

UDC 159.923.2:316.362.1

## OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE AND BEHAVIOR SELF-REGULATION IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE PERSONAL COMPONENT OF INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE

Sevostianov P.O.  
ORCID 0000-0003-3461-9920  
P.sevostyanov@karazin.ua

*У статті коротко розглянуті етапи вивчення індивідуального досвіду, наведені сучасні моделі структурної організації індивідуального досвіду. Розглянуто окремі компоненти досвіду, наведені короткі характеристики кожного з компонентів. Зроблено акцент на дослідженнях в рамках трьохфакторної моделі індивідуального досвіду А.Н. Лактіонова, в якій виділено особистісний, соціальний та мнемічний компоненти. Розглянуто динамічні аспекти взаємодії підструктур індивідуального досвіду.*

*Коротко наведені результати попереднього аналізу, присвяченого проблемі вивчення особистісного компоненту індивідуального досвіду: описані результати дослідження відкритості досвіду з ціннісними і смисложиттєвими орієнтаціями. Розглянуто дослідження, присвячене Я-концепції в структурі особистісного компоненту індивідуального досвіду.*

*Безпосередньо в рамках предмета статті розглянуті поняття відкритості досвіду і саморегуляції, і обґрунтовано акцентування дослідницького уваги на них.*

*Описано дослідження, присвячене вивченню відкритості досвіду і саморегуляції в структурі особистісного компоненту індивідуального досвіду, в рамках якого аналізувалися особливості взаємозв'язку даних феноменів.*

*В ході дослідження на вибірці з 154 студентів було виявлено, що зв'язок між відкритістю досвіду і таким стилем саморегуляції поведінки, як програмування, відсутня. При цьому, були виявлені міцні взаємозв'язки відкритості досвіду з такими показниками саморегуляції, як планування, моделювання, оцінка результатів, гнучкість, самостійність, а також - із загальним рівнем саморегуляції.*

*Ключові слова: індивідуальний досвід, особистісний компонент індивідуального досвіду, відкритість досвіду, саморегуляція, студенти.*

*The article briefly discusses the stages of studying individual experience, and presents modern models of the structural organization of individual experience. The individual components of the experiment are considered, brief characteristics of each component are given. Emphasis is placed on research within the framework of a three-factor model of individual experience A.N. Laktionova, in which the personal, social and mnemonic components are highlighted. The dynamic aspects of the interaction of substructures of individual experience are considered.*

*The results of the previous analysis devoted to the problem of studying the personal component of individual experience are briefly summarized: the results of the study of openness to experience with value and meaningful life orientation are described. A study on the self-concept in the structure of the personal component of individual experience is considered.*

*The concepts of openness to experience and self-regulation are considered directly within the scope of the article, and the focus of research attention on them is justified.*

*The paper is devoted to the study of openness to experience and self-regulation in the structure of the personal component of individual experience, within which the peculiarities of the relationship of these phenomena were analyzed.*

*A study on a sample of 154 students revealed that there is no connection between openness to experience and such a style of self-regulation of behavior as programming. At the same time, strong interconnections of openness to experience with such self-regulation indicators as planning, modeling, performance evaluation, flexibility, independence, and also with the general level of self-regulation were revealed.*

*Keywords: individual experience, personal component of individual experience, openness to experience, self-regulation, students.*

*В статье кратко рассмотрены этапы изучения индивидуального опыта, приведены современные модели структурной организации индивидуального опыта. Рассмотрены отдельные компоненты опыта, приведены краткие характеристики каждого из компонентов. Сделан акцент на исследованиях в рамках трехфакторной модели индивидуального опыта А.Н. Лактионова, в которой выделены личностный, социальный и мнемический компоненты. Рассмотрены динамические аспекты взаимодействия подструктур индивидуального опыта.*

*Кратко приведены результаты предыдущего анализа, посвященного проблеме изучения личностного компонента индивидуального опыта: описаны результаты исследования открытости опыту с ценностными и смысложизненными ориентациями. Рассмотрено исследование, посвященное Я-концепции в структуре личностного компонента индивидуального опыта.*

