

**Balakina A.A.**

## Features of the relation to other of inhabitants of the megacity, largest and small cities

*The article analyzes the types and parameters of the relation to another among the inhabitants of metropolis, largest and small cities (Moscow, Rostov-on-Don and Creamsc). This article contains an introduction to the problem of studying the relations within the urban community, the problem of the relationship type of urban space with the content and structure with respect to another, and the presentation of the dissertation conducted study of the factors of spatial relations to other of the residents of the metropolis, the largest and small towns. The results of this study confirm the hypothesis about the presence of the differences in the parameters and types of relations to other residents of the metropolis, the largest and small towns.*

**Key words:** attitude to the other, generalized other, the concrete other, types of relationships, social and psychological needs, unconscious of another.

Man's relationship with other people is a prerequisite for human development, is formed from the moment of his birth and affects the formation of relationships in general [9, 11]. In psychology, decided to allocate four groups of factors that mediate the emergence and dynamics of the relationship between the individual (to himself, to another, to the world) [16]. The first group of factors include the factors that determine the formation and development of human relationships in ontogeny. The second group factors of the formation and development of relations, called in the literature of "personality" factors to which scholars, includes such components of the system of human relations, as the ratio of self and relationship to generalized others [9, 11, 16]. The third type of factors (so-called "group" factors) includes the processes of group dynamics. a fourth group of factors includes the time factor, the factor of spatial proximity, cultural and historical factors and a factor such as "life event". This group of factors in psychology is called as "external determination" that emphasizes that the dynamics of relationships depend of the subject of a number of variables. Recently, researchers have considered that spatial organization of environment is an important factor in the formation of relations (VT Shimko, 2006, EV Saiko, 20001, R. Sennett, 2002, VL Glazychev, 2007, A. Zhelnina, 2005, etc.). The need to study this problem is due to actual changes in the social interaction in modern society, the transformation of social relations of the subject. The mutual dependence of spatial aspects of the social process to date has been reflected in numerous foreign (K. Lynch, R. Sennett, C. Trowbridge, MA Heydmets, G. Feeling, K. Auer, etc.) and domestic-related research studying various aspects of human life in urban space (VL Glazychev, M. Shimko, M. J. Chernoushek, M. Crump, BG Ananiev, A. Florensky, N. Nechaev and others). Recently, more and more scientists are turning to the study of socio-cultural aspects of the processes of social interaction in an ur-



ban environment. Complicated by the content of research aimed at understanding the spatio-temporal parameters of the behavioral aspects of relationships. In the works of N. Shmatko, JL Kachanov, AP Lyusy, AJ Zavalishina, EV Morozova, K. Puning, M. Romashov, IS Samoshkin indicated a close interconnection between social interaction, the characteristics of their social behavior and the phenomenon of territorial identity. In studies of S. Milgram, B. Glazycheva, IV Tuliganova, K. Maslinskogo, EV Kurylenko and others stressed the interdependence and interrelation of image and relations of the individual: to another general, his interpersonal relationships, his relationship to the city [3, 5, 8, 10, 14]. However, despite the variety of available studies to date, territorial and spatial organization of the urban environment as a factor affecting the integrity types and parameters related to others to explore enough. Meanwhile, on the basis of the above works, we can assert that the types and parameters of relation to the other of resident of the city related to the spatial parameters of the urban environment, and suggest that this relationship is mediated by the type of city.

In this paper, we refer to such a geographically-spatial parameters of the urban environment as the scale of the city, population density, zoning, design, the central / peripheral, a set which allows differentiation of different levels [2, 5, 15].

Thus, the purpose of our dissertation research is to: a comparative study and description of the types and parameters relation to other of the residents of the metropolis, the largest and small towns.

This paper presents the results of a comparative analysis of parameters of the relation to the other of the inhabitants of three cities: Moscow, Rostov-on-Don and Krymsk, which have different territorial and spatial parameters. We followed by the definition of relations, VN Myasishchev, J. Sartre, LY Gozman, and studied two types of relation to another: the generalized other and concrete Other. Relevant to the specific and generalized others were studied in the conscious and unconscious levels, at the level of expression of the desired behavior and attitudes of others.

