

# Peculiarities of Participational Interaction in the System “Persons with Disabilities – Society”

Natalya Yevgenyevna SHUSTOVA<sup>1\*</sup>, Marina Anatolyevna LUCHENKOVA<sup>2</sup> and Olga Vitalyevna KARINA<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Chair of Pedagogy and Psychology, Balashov Institute of Saratov State University, Russia

<sup>2</sup>Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Chair of Pedagogy and Psychology, Balashov Institute of Saratov State University, Russia

<sup>3</sup>Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Chair of Pedagogy and Psychology, Balashov Institute of Saratov State University, Russia

\*Correspondence to: Natalya Yevgenyevna SHUSTOVA, Balashov Institute of Saratov State University, 29 K. Marx St., Balashov, Saratov region, 412300, Russia

E-mail: shustova.bissu@bk.ru

## Abstract

**Background:** The article presents a theoretical review and empirical results highlighting the issue of the peculiarities of participational interaction in the system “persons with disabilities (PWD) – society.” The main contour of perception of PWD in modern society as well as the peculiarities of their subjective perception of the importance of participational interaction are characterized.

**Objective:** to disclose the peculiarities of participational interaction of persons with disabilities in society based on the authors’ typology.

**Methods:** As a diagnostic tool the authors’ tool “A degree of the manifestation of participation” was used. The results were processed by means of the standard pack of the statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics 21.

**Findings:** The article presents the results of a theoretical analysis of modern Russian and foreign research which allowed us to single out the main predictors of participational process from the perspective of emotional, cognitive and behavioural aspects. The individual peculiarities of the manifestation of the development of the process of participation of persons with disabilities are presented. In the course of presentation of the empirical part of the research the typical models of participational interaction characterized of persons with disabilities are singled out. The means of realization of the set empirical objective is a cluster analysis. The result of the empirical research is types of participational interaction: actively cooperating, moderately inclusive, participating without initiative, inertly accepting.

**Conclusions:** The authors’ typology of participational interaction is presented which demonstrates a different attitude of persons with disabilities towards a possibility of communication of different statuses. Four types of participational interaction are empirically proved: actively cooperating, moderately inclusive, participating without initiative, inertly accepting. The authors’ typology has a theoretical value and can be used by specialists in their practical activities for creating an environment without barriers.

**Keywords:** participation; disabilities; types of participational interaction; social adaptation; perspectives.

## Introduction

Modern society is of different statuses according to its structure, and this is the reason why the life field of each social group has a peculiar spectrum of realization of individual resources. Persons with disabilities belongs to the category of the socially vulnerable as they need a special adaptation route in creating the vector of interactions with society and achieving vitally important purposes, the full realization of personality’s potential.

Social measures oriented at the support of persons with disabilities (PWD) taken in society promote creating an environment without barriers, searching for new effective ways of the integration of social space. However, it should be noted that the external factors of the optimization of the adaptation route of invalids and PWD should be determined by internal factors, in particular by the readiness of this category of persons for the full social and psychological interaction.

The anthropocentric direction of modern society is oriented at an active personality able to perceive the diverse word and diverse people making a free interaction with others. A free, open interaction of a personality with others supposes a subjective well-being of every personality, respect and mutual understanding built on self-knowledge and self-acceptance. In the process of communication the interacting sides can achieve different interactions: reach a consensus in actions, anticipate each other’s behavior, conflict, contest moral contradictions. Any communication leads both to the positive and negative result. The positive result allows us to accumulate social experience and introduce new perspectives into social development. The negative experience

accumulates corrupted information and leads to different social discords provoking negative processes in the development of society.

The phylogenetic development of society has social and psychological nature of different statuses influencing the specific features of interaction between members of society. An illustrative example of an interaction with different statuses is participational interaction with PWD.

The essence of participational interaction consists in that the process of an interaction with different statuses goes consciously consolidating the powers of the subjects of communication for achieving common purposes. A construct of readiness for such an interaction includes attitudes, social and personal expectations of PWD as well as their attitude towards the conditions of realization of an individual’s potential offered by society. In this connection, the monitoring of expected life perspectives, chosen strategies for achieving the desired purposes and, as a whole, the modality of attitude towards the status of one’s own otherness among PWD will allow us to ensure working out a successful vector of an effective integration into society.

