 2000 [in Russian].
- Shkuratov V.A., *Fazy paradigmy (jeskiz psihologo-istoricheskoi jepistemologii)*, Ch. 2, «Rossijskij psihologicheskij zhurnal» 2007, № 4(3) [in Russian].
- Starovojtenko E.B., *Vozmozhnosti Ja v otnoshenii k drugomu: germenevtika i refleksija «Psihologija. Zhurnal Vysshej shkoly jekonomiki»* 2013, № 10 [in Russian].
- Titov I.H., *Psykholohichni osoblyvosti subiektnosti dytyny doshkilnoho viku*, «Psykholohiia i osobystist» 2016, № 2(10) [in Ukrainian].
- Valdenfels B., *Topohrafiia Chuzhoho: studii do fenomenolohii Chuzhoho*, Kyiv 2004 [in Ukrainian].

Streszczenie: W artykule teoretycznie uzasadniono fenomenologię stosunku „Ja-Inny” („Ja-Inny Ja”) w kształtowaniu uświadomionej działalności komunikatywnej. Określono teoretyczne i metodologiczne podejścia do interpretacji stosunku komunikatywnego „Ja-Inny” i transformacyjny potencjał „Innego” w genezie uświadomionej działalności komunikatywnej. Teoretycznie uzasadniono, że w systemie intersubiektywnego paradygmatu poznania psychologicznego i interakcji ludzi w roli „Innego” może być dowolny obiekt zewnętrznej lub wewnętrznej aktywności osobowości (zindywidualizowany czy bezosobowy inny człowiek, wyimaginowany partner, „Inny” w kulturze). Ujawniono, że w trakcie określonego współdziałania i wzajemnego przenikania „Ja” i obiektów aktywności ten związek ewoluuje w bardziej skomplikowane relacje „Ja (Inna)-Inne (Ja)” i „Ja (Inne w Ja)-Ja (Ja w Innym)”. „Inny”/„Inne” przy tym pozycjonowane są nie tylko jako pewnik ontologiczny, ale też jako pewność epistemologiczna i aksjologiczna.

Słowa kluczowe: „Ja-Inny”; stosunek; świadomość; uświadomiona działalność komunikacyjna; intersubiektywna i paraspołeczna działalność komunikacyjna; refleksja