In our study, was attended by 120 residents of Moscow, 100 residents of Rostov-on-Don, and 100 residents Krymsk in age from 21 to 37 years living in various parts of these cities. Methods: «Questionnaire interpersonal relations» W. Schutz, block techniques, diagnose different kinds of relationships with other people (the scale" taking others' Feyya "scale hostility" Cook-Medley, "the scale of good will," Campbell's "scale of confidence," Rosenberg "scale manipulative relationship, "Banta), adapted from Y. Mendzheritskoy; questionnaire interpersonal T. Leary, color test against M. Etkind.

To detect significant differences in the types, parameters of relation to another and the relationship to the city was made a comparative analysis of data using the H – theta by the method of Kruskal and Wallis.

Table number 1 shows the results of comparative analysis of the modalities of relations.



Table 1

**Indicators of significant differences in the modalities of the relationship to the generalized other**

Nº	Modality	level of significance	average rank 1 group (Moscow)	average rank 2g (Rostov)	average rank of 3 g (Crimea)
1	Acceptance	0,001	158,95	169,99	125,74
2	Goodwill	0,000	184,35	157,65	108,29
3	Trust	0,014	158,76	165,79	131,92
4	Hostile relation	0,000	182,56	111,75	153,67
5	Manipulative attitude	0,007	170,40	132,46	148,46

According to the reported data in its most significant differences of the mentioned types of relationships (see Methods) were obtained on such modalities as acceptance, kindness, trust, hostile relation (cynicism), manipulative attitude.

Kindness, hostility (cynicism) and manipulative attitude is more pronounced among respondents in Moscow. The residents of Rostov-on-Don is dominated by indicators of the level of acceptance and trust.

Table № 2 shows the results of comparative analysis of major social and psychological needs in a relationship, as dealing with the following: the need for love, inclusion and control, each of which was seen at the expression level and the required behavior.

Table 2

**Indicators of significant differences in basic interpersonal needs in a relationship**

num p / n	parameter	level of significance	average rank 1 group (Moscow)	average rank 2g (Rostov)	average rank of 3 g (Crimea)
C(e)	Consumed in the control	0,044	167,96	136,72	135,89
A(e)	Consumed the in love	0,028	153,00	160,35	130,11
A(w)	Consumed the in love	0,004	130,78	171,70	144,77
I(w)	Consumed in the Including	0,000	162,77	176,24	103,23

According to table number 2 most significant differences were obtained for the following types of social and psychological needs: the need for control (C (e),  $p = 0,044$ ) and the need for love (A (e),  $p = 0,028$ ) (expressed at the level of behavior), needs to love (A (w),  $p = 0,004$ ) and the inclusion (I (w),  $p < 0,001$ ) (at the level required the relations).

Among the respondents, Moscow has been found highest expression of the need to control C (e). The residents, who live in Rostov-on-Don, found the highest representation of the need for love A (e), A (w) (at the expression level and the desired relation-



ship), as well as the need for inclusion of I (w) (at the level of the desired behavior.) Among the respondents Krymsk has been not found the highest rates of expression of the social and psychological needs.

Also as a result of pair-wise comparison of cities with the help of U – the Mann-Whitney test revealed that the increasing disparity in size of cities increases, the number of significant differences in interpersonal requirements.

Table 3

**shows the results of comparative analysis of the types of relations to the generalized other.**

num p / n	Type of relation	level of significance	average rank 1 group (Moscow)	average rank 2g (Rostov)	average rank of 3 g (Crimea)
1	aggressive - straightforward	0,012	142,45	134,47	169,60
2	humbly-shy	0,000	143,13	112,40	193,94
3	dependence of the docile	0,000	157,74	111,85	176,74
4	collaborating- conventional	0,000	149,09	122,39	176,81
5	responsibly-hearted	0,000	149,91	106,16	191,88

According to the data presented to it the most significant distinctions have been found out on 5 of 8 types of interpersonal relations: is rectilinear-aggressive, humbly – shy, dependent-obedient, collaborating-conventional, responsibly-hearted.

The highest level of the given types of the relation to another is observed among inhabitants of Krymsk, the lowest indicators of their expressiveness characterize Rostov-on-Don. We see that basically the allocated types of relations are concentrated round an axis “friendliness-aggression”.