It goes without saying that one of the basic ways of solving the issue of successful social adaptation of PWD is participational interaction. This interaction supposes not only the maximum inclusion of PWD in social space, the acceptance of the otherness of contacting partners, but also the rootedness on the mind of each personality equivalence of all subjects of interaction. In this connection, disclosing the peculiarities of participational interaction of PWD in society is topical.

## Literature Review

In modern scientific practice the notion “participation” (from French *participation* – involvement, empathy) is interpreted as interaction made on the principle of the maximum inclusion in the system of interactions of different statuses where each of the partners admits equivalence of the subjects of interaction and accepts the otherness of another partner outside the borders of the present limitations in possibilities. In other words, the process of participation allows all the subjects of interaction of different statuses to be in the same field of comprehension, acceptance and to feel effective and resourceful in achieving the common purpose.

The issue of participational interactions, beyond all doubt, has an interdisciplinary context and was considered by different scientists from the viewpoint of psychological, sociological and medical aspects at different times. In the most widely way this issue is presented in the conceptions of managing social groups, in particular referring to PWD (Isherwood, 2001; Baglyuk, Robustova, 2017; Kulagina, 1982; Einfeld et al., 2018; Hirano et al., 2018) as well as in the theories of personality motivation (Locke, 1968).

In other words, harmonic interaction and the control of the situation of achieving the common purpose are kept in case the partners in the process of interactions of different statuses are aimed at searching for new forms, ways of realization of the common purpose, and are not trying too hard to fix on the perception of the otherness of this or that subject of interaction. Participational interaction allows people to greatly broaden the frameworks of perception of the possibilities of each personality because it contributes to acquisition of new ideas about the resources of the people who are nearby outside the frameworks of their otherness in terms of their health. At the same time, the issue of participational interaction in the system “persons with disabilities – society” is reflected enough in scientific practice. In particular, there is no universal interpretation of the notion of participation, the peculiarities of building participational interaction in modern society.

Thus, in the research by Baglyuk, Robustova (2017); Ahlers et al. (2017) the most typical ideas of PWD grounded in public consciousness are reflected. The authors indicate at the existence of peculiar psychological blocks in building interactions with partners having disabilities which are expressed, to a greater or lesser degree, in the manifestation of inequality of rights when it comes down to evaluation of the joined contribution in the common field of activities.

In this connection, in the process of interactions the strategy of hyperprotection is most often used as an indicator of an enhanced control of the situation, the unequal distribution of forces for achieving the common purpose. Probably, this circumstance is connected with the fact that the social and psychological aspect of the coaching of PWD is not used widely enough thereby concentrating the attention on a deficit/lack of a partner's resources for interaction. Such a context of attitude is formed on the basis of the centration of perception on frequent cognitive impairments of PWD connected with the narrowness of one's realization in the life field of activities (Brown et al., 2018).

It should be noted that in spite of the significant value of paternal, supporting attitudes in the system of interactions of different statuses, the hidden motive among persons without limitations in resources is the awareness of the partners' inequality in their active contributions and the need for dominating. This circumstance may be conventionally indicated as a subjective choice in a situation of uncertainty where the responsibility for the common affair is taken by that subject who is not

only interested in the maximum result, but also can suggest a more variative course of actions.

In this case harmonic participational interaction is broken because the perception of equality of each personality included in the process of contacting disappears. Frequent effects of disharmonic interaction are ambivalent reactions (protection – distancing, fear – pity, etc.) (Kharlamenkova, 2018). It should be noted that ingrained mindsets received in the parents' family contribute not only to readiness/unreadiness for overcoming social difficulties among PWD, but also forms a model of a personality's life route (Franklin & Sloper, 2009; Hampson et al., 2018).

In case of an expressed feeling of stress connected with the necessity of living with and upbringing an invalid child in the family, beyond all doubt, the emotional background of the parents destructively influences the formation of personality among PWD (Kaleta & Mróz, 2018).

In this connection, the essence of participational interactions are centred in the sphere of mutual readiness of subjects for weighty relations in the active field of society as well as the absence of intrapsychological conflict among the subjects of contacting. In this case the fact of readiness itself for activities brings out the harmony of self-perception and the perception of the world around (Pavlova & Sergienko, 2016). An important factor of a harmonic joined activity is the presence of emotional resonating, ingrained friendly relations which contributes to a free communication between partners, reduces the level of negative perception of the difficulties in educational, social acts of self-realization (Ng-Knight et al., 2018; Snin, 2018).

