Article

Factors of Sovereignty of the Psychological Space of the Personality in the Study Groups of the Military Academic Lyceum

Ibragimova Rano Jalgasovna[1*]

1. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Psychology, Psychologist of Nukus "Temurbeklar maktabi" Military-Aacademic Lyceum, The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan.

* Correspondence: gulishodieva@mail.ru

Abstract: This study addresses the subjectivity of semi-closed study groups, focusing on the psychological privacy of individuals within such groups as a key indicator of their subjective qualities. While prior research has explored group dynamics and individual psychological sovereignty, the interplay between personal and group socio-psychological characteristics in semi-closed environments remains underexplored. The research aims to examine the extent to which these characteristics contribute to the sovereignty of psychological space in cadets of a military lyceum. Using a regression model, the study analyzed the influence of socio-psychological traits, integrating both individual and collective dimensions. Results highlight the significant role of group cohesion and individual autonomy in shaping psychological sovereignty, offering insights into optimizing group environments for enhanced psychological well-being. These findings have implications for the development of strategies to support individual privacy while fostering collective functionality in semi-closed educational settings.

1. Introduction

Turning to the problematic of studying semi-closed educational groups, it is necessary to note the specificity of their life activity, determined by the boarding residence of students (cadet corps, cadet boarding schools, general and correctional boarding schools, some gymnasiums, military universities, etc.). The organizational and educational environment of these institutions is characterized by a focus on military-patriotic education, in-depth study of general education subjects, high leisure activity, which has a positive effect on cohesion, coordination and other signs of subjectivity of the group [1]. However, there is a problem of maintaining the psychological privacy of the individual in conditions of restricted entry and exit from the group, freedom of movement.

2. Materials and Methods

Compared with students of semi-closed secondary general education institutions, military lyceum students are more motivated to enter a university and complete their education. In addition, by this age, the psychological privacy of the individual has already been formed [2]. However, in the organizational and educational environment, there are threatening factors generated by the specifics of these educational institutions (24-hour presence on the territory of the institution, living in barracks/dormitory, strict daily

routine, sexual homogeneity of the environment, control by the environment over life activities, etc.) [3]. In our opinion, they reduce the indicators of sovereignty of the psychological space, in particular, the sovereignty of the physical body, territory, personal belongings and habits. In this regard, it becomes relevant to study the personal and group characteristics of students of a military university as resources for maintaining their psychological privacy in the specific conditions of life of a semi-closed group [4].

The aim of the study was specified in the tasks:

1. to perform a comparative analysis of the socio-psychological portrait of students in four semi-closed groups;
2. to analyze the level of expression of sovereignty of the psychological space of the individual in semi-closed study groups, to describe group differences and similarities;
3. to analyze the relationship between the indicators of sovereignty of the psychological space of group members and their socio-psychological (value orientations, motives for admission, social ideas about the group, motives for choosing a profession and attitudes towards success) and group characteristics (norms of behavior in a group, group cohesion and group sociometric structure);
4. to perform a regression analysis of predictors of sovereignty of the psychological space of the individual in a semi-closed study group. To describe the contribution of socio-psychological and group characteristics to the model of the phenomenon under study [5].

3. Results and Discussion

Sovereignty of psychological space (SPS) provides the individual with a sense of security, both physical and psychological [6]. A positively formed property acts as a kind of guideline for understanding other people and building relationships with them and society as a whole, while deprivation of individual sovereignty leads to its marginalization, expressed in an aggressive attitude towards society and oneself [7]. All of the above reveals the understanding of the role of SPS in the process of individual socialization. Developing an approach to studying the subjectivity of a group as a property of a collective subject, we relied on the idea of the relationship between the individual and the group, developed in the scientific school of Umansky-Chernyshev [8].

Achieving a high level of development by a group is associated with the formation of the property of subjectivity. It indicates a highly organized mutual assistance of all members, their purposefulness, activity, ability for self-development and self-esteem [9]. One of the important tasks of a group with such a level of development is to maintain a balance between the group and the individual. Its violation leads either to the loss of individuality of group members (the group "absorbs" the individual), or to the loss of their connection with the social environment [10]. Note that this idea was outlined in the work of E. Fromm, who formulated the concept of "escape from freedom" [11].

However, in our understanding, the consequence of the loss of balance by the group is a change in the system of its connections, which can ultimately lead to the loss of subjectivity. In other words, the SPP of the individual performs the protective function of the individual subject in the group, thereby allowing to maintain a balance between the individual and the group [12]. Positively developed sovereignty of the individual subject contributes to the formation of the type of relationships that enhances the interconnectedness and cohesion of the group (signs of its early subjectivity), contributes to the formation of group norms, rules and values, and subsequently self-reflection of the group [13].

As factors of the SPP we selected socio-psychological (personal level of analysis) and group characteristics (group level of analysis). The former, in our opinion, demonstrated the basis, freedom and direction of the activity of an individual subject. The characteristics

of the group level were selected in accordance with the ideas of the vision of the subjectivity of the collective, namely: fixation of interdependence, interconnectedness and part of group reflection. The study of these factors of subjectivity of different levels will allow us to fix problem areas of the relationship between the individual and the collective, which can later be supplemented with other characteristics.

Methods and techniques used in the study. In order to study the expression of sovereignty of the psychological space of the individual, the technique "Sovereignty of Psychological Space - 2010" by Nartova-Bochaver [14] was used. The technique includes a general scale of sovereignty of psychological space and six subscales: sovereignty of the physical body, sovereignty of territory, sovereignty of things, sovereignty of habits, sovereignty of social connections and sovereignty of values [15]. According to the keys, 1 point indicates traumatized sovereignty, 2 points - deprivation, 3 points are the norm, 4 points indicate super-sovereignty.