In the table № 4 we can see the results of the comparative analysis of the extramental relation to generalized are presented other which was studied through the relation to following categories: others, the inhabitant of the city, aboriginals and visitors.

Table 4

**Indicators of significant distinctions of extramental relations to generalized to another**

№	object	level of significance	average rank 1 group (Moscow)	average rank 2g (Rostov)	average rank 2g (Rostov)
1	others	0,021	143,10	161,13	177,23
2	the inhabitant of the city	0,000	132,36	168,35	182,68
4	aboriginals	0,034	142,79	165,23	173,49
5	visitors	0,000	115,47	154,57	216,38



On the basis of the data presented in it, we can draw a conclusion that with increasing of size of a city and accordingly change of its territorially-spatial parameters intensity of the relation to generalized to other decreases.

In the table № 5 we can see the results of the comparative analysis of the extramental relation to «differentiated generalized» which was studied through such categories as: friends, neighbors, relatives.

Table 5

**Indicators of significant distinctions of extramental relations  
to «not differentiated generalized» to other**

№	object	level of significance	average rank 1 group (Moscow)	average rank 2g (Rostov)	average rank 2g (Rostov)
1	friends	0,003	159,86	181,42	137,15
2	neighbors	0,000	139,83	132,30	209,92
3	relatives	0,001	152,34	140,97	186,49

According to the data presented in this table, we can conclude that with increase of size of a city and accordingly change of its spatial organization intensity of the extramental relation to «differentiated generalized» to other to a formal and spatial sign decreases.

The comparative analysis of the data spent by means of H – the test on a method of Kruskala-Uollisa, hasn't revealed significant distinctions in the relation to concrete other of the respondents living in cities of different type.

Thus, the resulted results of dissertational research allow to conclude:

1. level of the spatial organization of a city (city type) determines the distinctions in modalities and types of the relation to generalized to other, in socially-psychological requirements for relations and their hierarchical structure;
2. level of the spatial organization of a city (city type) determines distinctions of the unconscious relation to various types of other: generalized, «differentiated generalized» and to concrete other.

### References

1. Berger P. The social construction of reality /P. Berger, T. Lukman. – M., 1995.
2. Bourdieu P. Physical and social space // Sociology of social space. M.: Institute of sociology, St. Petersburg.: Alteya, 2007. p. 64–87.
3. De Serto M. In the city on foot./ Communitas/Community. – 2005.-N. 2.
4. Glazychev V.L. Education space.// Knowledge is power. – 2004. -August.- p. 39–46.
5. Gurin S. P. The image of the city in the culture: the metaphysical and mystical aspects. – Mode of access:
6. Heidmets M. Review of studies on the spatial factor in interpersonal relations // Man environment space: studies on the psychological problems of space-object environment. Tartu: TSU. 1979. p. 129–161.



7. Iovlev V.I. Architectural chronotope and the symbolism/ V.I. Iovlev //Semiotics of space: collection of scientific works The International Association Of Semiotics of space; edited by A.A. Barabanov. – Architect, 1999.
8. Jel'nina A. Malaya Sadovaya street in St.- Petersburg: experience of formation of public space./ *Communitas/Community*. -2006.-N. 1. –p. 53–71.
9. Lisina M.I. Problems of ontogenesis of communication. M., 1986.
10. Lynch K. The image of the city. – M.: Stroizdat, 1982.
11. Milgram S. An experiment in social psychology. – Part 1. People in the big city. – SPb., 2000.
12. Myasishev V.N. Psychology of relations. – M.: Publishing House Of The Moscow psychological-social institute. -2003.
13. Sennett R. The fall of public man/translation of english about Isayeva, E. 13.Rudnitskaya, V.I. Sofronova, K. Chuhrukidze. M.: Logos, 2002.
14. Shimko M.S. Peculiarities of visual perception. – M.: Higher school, 1990.
15. Shkurko T.A. The concept of the relationship of a person // *Social psychology of personality*. Moscow: Gardariki. 2001 s. p.129–142
16. Shmatko N.A., Kachanov YU.L. Territorial identity as an object of sociological research// *Sociological researches*. – 1998.- n. 4.-p.94–99.
17. Spirchenko M.A. Image, image and brand of a tourist city. – Mode of access: