

SENSE OF OWNERSHIP REALIZATION IN THE SPACE OF INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM

Iryna H. Hubeladze

*PhD in Psychology, senior researcher
Institute for Social and Political Psychology of National Academy of
Educational Sciences of Ukraine,*

ORCID ID 0000-0001-8023-6408

ResearcherID J-5910-2017

irynaqubeladze@gmail.com

The article presents the understanding of individualism and collectivism as a complex, complementary system. The aim of the article is to analyze psychological features of sense of ownership manifestation in a space of individualism and collectivism, both individual (personal), group and social. Peculiarities of a sense of ownership realization in an area of individualism and collectivism at the individual, interpersonal and public levels are substantiated. It was shown that individuals with a higher level of collectivist guidelines are more likely to show feelings for collective, common target of ownership show a higher level of responsibility, control, self-investment and intimate knowledge, which is optimally combined with a willingness to share property with others; as well as have a lower level of desire for appropriation, control and desire to dispose than persons with individualistic guidelines. It is substantiated that the individual tendency to individualism or collectivism determines not the general orientation towards psychological appropriation only, but also the way of interaction with the target of ownership and other persons, which is realized in various spheres and social practices. Prospects for further research are an empirical study of attitudes to different objects of ownership depending on the level of individualism-collectivism.

Key words: psychological ownership, sense of ownership, sense of ownership realization, individualism, collectivism, post-industrial society, responsibility, my, our, their.

Introduction

Rapid changes in social and economic relations that marked the emergence of various forms of ownership, reduced the state's role in the process of regulating the economy, a sharp change in its structure, the formation of new socio-economic groups, leveling need for mandatory employment, etc., cause transformation in value orientations of citizens, including in relation to ownership, in ownership relations, there are changes in economic self-awareness and a formation of a new type of economic thinking [2; 10]. Current conditions of socio-economic development require a person to take a responsible and determined position in the field of actual and psychological possession. However, the leveling and devaluation of need for ownership over a long period of time has led to a weakening of a sense of ownership and the lack of economic thinking of modern Ukrainians.

Back in the late 90's and early 2000's the Ukrainian researchers noted the importance and value for the individual possession of a status of belongings that represent their position in society, while the benefits of things lost their value. For today, in general, the world is undergoing transformations of the economic system, primarily increasing demand for services, knowledge, innovation. At the same time there is a sharp decline in demand for goods, especially valuables. The emphasis shifts from owning of belongings to its utilization. It becomes more valuable to get impressions, experience, knowledge, the opportunity to travel than to buy real estate or a vehicle. This attitude towards property is reflected in various social practices, both economic and non-economic character.

Psychological mean of the possession plays the important role in the life of individual and community, any social group or society, in social relations and interaction.

Theoretical background

Scholars view a sense of ownership as a socio-psychological phenomenon based on a basic instinctive need for ownership, the satisfaction of which is closely related to a formation of personality and a functioning of group information; psychological attribute of personality, which distinguishes it from others; basis for classification and differentiation, which allows only in social interaction (Карнышев, Бурменко&Иванова, 2006 [6]; Пайпс, 2008 [12]; Хазратова, 2009 [15]; Noguti & Vokeyar, 2014 [21]). Psychological ownership is both the basis of social relations, determining the features of an entire system of relations of society, and the object of human relations, its experiences, values, the basis for the formation of its economic subjectivity.

Issues of individualism-collectivism were actively studied within the framework of philosophical, political and sociological theories (Калиняк&Колядко, 2020 [5]; Липовецки, 2001 [8]; Мейжис &Почебут, 2008 [9]; Остром, 2011 [11], Свідерська, 2013 [14]; Friedman M.&Friedman R., 2002 [17]; Hampton&Varnum, 2017 [19]; Menard, Warkentin&Lowry, 2018 [20]; Triandis, 1995 [23], etc.). However, despite the psychological nature of these phenomena, there is a lack of purely social-psychological and political-psychological analysis of the manifestation of individualism and collectivism as certain social and social-psychological phenomena. Even still an ongoing debate among scientists, the phenomenon itself is individualism-collectivism, whether these trends opposing one another, forming a bipolar univariate model [19] or they are a multi-components model that interact on the principle of complementarity [22].

