

Social Psychology

Perelygina H.B.

Perception and change of image as a phenomenon of interpersonal relationship

In the article, the author's conception of image as a phenomenon of interpersonal relationship is represented. Historico-methodological and theoretical bases of this conception creation are analysed elaborately.

Image itself is showed as a character of the subject created in the interpersonal relationship due to the cultural symbols. The image bases itself on the I-conception of subject. There are two plans that are worthy of being noted: the deep plan (image program, described by the concepts of "mission", "purposes", and "legends") and external plan, represented by image-creating symbols (verbal and non-verbal).

Number of research on formation and modelling the person's image has proved the conception offered by the author.

Keywords: *image, subject character, image concept, I-conception, image-creating symbols, interpersonal relationship.*

HISTORICO - METHODOLOGICAL BASES

Ideological premise of modern socio-psychological concept of the image as a phenomenon of interpersonal relationship are laid not only in history of socio-psychological science, but also in the whole range of the sciences of human being. The backgrounds of the concept of the subject image, which perception generates special relations between the image perceiving subject and the person embodied in the image, trace their roots back to the ancient philosophy, in which context the problematic of the subject image is separated out of broader range of questions connected with phenomena of image and reflection.

As early as in the classical period of history of Ancient Greece (V-IV centuries B.C.) - the time of bloom of antique notion of the personality and its social characteristics - there were two main ways, two tendencies, which we conditionally designate as "Platonic" and "Aristotelian" that had been distinctly outlined in Athenian thinkers' approach to the nature research and to the destination of the subject image.

Conventionality of this distinction is concerned with the fact that, in the process of further historical development of doctrines of the subject image, these two ways entered into the relationship repeatedly,

occasionally forming the most intricate combinations [19]. Therefore, before proceeding to the statement about the image concept as a phenomenon of interpersonal relationship, it is necessary to describe in a few words the distinctive features of these two ways.

For “Platonic” way it is typical to consider the subject image as a result of self-expression of the very person, where an aspiration for self-knowledge underlies. And this knowledge can be achieved only through the self-display, in the intercourse with any other person.

The process of such image creation represents as an active, creative, and purposeful activity of the person. And this activity consists of the actualization of qualities potentially incorporated in the person that promotes progressive self-development and self-improvement of the person.

So, in the dialogue “Timaeus”, Plato develops the doctrine of “singeneya” and “pandeya” [24] Singeney is a unity of God, regulating the world, and a person, aiming at calogatia [16]. In Plato's interpretation, calogatia presumes not two, as in the interpretation of Socrates predecessors [15], but three modi: mind, soul, and body.

Hence, the problem of education emerges. “Pandeya”, including the ways of formation of healthy soul and developed mind in the strong body of a teenager, acts as the art of carrying a person to external and internal harmony.

It must be noted that, the subject image in Platonic interpretation is defined as entirely adequate to the displayed one, reflecting real, objective properties of the individual, as the person itself, while aiming at self-knowledge - self-improvement, does not aspire to distortion of his own image.

One of the vivid descriptions of Platonic concept of self-knowledge through reflection in the other person is Plato's dialogue “Alcibiades II”. In this dialogue, Socrates, interpreting well-known inscription in Apollo's temple in Delphi, said: “If the eye wishes to see itself, it should look into the other eye”, and “if the soul wants to cognize itself, it should glance at the soul”.

The “Aristotelian” way is characterized by the interest in the problematic, related to the influence of the subject image upon an audience. In Aristotle's time, the social practice (speech of orators and politicians, activity of sophists, and the ancient theatre) dictated the following urgent questions: What do emotions and aspirations stir up in people by perception of this or that subject image? How to control people, influencing on their emotions, opinions, and decisions by presenting them one or another subject image?

It is obvious, that the subject image, created not with the purpose of adequate self-knowledge, but with the purpose of making one or another certain impression on the perceptive subject, must not so necessarily be completely adequate to its prototype.