A similar idea can be traced in the research by Kulagina (1982) where the author indicates at the connection of the readiness for coordinated actions in the process of making decisions and the choice of the strategies for achieving the common purpose which are optimal for each partner. In this context there is an interesting fact that the more conscientious the process of the preparedness and realization of the joined actions for achieving the common result will be, the more positive will be social and psychological well-being and the more favourable will be biomedical markers of the health among the subjects of participational interactions (Ng-Knight et al., 2018).

While analyzing the structural core of participation in scientific, psychological practice the scientists say about the marked connection of emotional, cognitive and behavioural predictors functioning as a single unity in the system of interactions of different statuses. The research of foreign scientists allows us to single out a context of the direction of participation: personal involvement, acceptance of the equal weighting of the partners' resources and involvement into the process of interaction (Locke, 1968; Miller & Monge, 1986; Sutin et al., 2018). The fact of the significance of involvement and activity including physical among PWD was shown in the research by Cornelius et al. (2012). Cottle (1976) considers the development of the skills of activity as a possibility of reducing psychological barriers and harmonizing the social skills of children with autistic disorders.

In other words, it can be stated that the development of the readiness for interaction and the skills for participational process require harmonizing all spheres of life among PWD, their acquisition of self-efficacy in society.

It goes without saying that the involvement, consonance of emotional, cognitive and behavioural aspects build a comfortable space for each subject of participational interactions because it removes a possible tension, allows people optimistically and, which is also important, constructively and carefully thinking choose a successful

route for achieving the common purpose. In this connection, it should be noted that the process of participation is basically aimed at creating conditions for a full realization of every personality's potential outside the differences of the otherness and increasing satisfaction of life as whole.

Thus, in the research by Isherwood (2001) the indicators of a full and self-effective life activity of PWD are shown. The author notes that the absence of boundaries in accepting the personality of another person substantially harmonizes social well-being, increases motivation for activities, contributes to a full realization of available resources. An interesting fact is noted by the foreign researchers Kaleta, Mróz (2018) who revealed an interconnection between proneness to forgive and life satisfaction among PWD. The authors show that the ability to timely and constructively reflex life difficulties allows a personality to perceive one's own life not as permanent overcoming the defect of development and an attempt for adaptation in society, but as new experience giving new opportunities.

A similar point of view can be traced in the works by Zhilinskaya, Bocharov (2018). The authors point out that the fullness and successfulness of a personality's existence in society is based on admitting the equality of the partners, the understanding of the resourcefulness of every personality outside their otherness.

Similar ambitions are possible when there is ingrained personal, social responsibility, in the process of contacts in the active field of society as well as when the process of participation is developing dynamically which makes it easy to understand the personality of every person. This thesis is proved by the idea highlighted in the research by Heller, Strauss (2004) who say that the awareness and successfulness of participational interactions contribute to a personal growth of the subjects of social contacting and an increase in their quality of life.

In the conclusion of that short theoretical analysis it can be stated that in spite of an obvious topicality of the issue in scientific practice there exists a lack of research of the issue of participational interactions; there is a strongly marked need for a systemic reflection of the available scientific data as well as a need for enriching diagnostic tools oriented at PWD.

## Materials and Methods

The research was conducted in Saratov region. Its participants were 100 young people belonging to PWD at the ages of 15–23. There were 47 boys and 53 girls. The sample included the young people having hearing disabilities, vision disabilities, mobility disabilities. In the framework of the preliminary work information agreement of all the respondents was received; the status of the respondents is anonymous. The readiness of the persons with disabilities for participational interaction was studied with the help of the authors' questionnaire “A degree of the manifestation of participation.”

Working out the authors' questionnaire aimed at finding out a degree of the manifestation of participation in the context of a personality's life perspectives among PWD was made at several stages. At the first stage we made a theoretical and methodological analysis of the phenomenon of anticipation, its structural components and the regularities of manifestation as well as its interconnection with different social and psychological phenomena and processes. On the basis of summing up the foreign and Russian sources we singled out three social and psychological indicators disclosing the peculiarities of participational interaction: interaction of different statuses itself, a personality's activities and his or her life perspectives. At the second stage the singled out indicators were the basis for posing questions. Then we made an evaluation of the efficacy of the worked out tools.

