

316.6:314.5.063

Family construction: team creation

Olga Kliapets

Institute of Social and Political Psychology
National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in Ukraine
Andreevska str. 15, Kiev, Ukraine

Abstract.

The family as a team - group of people, united by a total activity are regarded. The total activity a family space construction, and basic prerequisites of its successful implementation are environmental friendliness and dialogism interaction between family members are becomes.

Keywords: *family, small group, family construction, a team, environmental friendliness, dialogism.*

Family, marriage is a conservative phenomenon by its nature, are focused on changes a minimally. The main purpose is to recreate the historical experience of mankind but specific functions like the birth, maintenance and education of children, who are providing generational changes in the society and their socialization in specific historical conditions. This is the public concern in a family, which leads to interest in its preservation.

However the modern realities a wide prevalence of different forms from traditional drafts of family life and the possibility of overflow in some other family forms are shown. So the traditional ideas of the family only as a small social group whose members are united by marriage or blood relations, and what makes their livelihoods based on common economic, domestic, moral and psychological structures, the main purpose of which is the birth and upbringing children, where it is considered only as an intermediary between the individual and society in the development process, which now became inadequate, such that can not except challenges.

Singling out the essential features of small social groups, researchers usually focus on the presence of the joint goals, joint activities, subordinated to these goals, relationships and immediacy of communication and intensity (frequency and duration) of interaction between group members [Psychologist-practitioners` dictionary, 2001; Group, 2005].

In this case two main approaches are singled out to understanding common activities of family groups: firstly, the traditional, where mutual family activities and family is defined as a group of functions that are marked as its core: educational, reproductive, economical, sexual, psychological, recreational, regulatory, etc. [A. Galichanska., 2004; L. Shneiner., 2000]; and, secondly, post-nonclassical, which focuses on the process of building a family space by a family itself, so the family construction is understood as a common activity of family members [D. Kutuzova, 2005].

You can see that the traditional approach is more “society-focused“: family in this approach is, in common, an instrumental character; it is not so much an intrinsic value as a way for satisfying individuals` inner psychological and material humanity needs and for providing new state members for society and regulating their behavior. Thus, family functions singling and quality criteria for their implementation are in the society and can be seen in assessments for compliance with existing norms. Consideration of a family from these positions reserves individual projects of life-construction in family fields out of sight; and brings to the fore the effectiveness of the family in terms of society, satisfying family groups` social needs.

Demonstrating a more person-focused attitude to the family, post-nonclassical researchers are studying changes in the quantitative and qualitative composition of family functions (associated with gradual transfer of its functions to other family social institutions by family, as well as increasing the possibility of realization of family functions by each partner separately, independently of each other) and understand family not as a static entity but as a project that, firstly, greatly conditioned by socio-historical context and, secondly, always in process of becoming like an endless story of family life, the number authors equals the number of family members. Thus attention is focused not on the family structure and public functions execution but on changable and procedural aspects of family life. One does not exclude the other: for society family, which is multi-faceted and is very diverse in its structure, remains as a group, which is included in the regulatory structure of society, which performs certain social problem [D. Kutuzova., 2005]. The number and significance of social functions that contribute to their implementation are changed over time; some of them may completely disappear or depreciate, authority of others may increase but the efficiency of large family depends on the efficiency of the general public.

Recently in psychology of small groups the appearance of the concept of a “team” became more common, which is understood as the union of like-minded governed by a common purpose and collective subject of mutual activities. Team is a small group, but not every group is a team are emphasized. The main characteristics of the team that set it apart from the group are as follows: more interconnectedness of its members, focus expression on common goals, more under subordination of their activities and greater responsibilities and, as a result, the performance of common activities of its members. Common characteristic for a team is team spirit, positive and creative atmosphere, understanding, trust, and mutual consent. Effective solution of tasks for which it team was created is considered to be the essence of a team. The effectiveness of joint efforts of team members is much more important than the sum of their individual efforts and is conditioned by specific relationships in teams. Thus, the team is high levelled small group [H. Lozhkin., 2005; J.R. Katzenbach, 1997].

Joining post-non classical views on family, we believe that the family group can also be a team, showing a higher level of group development and greater efficiency in joint activities – family space construction that responds needs and wishes of each member. The creation of the common project, combining several independent ones and responds each family member idea about desired family, becomes a way to evaluate the ineffective of a “family team“.

By researchers it is marked that team has a capacity for self-organization, it creates the structure of efficiency in its actions through group indemnification of individual incapacibilities by itself, taking into account individual narrow-mindedness in time and resources, and also impossibility on laying hands on all necessary abilities and skills by one member [H. Lozhkin, 2005]. Therefore the key dispensation in a family team is predetermined social not by stereotypes or «norms» but in accordance with, firstly, possibilities, necessities and desires of every family member; secondly, general tasks which must be decided; and, thirdly, concrete terms of their implementation.

An important indicator of team families is also acceptance family members` roles by them, which is provided not only by their freedom of choice, but also the possibility of discussing them and/or changing them at any time. Thus, family becomes fluid constant efforts of its members on creation, recycling (remaking) contemporary family life [K.J. Hossfeld, 1991]. Of course, under these circumstances responsibilities of family members as the result of efforts: quality family space, significantly increases.