Accordingly, it is estimated not only at a degree of conformity with the prototype, but at other factors (such as conformity with ethic and aesthetic standards, internal consistency, etc.) as well. Strategy and techniques of designing a person image, taking into consideration the features of its perception, become the objects of analysis that implies the analysis of the image structure, as well as its sign and symbolical nature recognition.

In the treatise “Theory of poetry”, within the bounds of the doctrine of the character, developed by him [4], Aristotle covered such problems as creation of a character, its structure and elements, perception of the character by public, and typology of the character.

As a matter of fact, by character it is implied nothing else than a symbolic image of the person, specially created by simulation of prototype (as a rule, mythological or historic figure) particular behaviour, his individual features, taking into consideration the regularity of its perception by the audience, for the purpose of having a certain psychological influence upon it.

In Aristotle’s opinion, character is not a mechanical analog of the prototype; schematization and idealization is used for creating it. At the same time, owing to the individualization, character provokes in the audience an emotional reaction (empathy), serving as a basis for catharsis.

According to Aristotelian definition of catharsis, the indispensable condition of approaching it is “reproduction by the action, and not by description” that is a straight (rather than by way of description) demonstration of characters. Thus, one might say, that by Aristotle, the main function of the character is the demonstration of behavioural features and others active characteristics of the subject-prototype. Aristotle's position that irrespective of character qualities, its contemplation always gives pleasure, has a great value.

Both Plato and Aristotle acknowledged the symbolical nature of the person image. However, in interpretation of the concept “symbol”, the distinctions in kind of their approaches became apparent. In the frame of “Platonic” way, attention attracts to richness and inexhaustibility of the symbol’s matter, to the point of underlining its mystical nature; quite the contrary, in the context of “Aristotelian” point of view, the conditional character and schematisation of symbolic notation is emphasized.

It is also necessary to accentuate that, at the heart of both approaches to the subject image research the specific phenomena of social practice lied. “Platonic” approach came out from the philosophical and theoretical reflection of Socrates’ life and activity, as well as the religious practice of V-IV centuries B.C.; “Aristotelian” approach reflected the practice of sophists and ancient theatre.

In the course of the further development of European conception, the mentioned tendencies were often intertwined, as, for instance, in the theoretical concept of humanists, which eclecticism became a reflection of public consciousness in the era of Renaissance, having typical pluralism of the public ideal.

The further development of the theoretical comprehension of the phenomena, concerned with the creation and perception of the subject image, frequently united the approaches typical for two directions chosen by us conditionally.

V. Diltey, in the frame of his concept, has developed the idea of empathy first entered by T. Lipps and put into scientific use a notion of “in-sensation” and “expression” as a generalized experience of the person. This concept came as an important step in modern comprehension of the symbolic nature of the image as an image of the person created in the interpersonal relationship.

The important theoretical premises of modern concept of image are contained in D. Durkheim's doctrines of social concept, in ideas of collective consciousness and “psychology of nations” of W. Wundt, G. Lebon, and G. Tard that formed an ideological base for studying socio-psychological regularities of the image perception as a phenomenon of interpersonal relationships.

Before the scientific social psychology, the ideas and methods of study of the person image had speculative character, lacking the strict theoretical development, as well as essential data of empiric researches.

Subsequently, with the advent and development of social psychology, many of these ideas and approaches have received a scientific substantiation and were reproduced at a theoretical level in the structure of socio-psychological theories of the twentieth century. As for mentioned above two ways of the person image research, they are present at the development of social psychology of the twentieth century in the form of two complementary tendencies.

The tendency, conforming to “Platonic” way, consists in considering the person image as a method of self-expression, self-consciousness, and self-realization, while the tendency, conforming to “Aristotelian” way, consists in viewing the person image in the aspect of psychological

influence. Both tendencies frequently adjoin within the unified concept, but quite often one of them predominates over another.

So, the clear prevalence of “Platonic” way is distinctly found in the concepts of J. Mead and J. Moreno, the prevalence of “Aristotelian” way can be traced in the doctrines of C. Coolie, I. Goffman, and others. Besides, theoretical premises to consideration the image in the context of mass consciousness research are contained within the concept of social ideas, developed by French social psychologists S. Moscovisy, J-P Codole, D. Jodelet and others [8, 9]. Categorization theory of G. Tajfel and J. Turner, as well as the extensive data of the empiric research carried out by them and their colleagues, has a great importance for the study of image functioning [27].

