S. YANOVSKAYA (Svitlana Yanovskaya)
Candidate of Psychological Sciences (PhD),
Associate Professor of the Applied Psychology Department
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University,
4 Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, Ukraine
E-mail: sgyanovskaya@karazin.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5439-5269
S. REVA (Serhii Reva),
postgraduate student of the laboratory of environmental psychology
H. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, St. Pankivska, 2, Kyiv, Ukraine.
E-mail: revas2312@gmail.com
R. TURENKO (Rimma Turenko)
Senior Lecturer the Department of English Language
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
4 Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, Ukraine
E-mail: tyrenco@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6948-4339
N. KONONENKO (Nelli Kononenko)
Senior Lecturer of the Department of Physical Education
National Aerospace University named after M. E. Zhukovsky "Kharkiv Aviation Institute" Kharkov, st. Chkalov, 17 Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3915-4248
N. BILOUS (Natalia Bilous)
Senior Lecturer, Department of Physical Education
National Aerospace University named after M. E. Zhukovsky "Kharkiv Aviation Institute" Kharkov, st. Chkalov, 17 Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7803-8936
R. ZUB (Ruslan Zub)
Master of Psychology
E-mail: ruslan.zub.zs@gmail.com

TYPES OF NETWORK GROUPS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR MEMBERS

The purpose of the work is to determine the types of network groups and the psychological characteristics of their participants. The following research methods were used: the questionnaire method for diagnosing the attitude of the participants to the network groups in which they are (developed by us) and the Ukrainian-language version of the semantic differential method. 193 people (113 men and 80 women aged 18 to 40) took part in the study, who were involved through various online platforms: social networks, messengers, forums, game resources, educational platforms, etc. The survey was conducted using Google forms. According to the results of the research, the following network groups were selected: groups in social networks; groups in messengers; study groups; dating groups; Internet forums and gaming groups. The members of each group have certain psychological characteristics. The common and different motivations of online group participants were determined. The most expressive motive of the participants of social network groups, messengers of study groups and dating groups is the motive of communication and among the participants of Internet forums and game groups, the expressive motive is the entertainment motive. In addition, a second expressive motive was found in each of the specified groups: in the participants of the social network groups, the motive of belonging, in the participants of the messenger groups - to pass the time, in the participants of the educational groups - knowledge, acquaintance groups - the entertainment motive, Internet forums - collecting, game groups - game motif. Two types of users' attitudes towards network groups were identified: "Loyal", for which they highly evaluate these groups, and determine the degree of their high significance and significant intensity of interaction with them, and "Indifferent", which is characterized by an uncertain attitude towards network groups. At the same time, "Loyal" groups to a greater extent show entertainment and game motives for being in network groups; however, for users of the "Indifferent" type of attitude towards online groups, shopping motives are more expressive.

Keywords: *network groups; social networks; messengers; study groups; dating groups; Internet forums; game groups.*

Introduction and current state of the researched problem. The digitalization of modern society requires the scientific community to conduct various studies of the online environment and highlight its psychological aspects. Psychological characteristics of social sites users are studied (K. Lesto), psychological aspects of virtual group interaction within the framework of distance learning (O. Bobokal, O. Vasylieva, O. Datsenko, M. Nazar, S. Prakhova,

G. Radchuk, A. Shpak and others), psychological features of virtual environment in which participants of online study groups interact (M. Smulson), psychological parameters of online communication (O. Nemesh), etc.

The listed studies can be divided into those in which, firstly, it is emphasized that the replacement of real activity with an online environment is not capable of ensuring productive personality development, and secondly, virtual reality provides a person with instant access to various opportunities for both personal growth and emotional experiences, thanks to the involvement of a person in participation in various network groups. Today, there is no unified approach to understanding the principle of selection and classification of such groups. According to P. Garbrecht (2017), there are three basic types of online groups: discussion groups (participants share opinions and experiences regarding specific interests (films, series, collectibles, sports teams, politics, etc.); support groups (a resource for those who need help); effective groups (focused on changing the state of things, encouraging users in these groups to work together to achieve a common goal).

P. Kula (2019) distinguishes six types of network groups: event groups (platforms that unite users around one or more events of varying degrees of significance), knowledge and learning groups (all platforms with the help of which educational activities are carried out), brand groups (unit associations of certain trademarks fans), expert networks and advisory groups (groups that unite users with little experience in a certain matter around more experienced participants in order to receive and transmit advice and expert opinions), membership groups (membership organizations, associations, societies) and action groups (participants are focused on changes in the current state of affairs).