The result of summing up the work at each of the stages is the questionnaire “A degree of manifestation of participation” which includes three scales (the scale “Activity vector”, the scale “Modality of life perspective”, the scale “Participational interaction”) and consists of 31 statements. It is necessary to express your degree of agreement with those statements on the basis of a 4-point rating scale (“absolutely wrong”; “more wrong than right”; “absolutely right”).

The scale “Participational interaction” is meant for identifying the manifestation of participation in the context of its basic structural components: emotional, cognitive, behavioural. This scale has 15 statements.

As scientists note, in participational interactions an attitude towards the joint act of actions for achieving the unified decision/result plays a special role where the different statuses of the partners do not block the unified access of information for making an effective decision and choosing a constructive strategy for achieving the purpose (Franklin, Sloper, 2009; Snin, 2018; Shavel, 2017). Thus, Franklin, Sloper (2009) in studying the inclusions of invalid children into the process of interaction with their peers who do not have problems with health showed that in the process of interaction the awareness of the participants play an important role. Children must have an opportunity to freely express their opinion and influence the process of making a decision as well as be sure of the fact that their opinion is taken into account in the process of interpersonal interaction.

In participational process its structural components (cognitive, emotional, behavioural) are revealing (Luchenkova et al., 2017).

Thus, Zhilinskaya, Bocharov (2018), Pavlova, Sergienko (2016), Shamionov (2017) emphasizing the role of cognitive component note that through interaction communicating persons build up joint actions helping realize the planned activity. An exchange of information actualizes psychic activity which allows us to reinforce information, to think, to evaluate and to form an attitude towards interaction. An analysis of information about the process of interaction correlates with personal characteristics, and an interpretation of acts takes place (Zhilinskaya & Bocharov, 2018).

Emotional expressions mobilize people, help to regulate behaviour in the process of interaction. Ng-Knight et al. (2018) note that through an emotional component a person can build up interaction. His or her evaluation of the partner, the situation of interaction leads to a continuation of interaction or to a termination of this interaction.

A behavioural component reflects not only the readiness for actions, but also the existing experience. It is closely conditioned by a complex of the existing skills and abilities in the sphere of interaction (Na & Mikami, 2018). Thus, Snin (2018) found out that young people find friends who are similar to them, i.e. young people who demonstratively behave in communicating with other, find friends who are not looking for help, contained in communication and interaction. Those young people who are sincerely trying to help others and looking for help themselves find friends ready for interactions, trying to help others and asking for other people's help.

In light of this, the statements of this scale are formulated so that the essence of participational interaction in the context of its basic structural components can be reflected. Among the offered statements there are, for example, these ones: “The ability to work in a team with different people boost chances of success”, “I feel sorry when common problems are solved without my participation”, “The work in a team irritates me as a mistake of one person can lead to the failure of all”, “I like working in a collective, in a team”, “A decision made together is better than an individual decision”.



The scale "Activity vector" is meant for identifying the manifestation of a personality's activity in participational interaction. It has 8 statements.

In scientific sources it is emphasized that a personality's activity as an integral quality manifests itself in his or her active attitude towards life and people. Thus, Pavlova, Sergienko (2016) consider the subjective and personal regulation of behaviour in the context of manifestation of the individuality of a person. Due to a personality's psychological maturity and the building of time perspective the regulation of behaviour goes more active. Shavel (2017), speaking about a personality's activity, points out at the fact that the motivational sphere of a personality is responsible for a motive for an action.

Thus, the productivity of participational interaction depends on a personality's activity. In this connection, the questionnaire includes the statements aimed at finding out this aspect. Examples of these statements are: "I take an active part and independence in achieving my goals". "Any difficulties, even slightest ones, make me inactive", "A special status of my health reduces my possibilities for self-realization in society".

The scale "Modality of life perspective" is aimed at finding out a personality's attitude towards his or her life, its perspectives, and has 8 statements.