In the Russian psychological tradition, results of development of such investigation lines as *image study*, *problematic of the theory of activity*, *relations and social knowledge study* are directly relevant to research of the image phenomena.

In Russian psychological science the image study has old tradition, in which development such scientists as I.M. Sechenov, B.G. Ananjev, A.A. Bodalev, P.O. Makarov, N.N. Lange, S.M. Vasilevsky, A.V. Belyaeva, P.K. Anokhin, A.V. Zaporozhets, A.V. Libin, I.S. Kon, and others have made their contribution.

Development of the theory of activity, according to which the consciousness of the person is formed, developed and shown in the activity that always have a social nature, has a very old history as well. Within the limits of this approach in theoretical and experimental research of B.G. Ananjev, L.S. Vygotsky, A.N. Leontjev, A.R. Lurya, V.N. Mjasishcev, S.L. Rubinstein and a number of other psychologists, the social conditionality of the person mentality and intercourse of the individual with society was proved.

Within the bounds of the active approach, the phenomena of intercourse were studied too. Thus, A.N. Leontjev, examining the ontogenetic development of mentality, noted that “communication <...> is an essential and specific condition of development of the person in the society” [13]. From the middle of 70th, under the influence of sociology and social psychology to a considerable degree, view on the communication, as on independent mental phenomenon, which is not entirely brought to activity [12, 14], has become firmly established in the domestic psychology.

This approach has obtained a further development and a concrete definition in the Russian scientists’ works, devoted to the problems of social perception and social knowledge research [1, 2, 3, 6]. The further

deepening of interpersonal approach has made it possible to look from the different angle at the psychological influence, which in view of the feedback mechanisms, is considered as a variety of psychological interaction [11].

Thus, theoretical prerequisites of the development of scientific and theoretical bases of the image psychological theory are widely presented in world and domestic psychology.

As for research, devoted directly to the image, the number of these works has sharply risen recently. However, research of the image perception in the processes of mass communication [5, 10, 17] in a magnitude relation prevails among them, and at the same time the processes of image creation and those personal changes, which under the influence of the image are undergone by its person -prototype, as a rule, do not get in the range of vision.

Some authors interpret the image exclusively as one of the means of public consciousness manipulation. As a whole, using the given above terminology, in the image research, a significant preponderance of “Aristotelian” way over “Platonic” one is observed.

THE CONCEPT OF IMAGE AS A PHENOMENON OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP

However, starting development of the concept of image, as a phenomenon of interpersonal relationship, our task was not only the straightening of this “heel”, but mainly, the revelation of opportunities and mechanisms of positive changes achievement in I-concept of the image subject-prototype under the influence of image.

In the generic substance, image represents nothing else than the person image that arises and functions in the process of interpersonal relationship. Internal contradictions peculiar to this phenomenon are expressed in a number of its intrinsic essential characteristics, such as:

- ability of image to influence the behaviour of persons perceiving it and, along with it, its dependence on the content of social ideas and stereotypes of the perceptive subjects;
- ability of image to provide both true and false information on the displayed subject;
- availability of rational and emotional in the course of creation and perception of image;
- discontinuity of symbols, used at the image creation and, at the same time, resulting character integrity;

- presence of image of stereotyped characteristics and symbols in the structure, and at the same time –an individualistic presentation of the displayed subject;

- image flexibility (modification capability in specific conditions), its relative stability, and independence from the situational circumstances as well;

- symbolicalness of the image as a character, expressed in cultural symbols; stipulation of the image formation as a phenomenon of the interpersonal relationship in the real socio-cultural, political, economic, historical and professional context;

- adequacy of the person image and the subject-prototype of image and correlation of the subjects perceiving image with social expectations;

- image, mediated by the socio-cultural values, according to which the subjects of image perception estimate the individual, personal, and professional qualities of the perceived subject.