To study the socio-psychological characteristics, the following were used: the method of value orientations (author E.B. Fantalova); The author's questionnaire of economic and psychological characteristics (assessment of the level of material well-being and satisfaction with it, self-assessment of economic status), motivation for entering a military lyceum, professional orientation (ideas about a future profession), subjective assessment of the importance and significance of indicators of success in life [16]. In order to study the individual's ideas about the group, an association test was used. The obtained results were processed using content analysis.

The matrix we developed included fifteen categories of analysis: ideas about the group as a team, a group of friends, comrades, a study group; ideas about interpersonal and business relationships, about leisure in a group; ideas that reveal the nature of intragroup relationships (helping, supporting, etc.). Additionally, the modality of ideas was assessed - positive/negative/neutral [17].

The analysis of the equivalence of groups showed that all four groups of cadets are equivalent in gender, age, and family composition. The results of the comparative analysis of the socio-psychological portraits in the four groups showed the following. All groups of cadets are characterized by common group profiles in terms of basic values (health, friends, happy family life), preferred motives for choosing a profession, focus on achieving success, absence of isolated students in the sociometric structures, and ideas about their group. In particular, according to the associative test, respondents associate the image of their group with the concepts of "friendship", "team", "leisure"[18].

The commonality in the motivation for admission among cadets is determined by interest in the profession, adherence to family traditions in choosing a profession (family dynasty), the desire of parents, and the dream of mastering this profession. Motives for obtaining an education, building a career, or the desire to help people are less represented in the students' responses [19]. It is interesting that some of the respondents studying at the military lyceum are aimed at obtaining a civilian profession [20].

4. Conclusion

The findings of this study suggest that the sovereignty of the psychological space of students in semi-closed educational groups, particularly in a military lyceum setting, is significantly influenced by both personal and group-related factors. While the overall severity of psychological sovereignty indicators points to a sense of traumatization and deprivation, personal characteristics such as internal motivation, social values, and the individual's perception of the group as a reference point play a more prominent role in preserving psychological sovereignty compared to group dynamics. Notably, cadets' sense of sovereignty is least impacted in the spheres of social connections and values, likely due to their positive view of group cohesion and interdependence. The sociometric status of individuals within the group and their intrinsic motivation to attend the lyceum further contribute to their psychological resilience. These findings underline the importance of

fostering individual motivation and a supportive group environment to mitigate psychological distress. Future research could explore the long-term effects of such educational environments on individual development and the role of group cohesion in enhancing mental health outcomes.

REFERENCES

[1] A. M. Borovik, Specificity of Social and Psychological Adaptability of Pupils to the Conditions of a Cadet Boarding School: Author's Abstract. Diss. Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Moscow, 2015, 28 p.

[2] K. M. Gaidar, "Group Subject in the Mirror of Social Perception," Bulletin of the Volgograd State Pedagogical University, vol. 4, no. 48, pp. 108–111, 2010.

[3] K. M. Gaidar, Social and Psychological Concept of a Group Subject, Voronezh: Publishing House of Voronezh University, 2013, 396 p.

[4] L. M. Dodova and L. Yu. Konstantinidi, "The Role of the Educational Environment in the Personal and Psychological Development of Pupils of the Cadet Corps," Eurasian Union of Scientists, no. 6-6 (15), pp. 54–56, 2015.

[5] A. Gordienko, "The Acephalic Community: Bataillean Sovereignty, the Question of Relation, and the Passage to the Subject," Continental Philosophy Review, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 75–90, 2019.

[6] J. M. Domingues, Sociological Theory and Collective Subjectivity, London: Macmillan Press, 1995.

[7] K. M. Kirby, Indifferent Boundaries: Spatial Concepts of Human Subjectivity, New York: Guilford Press, 1996.

[8] G. Duncan, "Sovereignty and Subjectivity," Subjectivity, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 406–423, 2013.

[9] A. Abizadeh, "Does Collective Identity Presuppose an Other? On the Alleged Incoherence of Global Solidarity," American Political Science Review, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 45–60, 2005.

[10] J. P. Burgess, "The Real at the Origin of Sovereignty," Political Psychology, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 653–668, 2017.

[11] N. Rose, Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power, and Personhood, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[12] M. Verkuyten and B. Martinovic, "Collective Psychological Ownership and Intergroup Relations," Perspectives on Psychological Science, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1021–1039, 2017.

[13] K. Woodward, J. P. Jones III, and S. A. Marston, "The Politics of Autonomous Space," Progress in Human Geography, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 204–224, 2012.

[14] C. L. Zeiher, "The Conjecture of Sovereignty: New Anxieties for the Subject," Journal of Extreme Anthropology, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 92–110, 2018.

[15] Y. Wu, Affect, Violence, and Sovereignty: Reading Collective Isolation in Post-Catastrophic Trauma Writings, Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 2024.

[16] V. Grebennikova et al., "Spiritual and Moral Sovereignty of Personality in Information Society: A Subjective Environmental Approach," Synesis, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 100–112, 2023.

[17] W. Coffey and R. Tsosie, "Rethinking the Tribal Sovereignty Doctrine: Cultural Sovereignty and the Collective Future of Indian Nations," Stanford Law & Policy Review, vol. 12, pp. 191, 2001.

[18] D. W. Riggs and M. Augoustinos, "The Psychic Life of Colonial Power: Racialised Subjectivities, Bodies and Methods," Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 461–477, 2005.

[19] J. Cocks, On Sovereignty and Other Political Delusions, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.

[20] D. Stojanovic, "Space, Territory and Sovereignty: Critical Analysis of Concepts," Nagoya University Journal of Law and Politics, vol. 275, pp. 111–185, 2017.