*Непосредственно в рамках предмета статьи рассмотрены понятия открытости опыту и саморегуляции, и обосновано акцентирование исследовательского внимания на них.*

*Описано исследование, посвященное изучению открытости опыту и саморегуляции в структуре*

*личностного компонента индивидуального опыта, в рамках которого анализировались особенности взаимосвязи данных феноменов.*

*В ходе исследования на выборке из 154 студентов было выявлено, что связь между открытостью опыту и таким стилем саморегуляции поведения, как программирование, отсутствует. При этом, были выявлены прочные взаимосвязи открытости опыту с такими показателями саморегуляции, как планирование, моделирование, оценка результатов, гибкость, самостоятельность, а также – с общим уровнем саморегуляции.*

*Ключевые слова: индивидуальный опыт, личностный компонент индивидуального опыта, открытость опыту, саморегуляция, студенты.*

Individual experience, in one way or another, has been the object of analysis both in philosophy and in psychology, beginning with antiquity, and is such today. Obviously, individual experience was perceived differently by researchers in different eras, and this perception in previous epochs is different from how this concept is viewed today.

The main conclusion of the aforementioned analysis is that individual experience becomes a research problem only if a person is subjected to analysis as a subject of his own activity, social changes and history: becomes a «condition», a «prerequisite» and «initial level».

In general, many attempts were made to describe the organization of individual experience, but until recently the question of organizing its categorical space, its structure, methods of transformation was not raised.

The study of individual experience can be divided into several stages, the first of which falls on the XVII-XVIII centuries. At this time, amid empiricism that is gaining momentum, experience is defined as the source of human knowledge. The second stage is related to the development of American pragmatism (XIX - I half of the XX century), where experience was studied as a tool for the effective adaptation of a person to changing environmental conditions. Finally, the third stage is associated with the development of humanistic psychology, where recourse to one's own experience is one of the main conditions for self-knowledge and human self-realization. Note that in Soviet psychology, individual experience goes into the background due to the fact that, as mentioned above, it becomes a research problem only when it is a person who is studied, and the Soviet time is characterized by a lack of personification and the study of the masses.

We can say that the next - already the fourth burst of scientific interest in individual experience as a subject of scientific study started, which is characterized by the fact that individual experience is interpreted as a characteristic of a subject in the context of constant social-political changes.

As mentioned above, until recently (during the first three historical stages of studying experience) the question of organizing the categorical space of individual experience, its structure, methods of transformation has not been raised, but today we have certain results of its structural analysis. So, for the first time, A.N. Laktionov leads a structural model of individual experience (Laktionov, 1998).

The work "The Coordinates of Individual Experience" presents the structure of individual experience, covering the entire vital range of a person, namely, the three spheres of the person's activity - social, personal, and mnemonic. Note that neither the organismic needs (instincts, etc.), on the one hand, nor historical experience, on the other hand, are considered in this case as part of individual experience. And if only the role of prerequisites of individual experience is assigned to the first, then historical experience is not considered as part of the above structure due to its correlation not with experience, but with the individual life activity as a whole, carrying the function of a general socio-cultural coordinate system (Laktionov, 1998).

So, there are three components of individual experience: personal, social and mnemonic. Let us pay attention to the expediency of distinguishing these three substructures. On the one hand, as mentioned above, this classification covers the whole space of human life, but with the other, personal and social component would be enough to describe the experience as a whole, if we talked exclusively about the category of activity, referring to the study of experience. The category of vital activity gave grounds for isolating the third component - mnemonic.

So, the characteristics of the personality component are microstructural and macrostructural statistics and various interpretative complexes. If we talk about the social component, it implies interpersonal space, stereotypy and uniqueness of the individual. Mnemonic experience, fulfilling the task of accumulating and integrating traces of memory around some significant biographical time marks, is represented by such a characteristic as interpersonal space. Note that in the process of forming and implementing a certain program of behavior, any component of the experience can be dominant, i.e. the relationship between them is not rigidly fixed.