The listed characteristics of the image are steady, invariant, and recurring irrespective of the specific conditions of image interactions; that is why, in fact, they are named “essential”, in spite of being shown at a phenomenological level. Invariance of these characteristics points out their nonrandom character, their connection with the image essence, as it is shown in the interpersonal relationship.

The definition of image as a symbolic character of the subject, created in the interpersonal relationship [20], can serve as the following step to penetration into the image essence. Thus, the basic coordinates of internal space of the image essence as a phenomenon of the interpersonal relationships and its critical parameters are designated. It must be noted that, this definition includes the references to a number of socio-psychological concepts, which open its substance. Namely, the concept of *the character* includes the definition of image in the context of social perception and social knowledge research. As G.M. Andreyeva emphasized, “The image as “a result” of socio-perceptive process continue to function in the whole system of mutual relation of people. Moreover, “Sometimes “images” of the other person, group, or any social phenomenon in these relations are more significant, than the very objects” [2].

Thus, distinguishing in the intercourse structure three interconnected sides, like communicative, interactive, and perceptive [3], G.M. Andreyeva emphasizes: “In reality, each of these sides does not exist separately from two others” [3]. Results of empirical research have shown the correctness of this general state, regarding the image as a specific type of the character arising in the social knowledge. So, during a number of experiments that

we have started in 1998, along with the socio-perceptive regularities of formation and the mechanisms of image functioning, communicative and interactive regularities and mechanisms, have been revealed as well [21, 23].

The term “created” (instead of “arising”) used in the structure of our definition of image, shows that the image acts not only as the phenomenon included in the system of the person activity, but also as the phenomenon, arising from the purposive activity. As the research has shown, the activity aimed at creation and change of the image can be carried out both spontaneously, at the level of vital activity, and professionally, using the humanitarian technologies that raise the efficiency of the activity and promote the optimization of the image [22].

In the structure of image definition, the concept of interpersonal relationship is of great importance. It specifies, in particular, that the image creation comes out from the activity of the subject-prototype of image, as well as the activity of all other participants of this process, that is the image perceiving subjects. Results of the image perception studies that have been carried out in Ekaterinburg since 1998, confirmed an active role of the image perceiving subjects in the processes of creation and change of the image. So, as a result of series of investigations, implemented from October, 1998 till April, 1999 (the total number of surveyed has come to 3183 persons, selected by age, sex, line of professional activity, status characteristics, and place of residence), was proved the hypothesis that, the image perception represents an individual, personally significant semantic interpretation of image creating symbols according to the purposes, aims and I-conception of the personality of the image perceiving subject, its status and role position, in the context of norms and stereotypes of the social environment [23].

In the image definition, its description as *symbolic character* has a great value. Within the bounds of semiotics, symbol differs from other kinds of signs by the most mediated connection with the emphasized that opens a vast field for various - cultural, ethno-psychological, and socio-psychological interpretations of symbolism.

As the research, carried out from May 1999 till October 2000 in Humanitarian university of Ekaterinburg, shown, the symbolization mechanism is actively used by the subject-prototype of image in creation, selection, and presentation of the image creating symbols, as well as by subjects, perceiving the image in perception and interpretation of the image creating symbols [21].

Having defined the image as the character of the person, formed in the interpersonal relationships, we emphasize the activity of the subject-

prototype of image and its initiating role in the creation of its own image for the social environment. It also defines the substance of image, in which basis the I-conception of the subject-prototype lies.

I-conception representations have deep roots in the world philosophy and psychology. U. James, C. Coolie, and J. Mead were the authors of first doctrines about I-conception. Significant contribution to the I-concept theory development has made C. Rogers. In his approach, I-conception is the central notion. I-conception, or “Self” is defined by C. Rogers as “an organized, serial, and conceptual gestalt, made up from the perception of “I” or “self” characteristics and perception of interrelations of “I” or “self” with other people, with various aspects of life and the values, connected with these perceptions. It is a gestalt, which is accessible to understanding, but at the same time, is not necessarily realized” [25].