By the way, each team member responsibility for the final result stands as an important feature of any team. Responsibility itself is a significant factor of the so-called synergistic effect, when physical and intellectual efforts of one team member is multiplied by the efforts of others, so

team can solve problems, not solvable for individuals or groups with lower level of development [H. Lozhkin., 2005].

The same can be said about a family team: some aspects of family life are engaged by a wife, husband or some other family member but the responsibility for the result lies at all. No matter who is largely responsible for the financial situation of the family, who cares more of housekeeping, children upbringing and education or family members medical support. It is important to understand that each family member takes on some part of the common cause – family building - and every job is important and necessary for the welfare of everybody.

The responsibility becomes the “rod“ around which family life is built in case when team level of the family group determines the effectiveness of common operations and the quality of relationships. Feeling of each team member mutual responsibility for everyones actions and for the common result - for what family space is, inspires everyone to do their job the best way possible and invest into building the family all possible resources.

Two main prerequisites for effective family space construction are marked: *environmental friendliness and dialogism* interaction [O. Kliapets., 2014]. Both are based on responsibility and might be considered to be of family team group features.

Environmental friendliness in family life construction is manifested in its creation using such practices, which, allowing to achieve what is desired, do not harm other, and do not hinder them to build the story which they prefer. Family space is constructed as a comfortable place where each member of family realizes himself in cooperation with others and takes care of other family members, helping them to realize themselves. Thus, the environmental friendliness basis of family relationships is such cooperation of family members efforts, based on respect for themselves and each other, which leads to the rejection of any violence for themselves and others.

Dialogism in family life construction can be explained that team is primarily interpersonal space which is constructed, created in interaction between its members [H. Lozhkin, 2005]. So constant presence willingness of team members for discussion, reviewing conditions of implementation of open project “Family”; if it is needed (changes in external or internal conditions) is a necessary condition for its effective design. Through dialogue at family construction becomes possible to move from stereotypical expressions to cognitive strategies, assessment of differences to understanding the actions, from impatience to tolerance, from processing family members to your liking to harmonizing differences of absolute standards and relativity requirements for their use, analyze their feasibility.

Thus, we can **summarize**.

The family as a small social group evolves, transforms in a process of social development but still has certain social problem. Socio-psychological characteristics of the modern family is its greater independence from the environment, and multivariate shift from family social functions quality to the quality of common family space created by family itself.

So, we can talk about moving the family group to a higher level of development, its transformation into a team. Important family team features are environmental friendliness and dialogism interaction between family members; family members implementation of these principles in their social-psychological practices family life allows to construct family space more efficiently, making it comfortable and cozy.

Each member of the family team has to understand that people – are not the highest value but the highest value along with another person. The adoption of this opinion is not declaratively,

fictitious, and actually allows us to coexist with each other, effectively interacting in a family space and in other areas of life.

Literature:

1. Slovar psihologa-praktika (2001) [Dictionary psychologist practice], compiler S.Yu. Golovin, Minsk: Harvest, 976p., p.139 [in Belarus].
2. Grupa (2005) [Group], Psihologichniy dovidnik uchitelya [Psychological Teacher Directory], V.4, compiler V. Andriyevska, Kiev: Glavnik, 112p., pp.53-54 [in Ukrainian].
3. Galichanska A. (2004) Simetrichnist funktsiy chleniv podruzhhya [Symmetry functions marriage partners], Sotsialna psihologiya [Social psychology], No 5, – pp. 155–161 [in Ukrainian].
4. Shneyder L.B. (2000) Psihologiya semeynyih otnosheniy. Kurs lektsiy [Psychology family relations. Lectures], Moscow: Aprel-Press, 512 p. [in Russia].
5. Kutuzova D.A. (2005) «Byit semyoy»: vzglyad s tochki zreniya sotsialnogo konstruktsionizma. Obzor rabot L.Bellyi i eyo sotrudnikov [“Family making”: from the point of view of social construction. Review works L. Bella and other], Postneklassicheskaya psihologiya [Post-non-Classical Psychology], №1, pp.72-93 [in Russia].
6. Lozhkin G. (2005) Komanda yak kolektivniy sub'ekt spilnoyi diyalnosti [The team as a collective entity joint activities], Sotsialna psihologiya [Social psychology], No 6 (14), – pp. 52–58 [in Ukrainian].
7. Katzenbach J.R. The wisdom of teams: creating the high-performaceorganization / Jon R. Katzenbach, Douglas K. Smith. – New York: Ballantine Books, 1997. – 409 p. [in USA].
8. Hossfeld, K.J. Pondering the Post-modern Family (1991) Socialist Review 3-4: pp. 187-194. [in USA].
9. Kliapets O. Ya. (2014). Diskriminatsiya alternativnih form konstruyuvannya sim'yi v suchasnomu ukrayinskomu suspilstvi [Discrimination of the alternative forms of family constructing in modern Ukrainian society], Psihologichni nauki: problemi i zdobutki. Zb. nauk. prats [Psychological sciences: problems and achievements. Collection of scientific labours], Issue 6, pp. 75-91 [in Ukrainian].

Article received: 2015-07-21