C. Burton (2022) differentiates network groups by values, moderation, management, goals, tasks, structure and approach. It defines the following network groups: brand groups; study groups; member groups; action groups; fan groups; social groups; network groups; insight groups; local groups and groups of circumstances.

M. Porat (2023) and co-authors define eleven types of network groups: groups of a common goal (uniting users to achieve a certain goal, solving tasks), groups of inspiration (startups, business ideas, etc.), religious groups (uniting around an object of belief or according to the principle of religious affiliation), group coaching groups (an online analogue of classic group coaching), event groups (uniting around an event), training groups (training in different directions), content groups (uniting content creators with common interests), practice groups (groups of people working in common or related fields), micro-groups (small groups, usually up to 30 people; they are an analogue of local groups according to C. Burton), Internet forums (forum users of any which direction) and brand groups (which are defined in the same way as P. Kula, mentioned above).

In domestic psychology, there is a sufficient number of classifications of network groups. T. Golovanova (2015) distinguishes three types of groups: user groups united around online games, which necessarily involve virtual interaction within the game; virtual communication groups (social networks, dating groups, etc.); information search groups (intended to meet cognitive needs of an educational,

developmental, recreational, etc. nature). The basis for distinguishing the types of online groups in O. Nemesh (2014) is the flow of Internet communication in them: chat rooms; private correspondence associations; expert correspondence associations; groups of local ads; global announcement groups and global conference groups.

In the classification of types of network groups according to K. Lesto (2010), typical psychological profiles of their participants are distinguished as a basis. The author singles out five profiles. 1. "Distributor" - a user of a network group who uses it for his own purposes, usually for the purpose of distributing information; 2. "Communicator" - a user whose main motivation for being in the group is to communicate with other users; 3. "Explorer" - a user whose activity in network groups is determined by the desire to learn something new; 4. "Watcher/observer" - a person whose motivation for staying in the group is determined by interest in the photos of other participants; 5. "Commentator/evaluator" - a user who expresses himself through the comments he leaves in the community.

Thus, there are a sufficient number of approaches to the classification of network groups in the modern online environment. In our opinion, the following types of network groups are prioritized for further research: groups in social networks; groups in messengers; study groups; dating groups; Internet forums; and playgroups. Involvement in these groups can ensure the growth of a person's independence, manifested in critical thinking; encourage the formation of active visualization, search competence; to the development of the ability to expand the variety of methods of transforming objects, etc. However, participation in such groups can lead to increased frustration of basic needs at the social level due to a lack of quality interpersonal interaction, cognitive overload, a decrease in positivity in the perception of themselves, psychological, communicative and emotional barriers; to the distortion of feedback between the participants of social interaction, the shaking of volitional impulses, the lack of formation of communicative competence, etc.

The defined variety of research on network groups in the online environment still has certain gaps and requires research that would cover the specifics of a wide range of types of network groups in the context of analyzing the psychological characteristics of their participants.

The purpose of the work: to determine the types of network groups and the psychological characteristics of their participants.

Research methods. To diagnose the attitude of network groups members to the online groups in which they are, the author's questionnaire and the Ukrainian-language version of the semantic differential method by Ch. Osgood, adapted by S. Yanovska, P. Sevost`yanov and R. Turenko (2023) were used. The results were processed using MS Excel and IBM SPSS using such methods as: descriptive statistics, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for checking the normality of the distribution of empirical data, cluster analysis (k-means method), methods of comparing independent samples - Mann-Whitney and Kruskell-Wallis; Spearman correlation analysis.

Characteristics of the sample. A total of 193 people participated in the study, who were involved through various online platforms: social networks, messengers, forums, game

resources, educational platforms, etc. Among the subjects - 113 men and 80 women aged 18 to 40 years. During the distribution of the sample into subgroups, representatives of network groups were obtained: in social networks: 35 (17 male and 18 female); in messengers: 38 (20 male and 18 female); educational: 43 (19 male and 24 female); acquaintances: 26 (19 male and 7 female); forums: 20 (14 male and 6 female); games: 31 (24 male and 7 female). The survey was conducted using Google forms.

Results and discussion. With the help of the author's questionnaire, the features of the network groups selected by us were analyzed in terms of the number of involved persons of different sexes, the frequency of performance of certain roles and the duration of time allocated to the group. For this, the Chi-square calculation was applied (Table 1).