Thus, according to Rogers, I-conception includes not only person’s cognitive notions of what he represents (himself), but the full completeness of its self-perception, including both realized and not realized self-attitudes and estimations of self. I-conception can include a certain set of “I”-images – for parent, spouse, student, office worker, manager, sportsman, etc., and these images are based not only on perception of what kind of person the subject is in fact, but also on perception, of what kind of person in his opinion he should be or would like to be.

This “I” component C. Rogers named “self-ideal”. I-ideal, according to C. Rogers, reflects those attributes, which a person would like to have even if he realizes that in reality these attributes do not inhere in him. C. Rogers has also shown that, along with the I-conception, the individual, as early as in his childhood, feels the need for the positive attitude from the direction of his people. This positive attitude, as a result of internalization, generates the need for the positive attitude of the individual himself (self-assurance), which makes the content of aspiration to self-actualization so as if I-conception becomes “a significant social another” for itself [26].

It is clear from C. Rogers’ theory how much significant for the individual is the image, which arises in his social environment as a reflection of this individual’s objective personal qualities and characteristics. This image can be named - *the I image of others*.

Taking into consideration the approaches of C. Rogers and other authors, engaged in the development of I-conception theory [18], we can picture the substance of the image reasoning from the mutual relations of *I-conception* (that expresses what the individual sees himself) with his *ideal I* and the others’ opinion of this image. By *ideal I*, we imply what kind of person the subject would like to be, and by the others’ opinion - his unbiased image, what he is for people, and whom he socially interacts with.

From three specified formations, I-conception is the most complicated by the structure, as in certain parts it reproduces the substance of two other formations. So, the others have as much adequate image in the I-conception, as the person has adequate understanding of how he is perceived by others. In any case, the characteristics, expressing the attitude of other people, are included in the I-conception (example: “I make an impression of the blunderer”, “Subordinates fear me”, “I am considered a good manager”, etc.).

The ideal I is also refracted in the I-conception, owing to the fact that, many characteristics imputed to the individual by himself, what he is actually and proceed from the corresponding characteristics of the ideal I (for example, “I am not organized enough”, “I manage too softly”).

In most of the cases, neither I-concept nor the ideal I or the other’s opinion do not agree with the person image. It means that the person feels himself as he would like to be and his social environment also perceives him as he feels himself and what he would like to be. In that case, there would be no need for the activity on the image creation, which is one of its obligatory attributes arising from our definition of image as the created character.

Therefore, the character, in which I-conception agrees with the ideal I and with the others’ opinion about this image, cannot be denoted as the image. Moreover, the very divergences of the I-conception, ideal I and the others’ opinion about the image, serve as a source of the person activity, which appears in the image creation activity. Thus, the most significant are the divergences of the ideal I and the others’ opinion, that is, between “what I would like to be” and “what I am for the others” [20].

The image creation activity is aimed at this contradiction resolving. The elementary and active form of this activity is the self-presentation, which is defined as “the act of self-expression and behaviour, directed to making the favorable impression or the impression meeting someone’s ideals” [18]. During this activity, the person aspires to bring his own image (in the others’ opinion) near the ideal I.

Not any image created in self-presentation, is an image but only the one, for which creation the cultural symbols are used; that provides his inter-personalisation. That is division of a certain social group that is the audience of this image, and also a certain stability allowing this image to exist rather irrespective of its owner.

So, the substance of the image as a phenomenon of the interpersonal relations is defined by essential contradiction between the substance of ideal I of the subject-prototype and its image in the others’ opinion. In its turn, the image is projected on the I-conception of the person and that leads

to certain changes in it, these changes are expressed in its approach to the ideal I.

For example, the image of the professional comes out from resolving the contradiction between “the ideal I” of the professional and his “image in the others’ opinion” (a set of the objective impressions, which the given professional makes on his colleagues, clients, managers, and subordinates).