By life perspective in scientific community they understand a relatively whole image of the future filled with planned and expected events having a different subjective and modal significance for a personality. Life perspectives reflect ideas of a personality about his or her future, its determinism or different variants, connections with the past or the present, about an influence on the choice of today's model of behaviour. Cottle (1976), Zhilinskaya, Bocharov (2018) note that time perspective reflects a person's ability to act in the present with a focus of foresight of relatively distant events of the future.

As Shamionov (2017) notes, the realization and comprehension by a person his or her being, the understanding the place occupied by a person in life continuum are closely connected with the degree of one's own subjective well-being.

All that was the basis for making a number of statements among of which are the following: "My past is better than the present and the future", "In my life there are few bright events", "I feel comfortable in society", "My life is worse than that of other people".

The psychometric analysis of the questionnaire shows that the tools can be found suitable for studying a degree of the manifestation of participation in the context of life perspectives of a personality among PWD. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were proved. All the scales of the tools have internal consistency high enough (Cronbach's alpha coefficient is from 0,77 to 0,81).

Thus, the authors' questionnaire allows to study individual peculiarities of participational interaction. At the same time we understand that typical models lie behind all the varieties of individual models of participational interaction. Consequently, we can single out groups of people with similar models of participational interaction.

The solution of the set task was conducted by means of the use of cluster analysis. As the benchmark data for clustering were taken such predictors (indicators) as vector of participational interaction, pragmatic activity and modality of life perspective.

Processing of the results was made by means of the standard pack of the statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics 21.

## Results

The primary analysis of the data allowed us to characterize the peculiarities of participational attitude of PWD as whole in our sampling. Thus, the mean value in the parameter "vector of participational interaction" was 2,9 points, in "pragmatic activity" – 2,6 points, in "modality of life perspective" – 2,7 points. In addition to the above it should be noted that the minimal variability of data is characterized of the vector of participational interaction ( $\sigma=0,37$ ) which indicates at the relative solidarity of the respondents in their evaluation of this parameter. In the other parameters the standard deviation is 0,55 and 0,51 respectively.

The analysis of the respondents' responses for some statements clearly demonstrate the position of PWD in the framework of the sphere in question. Here is the distribution of the respondents' responses for some of the offered statements in the parameter "vector of participational interaction". For example, the vast majority of the respondents expressed their agreement with the statement "Choosing between group and individual work, I prefer work in a team" (60% of the respondents chose the variant "more right than wrong", 22 % – "absolutely right", 13 % – "more wrong than right", 5 % – "absolutely wrong"). A similar response dispersion was given for the statement "A decision made together is better than an individual decision" (64% of the respondents preferred the variant "more right than wrong", 15% – "absolutely right", 18% – "more wrong than right", 3 % – "absolutely wrong"). Besides, there were other opinions. Thus, the responses for the statement "In comparison with others I take part in joint events more often" were 45% – "more right than wrong", 32% – "more wrong than right", 13% – "absolutely right", 10 % – "absolutely wrong".

The study of opinions of PWD in the parameter "pragmatic activity", as was expected, showed the presence of different opinions. The respondents differently evaluated their life energy. For the statement "I am more energetic than others" 24% of the respondents said "absolutely true", 30 % – "more right than wrong", 27% – "more wrong than right", 19 % – "absolutely wrong". The response dispersion for the statement "In achieving goals I always rely on the help of others" goes well with the context of the obtained data (21% – "absolutely true", 26% – "more right than wrong", 40 % – "more wrong than right", 13% – "absolutely wrong"). Meanwhile, a considerable part of the respondents pointed out at the manifestation of one's own activity and a kind of drive in solving vitally important issues. Thus, an analysis of the responses for the statement "In achieving goals I display perseverance" showed that 24% of the respondents expressed their full agreement with it, 40% agreed to some extent while 31% of the respondents doubted the importance of their own contribution, and 5% of young people admitted their inactivity.