In studies of ownership, individualism has traditionally been seen as a source of heightened property, accompanied by increased control, a sense of responsibility, and self-investment and self-realization in and through target of ownership. Collectivism, on a contrary, encourages individuals to unite with the group, dissolve in it, and thus weaken, erode the desire for individualized possession [5; 9]. For today, both the psychological theory of ownership and theoretical investigations on the individualism-collectivism manifestation have gone much further. Their relationship is not so clear and straightforward. First, we are talking about ways of ownership: individual, common, collective, and therefore the predicates of different types of ownership will differ. As a matter of fact, it also lends itself to rethinking the categories of individualism and collectivism. Increasingly, they are seen not as opposition to each other, but as orthogonal, included in the unified interaction.

Thus, Kylyniak and Kolyadko argue that all generations are characterized by a mixed system of values in the context of indicators of individualism and collectivism. At the same time, the importance of individualistic values clearly increases with each new generation. However, in each generation there is a manifestation of both individualism and collectivism, albeit with different levels, which gives grounds to argue that the value dichotomy individualism / collectivism should not be a separating factor for modern Ukrainian society, but on the contrary, thanks to common ground can serve as a significant consolidating axis for modern society [5].

As Knyaziev's substantiates, the axiomatics of human nature denies categorical unrestrained individualism, to which it is impossible to reduce all the diversity of human behavior in everyday life, and all-consuming, even to some extent violent collectivism, which subjugates a free personality. The possibility of optimal combination of these two principles at all levels (at the level of an individual, in society, in the state and society as a whole) [7] looks more realistic. The actual study of the peculiarities of their combination and, accordingly, their impact on various socio-psychological phenomena is one of the key tasks of modern socio-psychological science, which will predict the development of certain social phenomena and behavioral reactions and attitudes of individuals and groups of people and other conditions.

The purpose of the paper is an analysis of the psychological features of the sense of ownership manifestation in the space of individualism and collectivism on individual (personal), group and social levels.

The statement of the main research material

Social collective structure is inherent in different cultures, states, including Eastern cultures. Individualism and collectivism are one of the socio-cultural factors in the development and realization of a person's sense of ownership in social practices, as it sets the general tone of social communication, traditions, determines the value of property and ownership, power-communication.

It is known that the social manifestation of any psychological phenomenon, including individualism or collectivism, is more than the sum of its individual manifestations, although it largely determines it. At the societal level, individualism-collectivism manifests itself in a different way. Being, as it were, at first glance, the sum of various individual interests, the social is formed and manifested differently and may even come into conflict and conflict with the individual values of individuals, members of the society.

According to the author's concept of the sense of ownership realization in social practices, a sense of ownership is defined as a subjective emotional experience of a person about belonging to certain targets of ownership, which reflects the meaning and significance of real or abstract, concrete, or generalized targets of ownership, that is, all that can be called their own. It arises and manifests itself as a subjective feeling of "mine" or "ours" in relation to tangible, intangible, and even abstract targets of ownership [3]. A sense of ownership is realizing in various social practices of possession, which arise, and function based on a sense of ownership manifestation in various spheres, namely finances, own territory, material things, social contacts, personal information space, own body, time regime, professional sphere, and life, in the organization, own values, ideas, opinions, as well as in relation to the state and manifestation in the civic sphere [4].

In constructing and manifesting himself as an owner of various objects of property, a person relies on personal traits, guidelines, beliefs, practices of behavior that were laid down in the process of socialization through interaction with social values and socio-cultural space.

The concepts of individualism and collectivism are multidimensional, and researchers often include several different subjects in their constructions. Some scholars place collectivism and individualism on opposite sides of the continuum. That is, individualism and collectivism are indexed as one variable, where the lowest score indicates extreme collectivism, and the highest score indicates extreme individualism [23]. However, modern researchers argue that multidimensional conceptualization of individualism and collectivism is better than one-dimensional indicator.

We share the position that the actual mechanism of interaction of private and public (common) interests can be understood only in their complex unity and interdependence and not in their mechanical opposition as mutually exclusive categories. This approach will make clearer the notion of private (personal) and public goods, which are designed to realize two different types of personal interests, and public goods also meet the needs of relevant public structures in accordance with their subjective understanding of the interests of this society. It is worth distinguishing that the individual and collective needs of people, which reflect their respective interests, are met by different benefits: both private and public.

Rubinstein A. formulates the "paradox of public goods" associated with the incompatibility of methodological individualism and a positive demand for public goods. The author criticizes neoclassical theories and proposes an alternative principle of complementarity to methodological individualism, according to which interests of society cannot be completely reduced to interests of individuals [13]. We propose to consider the manifestation of individualism-collectivism on three levels: individual (personal), interpersonal (group) and public.