We will describe each of the studied groups. Gaming groups are characterized by a reliable dominance of the representation of the male gender, and the group role "participant who manifests himself as much as possible through the attitude of "likes" and "favorites" (Nemp=13). Such results confirm the opinion of K. Lesto (2010), O. Nemesh (2014) and M. Porat (2023) that men are more prone to gambling. The passive roles of users who are mostly in game communities can be explained by the fact that for them the meaningful side of games is a priority, rather than social communication, which is implemented within this network group (Table 1).

Table 1. Analysis of the evenness of the distribution of the factors of gender, time spent in the group, and the role played in the group, depending on the type of online group

Scale	Parameter	Soc. Networks	Messengers	Educational	Dating	Forums	Gaming
Gender	Xi- sq	.029	.105	.581	5.538	3.200	9.323
	St. dev.	1	1	1	1	1	1
	P (2- sided)	.866	.746	.446	.019	.074	.002
Time	Xi- sq.	9.057	5.895	14.070	8.231	6.500	3.645
	St. dev.	5	5	5	4	4	5
	P (2- sided)	.107	.317	.015	.083	.165	.602
Role	Xi- sq.	7.000	6.526	18.535	8.154	11.200	21.839
	St. dev.	5	5	5	3	5	5
	P (2- sided)	.221	.258	.002	.043	.048	.001

Among users of the forums, a reliable unevenness of distribution according to the role factor was revealed: the dominant roles were such as "passive participant who can be attributed to the group only formally" (Nemp=7) and "participant who manifests himself to the maximum through the attitude of "likes" and "favorites". (Nemp=6). That is, this group is dominated by the two most passive roles. This division is quite justified: forums are mostly used as means of satisfying cognitive needs, and they are not suitable online platforms for active communication.

In dating groups, there are more men than women, and the role of "participant who actively leaves comments, unsubscribes under topics, etc. every day (or almost every day)" is pronounced. (Nemp=11). The revealed dominance of a rather active role is natural: familiarity implies the manifestation of initiative and activity. The breakdown by gender is explained by user reviews of dating apps. Female representatives are less willing to join them due to the fact that men who position their desire to get to know each other in a significant number of cases make indecent proposals or offer "frivolous" relationships. That is why women are less represented in dating groups.

In the study groups, significantly more dominance of the time categories was found: "from an hour every day" (Nemp=14) and "every day most of the day" (Nemp=10), and roles such as "participant who sometimes leaves comments, unsubscribes under topics etc." (Nemp=11) and "a participant who actively leaves comments, unsubscribes under topics, etc. every day (or almost every day)." (Nemp=15). The revealed distribution reflects the importance of educational activities for persons involved in distance learning: they spend a lot of time interacting with the group, and show different levels of activity.

In the groups from social networks and messengers, no significant differences in the distribution of the analyzed factors were found.

The results were analyzed using correlation analysis according to Spearman's test for further analysis of the relationships between the indicators of the attitude of the subjects to the network groups (Table 2).

According to the results of the correlation analysis, it was determined that the time allocated by the subjects to the reference network group is positively associated with the activity of the role performed in the group, with the motives of communication and knowledge, and with the degree of importance of the network group for the subjects, revealed on the basis of the indicator of the factor of the power of semantic differential. At the same time, time is negatively related to shopping motives. Such a result is indicative: the more a person seeks to communicate, the more he will strive for new information, the more he will strive for interaction within network groups, and the more actively he will manifest himself. Regarding the shopping motive, we assume that a person, before buying something, searches for information about the product in certain network groups. Usually, there is no unanimity of opinion about this product in such groups, due to which the desire to buy the product may decrease. So, the more time a person spends in online groups, the less motivated he is to buy a product.

Activity, which is determined by the user's role in the network group, showed a somewhat similar correlational behavior: it is positively related to the time spent in the group and to communication and learning motives. At the same time, it turned out to be negatively related to shopping motives. Therefore, for the behavior described above, in a number of cases, not only the time spent in the group, but also the degree of active participation in it should play an important role.