The response dispersion of PWD in the parameter "modality of life perspective" was also very informative. Here is an analysis of some of them. In evaluating the statement "In my life there are few bright events" there prevailed responses reflecting dissatisfaction of one's life among PWD (27% – "absolutely true", 45% – "more right than wrong", 37% – "more wrong than right", 4% – "absolutely wrong"). A different tendency is characteristic of the situation of forecasting life events (the statement "I look at my future with anxiety"). Only for a half of the respondents the future is uncertain and is connected with worries: 10 % of the respondents preferred the variant "absolutely true", 38% – "more right than wrong", 39% – "more wrong than right", 13% – "absolutely wrong". In addition, all the persons with disabilities expressed their hopes for positive changes. The responses for the statement "I believe my life will have lots of positive moments" were the following: 24% – "absolutely true", 69% – "more right than wrong", 4% – "more wrong than right", 3% – "absolutely wrong".

After the primary analysis of the research data obtained with the help of the authors’ technique we used a two-stage clustering for the purpose of studying the importance of the singled out predictors (“vector of participational interaction”, “pragmatic activity” and “modality of life perspective”) for dividing the respondents into groups (clusters) with similar characteristics in question.

The made calculations allowed us to single out four clusters among which there are two similar in size (each cluster has 29 respondents). Those clusters are the largest. The smallest cluster has 17 respondents; the medium one has 25 respondents.

The quality of diving into the clusters according to the “data for the model” obtained in the process of clustering is good. Consequently, we can accurately say about the presence of a clustering structure in the analyzed data.

The calculations of the importance of the predictors showed that the indicator “vector of participational interaction” is the basic for the clustering model (the importance of the predictor is 1,0). The indexes of “modality of life perspective” and “pragmatic activity) are a little lower, but also make a considerable contribution to the clustering model (the importance of the predictors are 0,83 and 0,75 respectively).

The mean value of the predictors shows a degree of their presence in each cluster which allows to describe the peculiarities of the representatives of the cluster. Following on from the analysis of the obtained data each cluster was given a name (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Types of participational interaction

Cluster	Name	Predictors, mean value			Quantity %
		Vector of participational interaction	Pragmatic activity	Modality of life perspective	
1	Actively cooperating type	3,35	3,20	3,37	25
2	Moderately inclusive type	2,7	3,03	2,97	17
3	Type of participating without initiative	3,05	2,23	2,4	29
4	Inertly accepting type	2,51	2,24	2,36	29

Thus, by means of the clustering analysis we defined four groups of the respondents. The inclusion of the respondents into this or that group is conditioned by such social and psychological characteristics as the relation to the vector of participational interaction, the manifestation of pragmatic activity and the evaluation of life perspectives. Each cluster taking into account the obtained value of each predictor was given the corresponding name: an actively cooperating type, a moderately inclusive type, a type of participating without initiative, an inertly accepting type.

## Discussions

The analysis of Russian and foreign publications testifies a general tendency of attracting more and more attention to the issues of participational interaction in society and to those difficulties which arise in the framework of this process (Baglyuk & Robustova, 2017; Einfeld et al., 2018; Layderdale–Littin & Blacher, 2017). This research is not an exception. Its main result is the authors’ typology of participational interaction which allows to systematize the ideas of the character of the inclusion of PWD into this process.

And it is the importance of the typological approach for the understanding of the essence of participational interaction that should be noted here. Thus, Kharlamenkova (2018) points out at the importance of research in the sphere of searching for new markers of similarities and differences in building up models of arrangement by a subject his or her activities of daily living. She also emphasizes that the inclusion of people into groups in a number of similar parameters allows not only identify the most typical manifestations of a definite phenomenon, but also take into account the identified peculiarities in practice-oriented activities.

In this connection, the authors’ typology of participational interaction represents value from the viewpoint of understanding integrative processes in modern society, the awareness of the degree of the preparedness of PWD for inclusion into common social space as well the comprehension of the peculiarities of their subjective perception of one’s own life as a whole.

As a detailed comprehensive analysis of the results of clustering showed, young people with disabilities in the context of the singled out parameters can belong to this or that type of participational interaction.

Thus, the representatives of the actively cooperating type have an active desire for partnership in the frameworks of participational interaction; they are sure about their future making an accent on the positive variant of developing the coming events, they show initiative in terms of building one’s life.

The moderately inclusive type is characterized by a “weighted” activity combined with the so-called reasonable approach in terms of participational interaction. Partner communication and making decisions together are considered as one of the variants of interaction with society. Recognizing the importance of participational interaction, they take part in this process as participants and only sometimes act as its initiators. For them the ability of a personality individually makes decisions is rather an important characteristic. The representatives of this type rather realistically look at the world; they have a fairly positive outlook at their own lives and perspective opportunities.