Comprehension of the existent contradictions makes the person develop image-creating activity, directed to bringing together the others’ opinion of image as the professional one with his own professional ideal I; creation of the image, approached to the professional ideal I in the others’ opinion, and designation of this image in cultural and significant symbols. As a result of such activity, appears an image as the symbolical character of the person, created in the process of interpersonal relation .

This stable image, perceived by its subject-prototype, has an influence upon the professional I-conception. And this influence occurs not only at the self-perception level, but at the level of change of the objective professional and active characteristics as well - an individual is though “pulls himself up”, aspiring “to correspond” to his own image. The degree of positivity of these changes defines a level of the professional image efficiency.

The given conception has received confirmation in a number of experiments, carried out by the author and under the direction of the author in the period from October 2000 - till February 2002. These experiments were directed to the investigation of the regularities of formation and modelling of the person image (respondents were chosen from among the students of Ekaterinburg Humanitarian University, the employees of the Center of the state sanitary-and-epidemiological inspection in Sverdlovsk region, and the employees and customers of three insurance companies. Altogether 2280 respondents representing different groups according to sex, age, status, and character of activity took part in this experiment).

As a result of the research it has also been established, that subjective image expectations and needs of the person forming its own image, defining motivation and goal-setting during the realization of activity of the image creation, and its further formation in the process of interpersonal relationships, in its turn, are defined by gender, role, and status characteristics of the image subject, as well as its valuable orientations and purposes.

Such mechanisms of the image creation and change as the mechanism of a depending on the social conceptions and stereotypes, the mechanism of realization of the person activity in the image, the mechanism of realization of humanitarian and personal potential of the

image subject-prototype through the self-realization in the image, and others.

As to the image structure, it is defined by its symbolical nature. In the image structure there are two plans that can be noted. The first, deep plan of image is its program. At this level, the qualities of the subject-prototype, which should be presented in the image, are defined. For the designation of basic elements of the image program it is expedient to use the conceptions, widely applied in the image study, such as “mission”, “purposes”, and “legends”, explicating them according to the image conception that we develop.

In our opinion, the main difference between the mission and purposes is that the purposes imply first of all rational comprehension, while the mission perception is a complex one and includes, along with cognitive, affective and connate components. The mission consists in the image correlation with the most important, basic values, divided by the social group that forms the image’s audience.

The image purpose usually implies openly demonstrated and proclaimed aims of the subject-prototype that form the mission realization program in their collection. Thus, the purposes are determined by two parameters: 1) their correspondence to the mission and 2) their practicability.

It must be noticed, that unsuccessful (inadequate to the audience value aims) mission and the absence of it do not provoke such a strong negative reaction of the image recipients as inadequate missions of the purpose. The point is, that realization of the mission usually depends on the farther future, while the person purposes, if they are irrelevant, contain a real danger “here and now”.

By the legend, we imply the part of the program, which is responsible for creating the specific and individualized image. In a number of cases, the legend mitigates some contradictions and noncoincidence between the purposes and mission or in the purposes structure.

Along with the image program elements, composing the internal logical framework of the image, the symbolical structure of the image contains external image-creating symbols. The symbols are directly perceived by organs of sense of image perceiving subjects and on their basis the audience receives an idea of the image as a whole and, accordingly, of the subject displayed in it, and states the value of the latter.

External image-creating symbols suppose various classifications. In particular, it is possible to distinguish verbal (wordy) and non-verbal symbols among them. Detachment of verbal symbols in the separate group, which is opposed to the whole set of other (non-verbal) kinds of symbols,

is caused by enormous value of human speech and language as communication means.

As G.M. Andreyeva marks, “Speech is one the most universal means of communication and when the information is transmitted by means of speech, the least of all the meaning of message is lost” [3]. If to consider image as “a message”, it’s meaning would be nothing else than its program. This very program contains a substantial “information pulse”, which is, being addressed to the image perceiving subjects, involves the main information on the subject-prototype that should be transferred to the persons. The image program, if to express it figuratively, is “a skeleton”, a framework, or a logical unit of the image, the image-creating symbols form “the body” of image.