Although individualism and collectivism are essentially socially determined psychological



traits that directly influence people's attitudes and behavior [23; 24], the number of empirical studies examining these meanings is insufficient. Instead, conceptually, and empirically, individualism and collectivism are considered mostly in intercultural psychological research, focusing more on the differences in the manifestation of the latter within different countries and societies. So, Triandis and his colleagues explain collectivism and individualism as a set of beliefs, norms, values, attitudes, and roles shared by people who speak the same language and have lived in the same geographical region for a certain historical time. Although individualistic tendencies have been shown to be more prevalent in developed capitalist countries with clear manifestations of economic and political democracy. If earlier researchers were inclined to believe that a country has a certain bias towards individualism or collectivism, later teachings argue that national cultures tend to combine elements of both individualism and collectivism [19].

There is also a difference in the way of creating and using individual, personalized goods and collective, mass, available. According to E. Ostrom, the collective use of common goods, such as a city park, a lake, leads to the depletion of its resources, and due to lack of individual responsibility - to the impossibility of correct restoration of such resources [11]. From the point of view of the way citizens consume common targets of ownership are divided into two fundamentally different types: tangible and intangible. Tangibles are specific objects which are used by everyone individually or jointly (parks, museums, libraries, educational institutions, hospitals, etc.) Occasionally some individuals can use the common targets many times, and others refuse it altogether because it is unnecessary, without receiving any compensation. Also, citizens enjoy the benefits purely individually and pay the part consumed only. However, there is a need for someone to commit to creating and maintaining these goods in good condition.

The interaction of individual (personal) and collective (common) is not clearly differentiated, structured and understandable. Based on the principle of duality of psyche and nature of the individual, we can say that both individual and society are always in a contradictory continuum between the desire to learn social norms, their internalization, compliance with social norms and rules as opposed to the desire for individualization, unique, external, and relying on their own capabilities in solving complex issues.

Individualism is often associated with alienation in relationships, in the pursuit of one's own, personal needs, as opposed to social, or collective, or common. Obviously, it is necessary to abandon the absolutization of individualism as such because the very nature of human speaks of his collective, social nature. So, the existence of an individual, maximally individualized, separated from social norms is simply unrealistic. Collectivism as a form of interaction, exchange implies that things, objects of property can be key factors in building relationships, determining the relationship of domination-subordination, based on their power, status, personal and social value, and significance. Collectivity, sociality is not an abstract concept, but manifests itself in each person, but to varying degrees and in different forms, depending on individual characteristics and even the situation.

The basic concepts which are related with the psychological component of individualism-collectivism and that are measurable are altruism and selfishness. Altruistic manifestations motivate a person to think not only about personal but also common interests. This is the origin of such phenomena as volunteering, patronage, etc. Sometimes people go into politics, into the civil service not for personal gain, but for common, group interests. Altruism may manifest itself both in family relationships and in the workplace, when a person prioritizes the satisfaction of collective, common needs. In such an extreme, hypertrophied form, it may usually also have negative consequences, both for the individual and for the group, the community in which it manifests itself. Each of us acts within certain social interests, adhering to certain rules of conduct, social norms, which has both positive and negative significance.

We propose to consider the sense of ownership manifestation in the space of individualism-collectivism on three levels: individual, personal (as a personal value), interpersonal, group (as a basis for interpersonal interaction) and public, social (as a form of social order).

Individualistic persons are defined as emotionally independent or "detached from the community" and they are usually self-contained, autonomous, and independent. They are more

likely to value self-direction, power, and personal achievement. On the other hand, those who are prone to collectivist attitudes are closely integrated into their communities and allow the needs of the group to displace their own interests [1; 23].

Although the individual level of individualism-collectivism manifestation is a personal trait and value, but it is created and functions exclusively in the interaction of a person with society. As with any ownership relationship, there are at least two actors involved in the target of ownership. In the process of intergroup interaction, individual inclinations of a person are expressed and manifested in a certain way.

Utilitarian collectivism assesses interests of a group or community through its own interest, as evidenced, for example, by the willingness to share tangible resources with other people who are not part of an immediate environment (family, friends). These components of collectivism were defined as cooperation to achieve common goals and collective responsibility and assistance to those in need.