PWD of the type of participating without initiative are characterized by inclusion in participational interaction in the background of insufficient individual activities and relative confidence of their life perspectives. The inclusion in participational interaction is predominantly perceived as a necessity, but not as the part of life greatly influencing their life as a whole, influencing its quality.

The representatives of the inertly accepting type as well as the representatives of the type of participating without initiative are characterized by a rather moderate manifestation of activity and an insufficient believe in their own promising future. All that manifests itself in a combination with a low inclusion into participational space of interactions

As we can see, the authors’ typology of participational interaction shows that PWD have different attitudes towards a possibility of communication of different statuses. Such an attitude, as a theoretical analysis of scientific sources and scientists’ empirical research show, can be conditioned by a number of peculiarities of both external and internal character. Among the peculiarities contributing to success of the building of interaction of different statuses scientists single out readiness of the partners for accepting each other and admitting the importance each partner’s contribution, belief in oneself and one’s own possibilities, a personality’s purposefulness (Brown et al., 2018; Cornelius et al., 2017; Corsano et al., 2017; Kaleta & Mróz, 2018).

Among the characteristics destructing participational interaction itself Keum et al. (2018), Na, Mikami (2018) name stigmatization and self-stigmatization.

In the context of the singled out types we find topical an idea expressed by Zhilinskaya, Bochaver (2018) who say that in the ideal case a person must gave a formed world picture and aware his or her place in it. However, as scientists emphasize, there may be both objective and subjective reasons in life preventing such an ideal situation. In this situation we find an issue of working out practice-oriented programmes the most topical. Those programmes must be aimed at an integration of PWD into society taking into account their type of participational interaction.

## Conclusions

A theoretical analysis of the scientific sources disclosed the essence of participation as a process of interaction of different statuses based on the consolidation of the efforts of the subjects of communication for achieving common purposes. It was noted that participational interaction significantly broadens the frameworks of perception of each personality's possibilities because it contributes to acquiring new ideas of the resources of the people around.

The conducted empirical research allowed us to single out the types of participational interaction: actively cooperating, moderately inclusive, participating without initiative, inertly accepting. The actively cooperating type is characterized by an active, deliberate desire for participational interaction, an initiative and the positive outlook at the future. The moderately inclusive type is characterized by a reflexive activity, making individual decisions, the positive and realistic perception of life perspectives. The type participating without initiative is characterized by forced participational interaction, a lack of initiative, and a vague idea of one's own future. The inertly accepting type is characterized by motivational deficiency of participational actions, discrete initiative, a diffusion of ideas about the future. The authors' typology was based on such indicators as vector of participational interaction, pragmatic activity and modality of life perspective. The results of the research proved the fact that PWD are involved in the process of participation in different degrees. In this connection, we see our next task as working out a practice-oriented programme aimed at the development of the skills and abilities of an effective participational interaction and the positivisation of contacting of different statuses outside the borders of the otherness.

## Acknowledgement

The research is supported by Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project No. 17-06-00338-OIH “The interconnection of personal expectations and the readiness for participation of persons with disabilities”