Table 2. The results of the relationships analysis of attitude indicators in the subjects to network groups (across the entire sample)

Variables	.corr.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 Time	r	1.000	.707**	.610**	.440**	.138	-.302**	-.039	.097	-.077	-.056	-.087	.085	.238**	.084
	P (2-s)		.000	.000	.000	.055	.000	.590	.180	.289	.437	.228	.238	.001	.248
2 Role	r	.707**	1.000	.525**	.224**	.316**	-.209**	.005	.049	.098	.015	.125	.022	.053	.125
	P (2-s)	.000		.000	.002	.000	.003	.944	.497	.176	.832	.083	.763	.465	.082
3 M. of com.	r	.610**	.525**	1.000	.145*	.124	.018	.252**	.133	.002	-.165*	.044	-.082	-.171*	-.090
	P (2-s)	.000	.000		.044	.086	.808	.000	.065	.975	.022	.547	.260	.017	.212
4 M. kn.	r	.440**	.224**	.145*	1.000	-.142*	-.080	.090	.265**	-.216**	.050	-.282**	.091	.500**	-.101
	P (2-s)	.000	.002	.044		.049	.267	.212	.000	.003	.492	.000	.210	.000	.163
5 Ent. M.	r	.138	.316**	.124	-.142*	1.000	.162*	.122	.120	.529**	.236**	.490**	.320**	-.046	.428**
	P (2-s)	.055	.000	.086	.049		.024	.091	.096	.000	.001	.000	.000	.524	.000
6 M. shop.	r	-.302**	-.209**	.018	-.080	.162*	1.000	.558**	.273**	.405**	.202**	.407**	.062	-.318**	-.140
	P (2-s)	.000	.003	.808	.267	.024		.000	.000	.000	.005	.000	.391	.000	.051
7 Econ. мот.	r	-.039	.005	.252**	.090	.122	.558**	1.000	.182*	.272**	.059	.273**	.018	-.290**	-.122
	P (2-s)	.590	.944	.000	.212	.091	.000		.011	.000	.417	.000	.807	.000	.091
8 M. belong.	r	.097	.049	.133	.265**	.120	.273**	.182*	1.000	-.001	.169*	.113	.097	.059	-.020
	P (2-s)	.180	.497	.065	.000	.096	.000	.011		.991	.019	.119	.181	.418	.784
9 M. coll.	r	-.077	.098	.002	-.216**	.529**	.405**	.272**	-.001	1.000	.415**	.634**	.295**	-.203**	.351**
	P (2-s)	.289	.176	.975	.003	.000	.000	.000	.991		.000	.000	.000	.005	.000
10 Pl. м.	r	-.056	.015	-.165*	.050	.236**	.202**	.059	.169*	.415**	1.000	.338**	.352**	.017	.138
	P (2-s)	.437	.832	.022	.492	.001	.005	.417	.019	.000		.000	.000	.811	.056
11 M. pass. time	r	-.087	.125	.044	-.282**	.490**	.407**	.273**	.113	.634**	.338**	1.000	.221**	-.338**	.316**
	P (2-s)	.228	.083	.547	.000	.000	.000	.000	.119	.000	.000		.002	.000	.000
12 valuation	r	.085	.022	-.082	.091	.320**	.062	.018	.097	.295**	.352**	.221**	1.000	.322**	.441**
	P (2-s)	.238	.763	.260	.210	.000	.391	.807	.181	.000	.000	.002		.000	.000
13 power	r	.238**	.053	-.171*	.500**	-.046	-.318**	-.290**	.059	-.203**	.017	-.338**	.322**	1.000	.233**
	P (2-s)	.001	.465	.017	.000	.524	.000	.000	.418	.005	.811	.000	.000		.001
14 activity	r	.084	.125	-.090	-.101	.428**	-.140	-.122	-.020	.351**	.138	.316**	.441**	.233**	1.000
	P (2-s)	.248	.082	.212	.163	.000	.051	.091	.784	.000	.056	.000	.000	.001	

A wide range of rather complex interrelationships of motives for staying in the group was also revealed, which we will not consider separately, given their large number. However, we should note that from the specified diversity, groups of adjacent motives should be distinguished, which are opposed to each other; the first - motives of communication, entertainment motives, motives of belonging and game motives; the second - motives of knowledge, economic motives and motives of collecting.

Attention should be paid to the significant positive relationship of the Evaluation factor with the motives of collecting, passing the time, entertainment and game motives; the Force factor is inversely correlated with the motives of communication, knowledge, shopping, collecting, and the economic motive - from which we can make an assumption that the objects of the specified motives cannot

agree with active group interaction; - and, if the group is important for the user, he is more directed to establish interaction in it, and not to satisfy exclusively his own needs. The perception of groups as active and dynamic is related to the entertainment motive, the collecting motive, and the motive to pass the time.