Continuing to move in line with modern research on the problem of individual experience, we give it's another model. Yu.M. Schwalb speaks of three types of individual (life experience): situational, activity, and personal (Schwalb, 2005). Here we see similarities with the Laktionov model, with the exception that the activity type is a broader concept than the social component, encompassing more than interpersonal space.

Continuing to follow O.M. Laktionov in our research, we recall that the hierarchy of social, personal and mnemonic components of individual experience is not fixed - any substructure may be dominant, depending on the implementation of a particular program of behavior at a specific time (Laktionov, 2000). But a detailed study of the components of the above-mentioned structure is most logical to us, starting with the personal component because of the peculiarities of its basic characteristic - "subjective value of oneself", which is

formed on the basis of personal interpretative complexes. Unlike the social component that has absorbed the desire of the individual to be similar to others, to comply with social norms, to defend their uniqueness, etc., and the mnemonic component responsible for the accumulation and integration of traces of memory around some significant biographical time marks, the personal component reflects a variety of aspects of the individual's life - these are subjective psychosemantic assessments, and the symbols of non-verbal behavior, and the rules of speech products, the primary study of which will contribute partially in the analysis of social and mnemonic components. That is, starting from the logic of rationality studying the individual experience, and from the fact that the personal component allows a broader look at the individual, we reiterate the priority of the personal component of the individual experience study.

It is obvious that personal experience, being a structural entity, is characterized by some stability, constancy. Despite the constant dynamics inherent in the formation of this structure, at one point in time, personal experience is a relatively stable structure.

Openness to experience, however, is capable of determining the dynamics of the formation of individual experience, and therefore can act as a dynamic characteristic of the whole individual experience and its personal component, in particular.

In the course of our analysis of individual experience in the student's voters, we have shown that such a substructure of his personal component, as the openness of experience, being connected with the control locus of the "Myself", in his manifestations is characterized by representations of himself as a strong person who has enough freedom of choice to build his life in accordance with his goals and ideas about his meaning. Also, this phenomenon, being connected with the locus of life control, in its manifestations is characterized by beliefs that it is difficult for a person to control his life, to make decisions freely and to embody them. Openness of experience, being connected with the general level of sense-oriented orientations, in its manifestations is characterized by the existence of life goals, the meaningfulness of elections and assessments, the satisfaction of life and the ability to take responsibility for it, influencing its course (Sevostianov, 2011).

We also found that openness to experience is interconnected with autonomy, the individual independence, it indicates the psychological maturity of the individual. Openness to experience eliminates its relationship with material hedonistic needs, including the desire to dominate others; openness implies belief only in one's own strength (Sevostianov, 2018).

Also we considered individual experience in the context of self-concept: the factorization of the indicators of the self-concept was carried out, which resulted in two factors which can be conventionally called the prosperous and problematic perception of self-concept. In the further cluster analysis, the four groups (profiles) were obtained, each of one is representing a certain personality component of individual experience features - from a safe to a conflict (Sevostianov, 2018).

At this stage, we are interested in the relationship between such substructures of personal experience as openness to experience and self-regulation.

Self-regulation is based on the totality of the laws of the functioning of the psyche and their numerous consequences, known as psychological effects. These include:

- the activating role of the motivational sphere, generating activity (in the broad sense of the word) of the individual, aimed at changing its characteristics;
- the governing effect of the mental image, arbitrarily or involuntarily arising in the mind of the individual;
- structural and functional unity (systemic) of all mental cognitive processes that ensure the effect of an individual on his own psyche;
- the unity and interdependence of the spheres of consciousness and the unconscious as objects through which the individual realizes the regulatory influences on themselves;
- the functional interrelation of the emotional-volitional sphere of the personality and its bodily experience, speech and thought processes.

The beginning of self-regulation should be linked to the allocation of a specific motivational contradiction - a kind of password for entering oneself. It is these contradictions that are the driving force that stimulates the restructuring of individual aspects of their personality. Examples include the disparity between the material level and the cultural level, and overestimated claims about real possibilities. When identifying the leading contradictions, one should take into account the possibility of direct influence on the controlling factor from the moral, material and temporal points of view.