Individualism-collectivism is also associated with individual differences in personality. A recent study [16] found that openness, integrity, extraversion, and pleasure are positively correlated with independent self-construction and individual life. The author argues that individuals who are bicultural, they have both Western and East Asian cultural identities or a significant influence of both types of culture, may also be taught to think individualistically or collectivistically, based on certain socio-cultural frameworks and according to the situation. At the same time, it remains unclear to what extent individualism-collectivism can be considered as parallel individually determined differences and how stable they are in different languages and social situations of interaction, including in social practices of possession. Individual individualism-collectivism related traits are less stable in situations in collectivist people.

Methods

To clarify the peculiarities of the sense of ownership realization in the space of individualism-collectivism at three levels we proposed to use several methods. In particular the proposed complex includes a number of methods: associative experiment to study the areas of sense of ownership realization, the peculiarities of its manifestation, including in the space of individualism-collectivism; focus group research to elucidate typical social practices of ownership in individualistic and collectivistic societies; survey; content analysis for data processing of associative experiment and focus group research; mathematical and statistical methods of data processing, factor and correlation analyzes to model the features of the sense of ownership realization in the space of individualism-collectivism.

The individual level of a sense of ownership expression in the space of individualism-collectivism relates to the manifestation of feelings "mine" and "ours". What someone belongs to the own, personal possession and what to the common, collective one? To this end, an associative experiment was conducted. Among other questions, respondents were asked to name a few examples of what they can call their own: "mine" and what "ours". As well as how they feel the difference between targets what belongs exclusively to them (marked as "mine") and what belongs to someone else (marked as "our"); why sense of ownership is important for a person and what does it give. The obtained data were analyzed considering the social-demographic peculiarities of respondents.

To study the peculiarities of the sense ownership realization at the interpersonal (group) level it is advisable to use questionnaires to study the level of individualism-collectivism (Scale of "individualism-collectivism" of the method of G. Hofstede), the scale of altruism –selfishness (Method "Diagnosis of social-psychological attitudes in the field of motivation and needs" O. Potiomkin, Scale A - identifying attitudes aimed at altruism and selfishness), internality or externality (Questionnaire "Level of subjective control"), and the level of sense of ownership development (Scale of psychological ownership, Avey).

To illustrate different social systems, four focus groups were conducted among



representatives of different societies: more individualized one – among European Master students (Norway, Germany) and a relatively more collectivistic – one among Ukrainian and Georgian Master students. In total, 4 focus groups were conducted with an average of 10-15 people each.

Furby L. substantiated the differences in a sense of ownership manifestation in socialist, collectivistic society, on the example of kibbutz, and the Israelites in opposite with individualized American society. This data shows that there are pronounced differences in the creation and development of a sense of ownership in ontogenesis depending on a social cultural context [18].

In Soviet times, the development of the Soviet economy based on national (common) ownership, did not contribute to development or formation of the owner's psychology. Privatization has not allowed many to use ownership as an effective basis for profitable production, but for most it has proved to be sham. For today in the conditions of consumer society demonstrative and simulacrum way of possession or rather even creation of possessive illusion continues to dominate. Digital space has created unprecedented opportunities for multiple replication and distortion of a fact of ownership, thereby significantly enhancing the illusory nature of the last one.

As for the economic aspect of ownership related to money or certain tangible property, Karnyshev A. and his colleagues pointed to the dominance of need and pragmatic possessive motives. The economic crisis causes a person's uncertainty in his future, his desire to create and have a financial cushion, to protect themselves from the devastating effects of possible risks. In such way the motives of insurance are beginning to emerge [6]. So, social status of an individual, his place in the social hierarchy sets a certain "perspective" of the vision of the state [15].

At the same time, it remains unclear to what extent individualism-collectivism can be considered as parallel individually determined differences and how stable they are in different conditions and social situations of interaction, including in social practices of possession. Individual traits associated with individualism-collectivism are less stable and situational in people who are prone to collectivism.

Conclusions

The article presents an understanding of individualism and collectivism as a complex, complementary system. The peculiarities of the sense of ownership realization in the space of individualism and collectivism at the individual, interpersonal and social levels are substantiated. It was shown that individuals with a higher level of collectivist guidelines are more likely to show feelings for collective, common ownership show a higher level of responsibility, control, self-investment, and intimate knowledge, which is optimally combined with a willingness to share ownership with others; and also have a lower level of desire for appropriation, control and the desire to dispose than persons with individualistic guidelines. It is substantiated that the individual tendency to individualism or collectivism determines not only the general orientation towards psychological appropriation, but also the way of interaction with the object of property and other persons, which is realized in various spheres and social practices.