During the socio-psychological research on formation and modelling of the person’s image that was carried out by the author in Ekaterinburg in the period from October 2000 – till April 2001, the certain regularities in the use of image-creating symbols, while creating the image, have been revealed. In particular, stable correlation in order of importance of various categories of image-creating symbols (degree and preference of their use and notional meanings) for different social groups have been discovered.

During the image-creating activity, the image subject represents itself, using a set of both verbal and non-verbal image-creating symbols, including circumstances and conditions of the communication. Thus, as the research has revealed, the certain types of the image-creating symbols serve as relatively stable semantic functions corresponding to these subjects. So, garments, hair-dress, inflexion, mimicries, and gestures of the subject-prototype execute the individualizing function.

Demonstration of work results, knowledge, professional competence, health (“healthy look”), and adequate reaction for the expectations of other people is interpreted as confirmation of correspondence between the purposes of the image and its mission. Rules observance, regulations knowledge, direct communication, and the atmosphere fulfill a personal function (the function of demonstration of the subject-prototype personal qualities).

The analysis of rank distributions of the magnitude of various types of image-creating symbols for image-creating activity of men and women has revealed a number of regularities. Thus, for men the largest role at the image creation plays the speech, the knowledge of regulations and rules, and other knowledge, while for women – knowledge, mood, and relations. Work results and success help women to create the image to a greater extent, than they help men. When creating an image, mood, and expectations of others are not of such a great importance for men, as they

are for women, but at the same time, knowledge of regulations and rules for men are more significant, than for women [7].

For evaluation of the verbal image-creating symbols, their correlation with one or another element of the image program - its mission, purposes or legends, as well as with individual and subject-active components of the subject-prototype of the image, has a great value. Apportionment of the image-creating symbols, in their correlation with program elements of image and individual and subject-active characteristics of the subject-prototype, is optimal.

Hence, some results received by the author in December 2002 - February 2003, during the study of dynamics of the structure of image-creating symbols of the manager image in the Russian press in 1995 – 2002, are of great importance. The research was carried out by the technique of quantitative and qualitative content analysis, with the use of DMS (database management system) Cros (version of 4.01.79), on the excerpts, made of the releases of 1448 editions, including national, regional, and local editions; on the whole, 2 279 771 texts has been scrutinized.

During the investigation, in particular, it has been determined that according to the correlation with the basic elements of the image program (mission, purposes, and legends) in materials of the Russian press of the given period, the image-creating symbols, connected with the image mission, considerably prevail; the second place take the image-creating the symbols, connected with the image legends, and the third place, with a big lag, take the image-creating symbols, connected with the image purposes. Such distribution of the image-creating symbols of the manager we consider unproductive, especially taking into consideration that the significant part of the investigated texts represents the image of the manager in the context of professional activity. Weak presentation of the purposes (that is, specific tasks, which are accomplished by the person within the frame of his professional activity) in image, preponderance of the mission description over the purposes description reduces the credibility of the image, make it unreliable, not inspiring the perceptive subjects with trust.

So, the research has shown that in the press materials out of three basic components of the subjects-prototypes of the image: individual, subject-active and personal – the subject-active one is presented most widely, on the second place – is the individual component, on the third, behind the previous two – is the personal one.

Thus, the investigation has shown that the image subject in the greater part of the materials is presented in the context of its professional

activity, but at the same time it is characterized in the view of specific features (appearance, tastes, preferences, and behaviour in the private life, etc.). As for personal (world outlook, value, and “behavioural”) manifestations, the authors of materials do not emphasize them adequately.

Such a weak presentation of the private life of the image subject is one more defect of image. It reduces the perceptive subjects’ confidence in the image, especially in the view of the fact that out of all elements of the image program the mission is presented most brightly in it – as the general purpose “super-task” of the professional activity of the image subject-prototype, which requires strongly a personal and world outlook and conceptually-value corroboration, on the one hand and realization program in the form of the system of purposes, on the other hand.

If the person and purposes of the person are presented poorly or if they are not presented at all in the image, then the mission is an empty declaration, which is not inspiring trust in the image perceptive subjects. The verbose stories about family members and favourite animals of the subject-prototype (we consider these symbols to be connected with the individual component of the subject-prototype), do not rescue such image from falsification in the conditions of information competition.