Self-regulation techniques are built on the mechanisms of reflection, concentration of attention, imagination, representation, relaxation, meditation, self-suggestion, etc.

It is due to the factors listed above that we take into consideration self-regulation.

At the current stage, 154 students took part in the experiment, representing V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University and Slavic National University.

In the course of the study, the following methods were applied: NEO PI-R - Revised NEO Personality Inventory (revised personal questionnaire NEO) and the technique "Behavior Self-Regulation Style" by V.I. Morosanova.

During the experiment, the following data were obtained:

Table 1

Indicators of the relationship of openness to experience and styles of self-regulation behavior

|                        |        | Planning | Modeling | Programming | Results evaluation | Flexibility | Independence | General Self-regulation level |
|------------------------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Openness to experience | $\rho$ | .210**   | .414**   | .061        | .258**             | .399**      | .376**       | .326**                        |
|                        | P      | .009     | .000     | .452        | .001               | .000        | .000         | .000                          |
|                        | N      | 154      | 154      | 154         | 154                | 154         | 154          | 154                           |

The results shown in Table 1 indicate that with all styles of self-regulation, apart from programming, openness to experience is directly interdependent.

With regard to programming, we can see that the individual development of conscious human programming of their actions does not correlate with the openness of experience, which may indicate that the phenomenon of openness to experience implies a comprehensive focus on all external incentives, and not only on those that are included in the program of the individual.

The individual characteristics of the nomination and retention of goals, the formation of a person's conscious planning of activities has a fairly strong relationship with openness to experience, which may indicate the choice of the most significant incentives to which an individual opens: not being able to perceive absolutely all incoming stimuli, to open the highest priority.

The individual development of ideas about external and internal significant conditions, the degree of their awareness, detail and adequacy also has a strong relationship with openness to experience, which, in our opinion, is explained by a certain amount of experience gained through openness and which allows to model the individual activity more carefully.

The same can be said about the individual development and adequacy of the person's assessment of himself and the results of his activities and behavior, which also revealed a direct relationship with openness to experience: the experience gained allows us to fully evaluate the results of activities adequately.

Ability to rebuild, make corrections to the system of self-regulation when external and internal conditions change have a strong relationship with openness to experience, and here we can also say that significant experience gained allows an individual to manage a large amount of knowledge and behavior, adequately apply them and interchange them. conditions of change.

The development of regulatory autonomy, which also has a direct relationship with the openness of experience, obviously indicates that the individual is more able to open up to new incentives in the absence of external controlling factors.

General self-regulation can also be related to openness to experience precisely because of the considerable amount of experience that accumulates with significant openness.

So, we can say with confidence that in the structure of the personal component of individual experience, self-regulation and openness to experience are closely interrelated.

#### References

- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Higgins, E. T. (1996). The "self digest": Self-knowledge serving self-regulatory functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 1062-1083.
- Laktionov A. N. (1998). *The Coordinates of individual experience*. Kharkov: Business-Inform, 1998. - 492 p. [In Russian].
- Laktionov, O. M. (2000). *Structural and dynamic organization of individual experience*. dis ... Doctor of Psychological Sciences: 19.00.01. K. - 374 p. [In Ukrainian].
- Sevostianov P. (2018). *The Self-concept in the Personal Component of Individual Experience Structure*. *Visnik of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University; A Series of «Psychology»*, 64, 51-55.
- Sevostianov P. O. (2011) *The relationship of value orientations and openness to the experience of students*. *Visnik of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University; A Series of «Psychology»*, 45, 259-261. [In Russian].
- Sevostianov P. O. (2018) *The Relationship Between the Openness of Experience and the Semantic-life Orientation of Students*. *Visnik of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University; A Series of «Psychology»*, 63, 12-16. [In Ukrainian].
- Shvalb Yu. M. (2005). *Psychological Forms of Life Experience Fixation*. *Actual problems of psychology: Psychological hermeneutics*. N.V. Chepeva. (Ed.). K.: Milenium, 2 (3), 14-20. [In Russian].