So, a rather complex system of intercorrelations of indicators of the attitude of the researched to network groups was determined, which, first of all, emphasizes the complexity of their relationships, which is determined by the characteristics of the network groups themselves, the purpose and motivation of a person's stay in groups and the characteristics of group interaction in them.

Now let's move on to a comparative analysis of attitudes towards online groups between subgroups of respondents representing different types of network groups (Table 3).

Table 3. The results of an online groups comparative analysis

Ranks			Parameters		Ranks			Parameters	
Scale	Group	Average rank	Xi- sq	P (2-s)	Scale	Group	Average rank	Xi- sq	P (2-s)
Age	Soc.Networks	100.59	107.713	.000	Motives of belonging	Soc.Networks	139.54	64.974	.000
	Messengers	132.66				Messengers	100.37		
	Educational	34.74				Educational	96.15		
	Dating	80.98				Dating	26.56		
	Forums	171.53				Forums	97.5		
	Gaming	100.95				Gaming	104.77		
Time	Soc.Networks	84.57	23.027	.000	Motives of collecting	Soc.Networks	88.7	126.888	.000
	Messengers	87.18				Messengers	131.5		
	Educational	127.23				Educational	23.07		
	Dating	102.13				Dating	122.62		
	Forums	65.35				Forums	163.13		
	Gaming	97.24				Gaming	102.48		
Role	Soc.Networks	84.24	14.418	.013	Game motives	Soc.Networks	66.23	155.097	.000
	Messengers	98.86				Messengers	139.41		
	Educational	103.56				Educational	52.84		
	Dating	122.04				Dating	40.58		
	Forums	66.18				Forums	122.15		
	Gaming	98.92				Gaming	172.11		
Motives of communication	Soc.Networks	113.97	30.973	.000	Motives of passing time	Soc.Networks	105.93	106.619	.000
	Messengers	112.8				Messengers	134.55		
	Educational	106.51				Educational	24.03		
	Dating	107.13				Dating	118.33		
	Forums	60.9				Forums	134.38		
	Gaming	60.06				Gaming	100.1		
Motives for knowledge	Soc.Networks	80.87	97.314	.000	Evaluation	Soc.Networks	90.33	87.565	.000
	Messengers	81.47				Messengers	69.5		
	Educational	152.58				Educational	67.9		
	Dating	29.12				Dating	76.17		
	Forums	132.65				Forums	173.08		
	Gaming	91.08				Gaming	147		
Fun motives	Soc.Networks	101.86	64.376	.000	Power	Soc.Networks	63.06	115.455	.000
	Messengers	86.89				Messengers	42.79		
	Educational	47.27				Educational	144.56		
	Dating	124.83				Dating	65.71		
	Forums	148				Forums	144		
	Gaming	116.65				Gaming	131.73		
Motives for shopping	Soc.Networks	145.81	157.843	.000	Activity	Soc.Networks	83.06	105.246	.000
	Messengers	139.46				Messengers	53.93		
	Educational	50.97				Educational	58.84		

Ranks			Parameters		Ranks			Parameters	
Scale	Group	Average rank	Xi- sq	P (2-s)	Scale	Group	Average rank	Xi- sq	P (2-s)
	Dating	46.5				Dating	149.56		
	Forums	161.23				Forums	150.58		
	Gaming	54.61				Gaming	139.82		

Scale	Group	Average rank	Xi- sq	P (2-s)
Economic motives	Soc.Networks	123.9	85.493	.000
	Messengers	133.17		
	Educational	77.09		
	Dating	63.85		
	Forums	148.5		
	Gaming	44.48		

According to all parameters of attitudes towards online groups, significant differences were found between subgroups of subjects representing different types of network groups. It is worth noting that this indicates a fairly high discriminability of the identification of types of network groups made by us during the theoretical analysis.

By age, the following significant differences were identified: users of forums and messengers are older compared to users of study groups and dating groups. Users of study groups and dating groups devote more time to network groups; the least - social networks and forums. Users of dating groups and study groups show the most active participation in group interaction within network groups; the smallest - social networks and forums (Table 3).