These results confirm a topicality of image research in the light of the issues of the social practice, which is connected with the use of the image in various spheres of the social life.

Bibliography

1. Agejev V. S. Social perception mechanisms // Psychological Journal. 1989. Vol.10. #2.
2. Andreyeva G.M. Social knowledge psychology, 2000.
3. Andreyeva G.M. Social psychology. - M.: Aspect Press, 2001.
4. Aristotle . Work in four vol. V. 4, 1983.
5. Belyaeva T.B. Communication style of the presenter and his influence on perception of the educational programs by the schoolchildren. Thesis for a candidate of the psychological science degree, L., 1982.
6. Bogomolova N.N. Social psychology of periodical press, radio and TV. - Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow State University, 1991.
7. Derkatch A.A., Perelygina H.B. Socio-psychological conception of the image as a phenomenon of the interpersonal relations (the joint authorship) / Under the scientific editorship of the honored worker of science of RF, Doctor of psychological science, Professor A.A. Derkatch. - Moscow: publishing house “Intelligence-center”, 2003.
8. Dontsov A.I., Yemeljanova T.P. Concept of social presentations in modern French psychology. - Moscow: Publishing house

of Moscow State University, 1987.

9. Dontsov A.I., Yemelyanova T.P. Social presentations as a subject of the experimental investigation in the modern French social psychology // Bulletin of Moscow State University. Ser.14. Psychology. 1985, #1. - P. 45-53.

10. A.J. Koshmarov. Television image of the political leader as a result of the reputation management // Psychology as a system of directions. YB of the Russian psychological society. - Vol.9, issue # 2, 2002.

11. Kovalev G.A. Three paradigms of psychology - three strategy of psychological influence // Questions on psychology, 1987. # 3.

12. Leontjev A.A. Communication as an object of psychological investigation // Methodological problems of social psychology. - Moscow: "Science", 1975.

13. Leontjev A.N. Problems of mentality development, 1972.

14. Lomov B.F. Communication as a problem of the general psychology // Methodological problems of social psychology. - Moscow: "Science", 1975.

15. Losev A.F. Classical calocogatia and its types // Questions on aesthetics. Issue # 3. Moscow, 1960. - P. 407 - 422.

16. Losev A.F. History of antique aesthetics (thousandth development results). Vol.8, 2nd book. Moscow, Art, 1994. - P. 218 - 231.

17. Matveyeva L.V., Anikeyeva T.J., Mochalova J.V. Display image and personal features of television presenter (the second article) // Psychological journal. Vol. 20. # 2. - 1999. March-April.

18. Myers D. Social psychology. - Peter Kom, 1998.

19. Perelygina H.B. Image as a phenomenon of interpersonal relations: the substance and ways of development. Thesis for a Doctor of psychological science degree - Moscow, 2003.

20. Perelygina H.B. Image psychology: the Manual. - Moscow: Aspect Press, 2002.

21. Perelygina H.B. Mechanism of image functioning as a phenomenon of interpersonal relations. - Moscow: "Intelligence-centre", 2003.

22. Perelygina H.B. Optimization of the process of image formation as a phenomenon of interpersonal relations. - Moscow: "Intelligence-centre", 2003.

23. Perelygina H.B. Regulations of image formation as a phenomenon of interpersonal relations. - M.: Publishing house "Itex", 2002.

24. Plato. Works in three vol. Vol. 3. Moscow: "Mysl", 1971.

25. Rogers C.R. A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.) Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 3. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959. - P. 184-256.

26. Rogers C. Person formation: Opinion of the psychotherapist // Rogers C.R. View on psychotherapy. Person Formation. - Moscow: Publishing group "Progress", "Universe", 1997.

27. Tajfel, H., Turner, J.C. The social identity theory of inter-group behaviour // S.Worchel and W.G.Austin (Eds.) Psychology of inter-group relations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall. 1986, p. 7 – 24.