The prospects for further research could be conducted in an empirical study of attitudes to different targets of ownership depending on the level of individualism-collectivism.

References

1. Васютинський, В.О. (2016). *Психологічна правда про індивідуалізм та колективізм*. К.: Міленіум.
2. Горбатенко, В. (2010). Людина і суспільство в ситуації постмодерну: філософсько-політичні детермінанти. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. 5. 151-166.
3. Губеладзе, І. Г. (2019). Почуття власності як соціально-психологічний феномен: концептуалізація поняття. *Наукові студії із соціальної та політичної психології*, 43 (46), 141-148. [https://doi.org/10.33120/ssj.vi43\(46\)](https://doi.org/10.33120/ssj.vi43(46))

4. Губеладзе, І.Г. (2020). Соціальні практики володіння як простір реалізації почуття власності. *Наукові студії із соціальної та політичної психології*. 46 (49). 242-250. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33120/ssj.vi46\(49\).173](https://doi.org/10.33120/ssj.vi46(49).173)
5. Калиняк, О.Т., Колядко, А.Ю. (2020). Індивідуалістичні та колективістські цінності в сучасному українському суспільстві: особливості міжпоколінневих інтерпретацій (на прикладі мешканців Львівщини). *Габітус*. 11. 41-47. DOI: 10.32843/2663-5208.2020.11.7
6. Карнышев А.Д., Бурменко Т.Д., Иванова Е.А. (2006). *Человек и собственность*. Иркутск: БГУЭП.
7. Князев, Ю.К. (2019). *Индивидуализм и коллективизм в современной экономике*. М.: Институт экономики РАН.
8. Липовецки, Ж. (2001). *Эра пустоты. Эссе о современном индивидуализме*. СПб.: Владимир Даль..
9. Мейжис, І.А., Почебут, Л.Г. (2008). Індивідуалізм чи колективізм? Соціально-психологічний погляд на історію та політичну культуру України. *Наукові праці*. 103. 90. 6-18.
10. Московичи, С. (1998). *Машина, творящая богов*. М.: Центр психологии и психотерапии.
11. Остром, Э. (2011). *Управляя общим. Эволюция институтов коллективной деятельности*. Москва.
12. Пайпс, Р. (2008). *Собственность и свобода*. М.: Московская школа политических исследований.
13. Рубинштейн, А. (2007). *Общественные интересы и теория публичных благ*. *Вопросы экономики*. 10. 90-113. DOI: 10.32609/0042-8736-2007-10-90-113
14. Свідерська, О. (2013). Масова політична поведінка в індивідуалізованому суспільстві. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філософсько-політологічні студії*. 3. 286-294.
15. Хазратова, Н. (2009). Психологічна природа почуття власності. *Соціальна психологія*, 5, 103–110.
16. Dunkel, C. S. (2013). Evidence for the role of the general factor of personality (GFP) in enculturation: The GFP and self-construal in Japanese and American samples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55(4), 417–421. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.04.002.
17. Friedman, M., Friedman R. (2002). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
18. Furby, L. (1980). The origins and early development of possessive behavior. *Political Psychology*, 2, 30-42. doi:10.2307/3790969
19. Hampton, R. S., & Varnum, M. E. W. (2017). *Individualism-Collectivism*. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, 1–8. DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_2023-1
20. Menard, P., Warkentin, M., Lowry, P. B. (2018). The impact of collectivism and psychological ownership on protection motivation: A cross-cultural examination. *Computers & Security*, 75, 147–166.
21. Noguti, V., Bokeyar, A.L. (2014). Who am I? The relationship between self-concept uncertainty and materialism. *International Journal of Psychology*. Vol.49. No.5, 323-333. DOI: 10.1002/ijop.12031
22. Taras, V., Sarala, R., Muchinsky, P., Kemmelmeier, M., Singelis, T. M., Avsec, A., ... Sinclair, H. C. (2013). Opposite ends of the same stick? Multi-method test of the dimensionality of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(2), 213–245. DOI: 10.1177/0022022113509132.
23. Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism & Collectivism*. Boulder: Westview Press.
24. Verkuyten, M., Martinovic, B. (2017). Collective Psychological Ownership and Intergroup Relations. *Perspectives on Psychological Sciences*. 12(6). 1021–1039. DOI: 10.1177/1745691617706514