The motives of communication manifest themselves most clearly in groups of users of social networks users and messengers; the least - gaming groups and Internet forums. Motives for knowledge are mostly represented in study groups and forum-groups; the least - in social networks and dating communities. Entertainment motives are highest among users of dating forums and groups; the lowest among users of messengers and study groups. Shopping motives are more pronounced among users of forums and messengers; the least - in those who are most involved in study groups and dating groups. Economic motives are represented to the greatest extent in forum-groups and in user groups by

messengers; the least - in gaming groups and dating communities. Motives for belonging manifest themselves most clearly in social networks and gaming communities; the least - in study groups and dating groups. Motives for collecting are the most developed among users of forums and messengers; least among people who are involved in social networks and educational groups. Gaming motives manifested themselves in game communities, as well as - among users of messengers; these motives are the least expressive in educational communities and dating groups. The most expressive motives for passing the time were among users of forums and messengers; the least - among users of game and study groups.

The users of Internet forums stand out among the others with high indicators in terms of the Rating, Power and Activity factors; group members in messengers have the opposite – low indicators on all three dimensions. Users of game platforms have a greater expressiveness of the Rating indicator compared to others; representatives of educational groups - according to the Strength factor; users of dating groups - Activities.

Also, in order to identify possible typical profiles of the research subjects attitude to network groups, clustering of the sample was carried out based on the factors of Evaluation, Strength and Activity. The results of cluster analysis are shown in Table. 4.

Table 4. Results of sample clustering based on indicators of semantic differential

Parameter	Cluster					
	1			2		
	Ev	P	A	Ev	P	A
Initial centers	12,00	10,00	12,00	-2,00	-3,00	-2,00
End centers	6,94	7,77	7,54	1,99	3,88	2,34
Number of subjects	94			99		

Two clusters were obtained. The first cluster (94 persons) is characterized by a relatively high value for all three factors; for the second, there is an almost undefined or barely noticeable trend towards a shift in the positive direction (99 people). No groups with clearly negative indicators were found.

Variance analysis showed that the differences in all three factors are reliable, therefore, the clustering can be considered discriminatory to a high degree (Table 5).

Conventionally, we can call the first cluster "Loyal" in relation to network groups; the second - "Indifferent".

Further, a comparative analysis of the obtained clusters was carried out according to the indicators of attitudes towards network groups, revealed by means of a questionnaire. Since there are quite a lot of indicators that were analyzed, in order to improve the perception, only the indicators that indicated the significance of the differences will be presented below (Table 6).

Table 5. Comparative analysis of the selected clusters according to the factors of Evaluation, Power and Activity

	Cluster		Error		F	P (2-s)
	Middle square	St.fr.	Middle square	St.fr.		
Evaluation	1179,673	1	8,485	191	139,033	,000
Power	728,572	1	11,683	191	62,363	,000
Activity	1303,363	1	8,836	191	147,508	,000

Table 6. Comparative analysis of clusters based on indicators of attitudes towards network groups (significant differences)

Ranks			Parameters			
Scale	Cluster	Middle rank	U	W	Z	P (2-s)
Fun motives	«Loyal»	109,57	3471,0	8421,0	-3,091	,002
	«Indifferent»	85,06				
Motives for shopping	«Loyal»	86,33	3650,0	8115,0	-2,713	,007
	«Indifferent»	107,13				
Economic motives	«Loyal»	83,59	3392,5	7857,5	-3,297	,001
	«Indifferent»	109,73				
Game motives	«Loyal»	106,30	3778,5	8728,5	-2,323	,020
	«Indifferent»	88,17				

The users of "Loyal" type network groups show themselves to a greater extent the entertainment and game motives of staying in network groups; for users of the "Indifferent" type of attitude towards online groups, shopping motives are more expressive.

We assume that the so-called loyalty, in which network groups are evaluated quite positively by users, can be formed on the basis of the purposes of using online groups. If we are talking about casual involvement in them for the purpose of general or gaming entertainment, it is quite possible that these entertainments as something pleasant are directly associated with network groups, respectively, and the later are also perceived in a rather positive light. If the groups are considered as means of making purchases, then they are perceived neutrally; and the variation of emotional and evaluative relationship is already built around the content of purchases.

Conclusions. Based on the results of the analysis of the obtained results, it is possible to draw conclusions about the network groups and the psychological characteristics of their participants.

In the online environment, the following network groups can be distinguished: groups in social networks; groups in messengers; study groups; dating groups; Internet forums; and playgroups. The members of each group have certain psychological characteristics.