## References

- Ahlers, K.P., Gabrielsen, T.P., Lewis, D., Brady, A.M., Litchford, A. (2017). Supporting individuals with autism spectrum disorder in understanding and coping with complex social emotional issues. *School Psychology International*, 38(6), 586–607.
- Baglyuk, S.B., Robustova, Ye.V. (2017). Forming an integrative process of the higher education of invalids and PWD under the conditions of modern educational medium. *Bulletin of Ufa State Oil Technical University. Science, Education, Economics. Series Economics*, 2(20), 149–156.
- Brown, D.A., Brown, E., Lewis, C.N., Lamb, M.E. (2018). Narrative skill and testimonial accuracy typically developing children and those with intellectual disabilities. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 32(5), 550–560.
- Cornelius, C., Fedewa, A.L., Ahn, S. (2017). The Effect of Physical Activity on Children with ADHD: A Quantitative Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 33(2), 136–170.
- Corsano, P., Musetti, A., Guidotti, L., Capelli, F. (2017). Typically developing adolescents' experience of growing up with a brother with an autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 42(2), 151–161.
- Cottle, T.J. (1976). *Perceiving time: a psychological study with men and women*. New York: Wiley.
- Einfeld, S.L., Beaumont, R., Clark, T., Clarke, K.S., Costley, D., Gray, K.M., Horstead, S.K., Hodge, M., Roberts, J., Sofronoff, K., Taffe, J.R., Howlin, P. (2018). School-based social skills training for young people with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 43(1), 29–39.
- Franklin, A., Sloper, P. (2009). Supporting the participation of disabled children and young people in decision-making. *Children and Society*, 23(1), 3–15.
- grounding for the basic predictors of the structural model of participation. *Humanization of Education*, 6, 89–96.
- Hampson, M.E., Hicks, R.E., Watt, B.D. (2018). Beliefs about employment of people living with psychosis. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 70(2), 103–112.
- Heller, F., Pusic, E., Strauss, G., Wilpert, B. (2004). *Organizational participation: Myth and Reality*. Oxford University Press.
- Hirano, K.A., Rowe, D., Lindstrom, L., Chan, P. (2018). Systemic Barriers to Family Involvement in Transition Planning for Youth with Disabilities: A Qualitative Metasynthesis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(11), 3440–3456.
- Isherwood, M.M. (2001). *Coping with disability*. Moscow: Pedagogika.
- Kaleta, K., Mróz, J. (2018). Forgiveness and life satisfaction across different age groups in adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 120, 17–23.
- Keum, B.T.H., Hill, C.E., Kivlighan Jr., D.M., Lu, Y. (2018). Group- and individual-level self-stigma reductions in promoting psychological help-seeking attitudes among college students in helping skills courses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 65(5), 661–668.
- Kharlamenkova, N.Ye. (2018). The development of a subject's psychology in modern research as a phenomenon of social support. *Psychological Journal*, 39(2), 25–36.
- Kulagina, I.Yu. (1982). On the possibilities of forming educational motivation among children with mental retardation. *Defectology*, 6, 3–10.
- Lane, D.J., Mathes, E.W. (2018). The pros and cons of having a meaningful life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 120, 13–16.
- Layderdale-Littin, S., Blacher, J. (2017). Young adults with severe intellectual disability: Culture, parent, and sibling impact. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 42(3), 230–239.
- Locke, E. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3, 157–189.
- López-Pérez, B., Ambrona, T., Gummerum, M. (2018). Emotional preferences and goals and emotion dysregulation in children with Asperger's syndrome and typically developing children. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 57(3), 274–290.
- Luchenkova, M.A., Shustova, N. Ye., Karina, O.V. (2017). A theoretical and methodological
- manifestation of a person's individuality.** *Psychological Journal*, 37(2), 43–56.
- Miller, K.I., Monge, P.R. (1986). Participation, satisfaction, and productivity: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 727–753.

25. Na, J.J., Mikami, A.Y. (2018). Pre-existing Perceptions of ADHD Predict Children's Sociometrics Given to Classmates with ADHD. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(10), 3218–3231.
26. Ng-Knight, T., Shelton, K.H., Riglin, L., Frederickson, N., McManus, L.C., Rice, F. (2018). ‘Best friends forever’? Friendship stability across school transition and associations with mental health and educational attainment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12246>.
27. **Pavlova, N.S., Sergienko, Ye.A. (2016). *The subjective and personal regulation of behaviour as a***
28. Shamionov, R.M. (2017). Psychodynamic properties as the predictors of a personality's subjective well-being. *Psychological Journal*, 38(1), 41–51.
29. Shavel, S.A. (2017). The motivational sphere of a personality's activity. *Sociological Almanac*. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/motivatsionnaya-sfera-lichnostnoy-aktivnosti> (Accessed on October 14, 2018).
30. Snin, H. (2018). The role of friends in help-seeking tendencies during early adolescence: Do classroom goal structures moderate selection and influence of friends? *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 53, 135–145.
31. Sutin, A.R., Stephan, Y., Terracciano, A. (2018). Facets of conscientiousness and objective markers of health status. *Psychology and Health*, 33(9), 1100–1115.
32. Zhilinskaya, A.V., Bocharov, A.A. (2018). On studying the formation of the trajectory of life way by teenagers. *Psychological Journal*, 39(1), 36–45.