Members of social networking groups spend a moderate amount of time in the networking group and show an average level of activity in it. The most expressive motives for staying in the network are the motives for communication and belonging; the least are collecting motives and playing motives. Such users are quite restrained in evaluating the network groups in which they are mostly presented, and equally restrained in determining the degree of their significance and intensity of interaction with them.

The activity of members of messenger groups is moderate in terms of time spent in groups and role in them. Expressive motives for being online are motives for communication and passing the time. Such users fairly neutrally evaluate their groups, and equally neutrally determine the degree of their significance and intensity of interaction with them.

The activity of the study group participants is moderate in terms of the time spent in the groups and their role in them. Users of study groups to the greatest extent show motivations for knowledge and communication. They fairly discreetly evaluate the network groups in which they are mostly presented, and determine the degree of their significance and the intensity of interaction with them.

The time involvement of dating groups members in the network is moderate. The activity of the roles they play in the specified groups shows a growing trend. The dominant motives are communication and entertainment motives. They highly evaluate the dynamism and intensity of interaction within the network groups, with the moderation of their overall evaluation and significance.

Internet forum participants show moderate (tending to low) activity in terms of group time and group roles. Distinctive motives for this group are entertainment motives, collecting motives, and cognitive motives. Belonging motives and game motives turned out to be the least expressive motives of this category of users. At the same time, the participants of the forum groups rate the reference network groups quite highly, and determine the degree of their high significance and significant intensity of interaction with them.

Members of gaming groups are moderately active in participating in online groups. To the greatest extent, they present game and entertainment motives for staying in network groups. Economic motives and shopping motives turned out to be the least expressive. At the same time, the participants of gaming groups rate reference network groups quite highly, and determine the degree of their high significance and significant intensity of interaction with them.

Network users are characterized by two types of attitude towards network groups: "Loyal", for which they highly value these groups, and determine the degree of their high significance and significant intensity of interaction with them; and "Indifferently", which is characterized by an uncertain attitude towards network groups. At the same time, among the members of the "Loyal" group, entertainment and game motives for staying in network groups prevail to a

greater extent; however, for users of the "Indifferently" type of attitude towards online groups, shopping motives are more expressive.

References

Burton, C. Top 10 Different Types of Online Communities. *The thinkific.* URL: https://www.thinkific.com/blog/types-of-online-communities.

Garbrecht, P. The 3 Types of Online Communities. *Khoros.* URL: https://khoros.com/blog/3-types-online-communities

Golovanova, T.M. (2015). The influence of the use of virtual space on the cognitive development of the personality. *Nauka i osvita.* *1.* 20-24. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NiO_2015_1_6. [in Ukrainian]

Kula, P. The six types of online communities you should know about. *Zapnito.* URL: https://zapnito.com/insights/the-six-types-of-online-communities-you-should-know-about

Lesto, K.A. (2010). Psychological characteristics of users of social sites. *Visnyk psykholohii i sotsialnoi pedahohiky.* *3.* 75-91. https://www.psyh.kiev.ua/%D0%9B%D1%94%D1%81%D1%82% [in Ukrainian]

Nazar, M.M. (2013). Characteristic psychological features of distance learning using the Internet. *Mediaosvita v Ukraini: naukova refleksiia vyklykiv, praktyk, perspektyv.* *1*(1). 264-274. https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/1524/1/Article.pdf [in Ukrainian]

Nemesh, O.M. (2014). Psychological foundations of Internet communication. *Aktualni problemy psykholohii.* *5*(14). 138-146. http://www.appsychology.org.ua/data/jrn/v5/i14/16.pdf [in Ukrainian]

Porat, M. 11 Types of Online Communities That Thrive. *Mightynetworks.* https://www.mightynetworks.com/resources/types-of-online-communities

Prakhova, S.A., Datsenko, O.A., Semenov, K.A. (2020). Distance learning in the space of modern educational systems: psychological context. *Visnyk Universytetu imeni Alfreda Nobelia. Seriia «Pedahohika i psykholohiia». Pedahohichni nauky.* *2*(20). 260-264. http://repo.dma.dp.ua/id/eprint/7417 [in Ukrainian]

Radchuk, G., Adamska, Z., Oleksyuk, V. (2022). Psychological features of the implementation of distance learning of students. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia psykholohichni nauky.* *12.* 107-114. https://doi.org/10.30970/PS.2022.12.12 [in Ukrainian]

Shpak, A., Bobokal, O. (2019). Psychological peculiarities of interaction of distance learning participants in the educational process. *Teoriia ta metodyka navchannia ta vykhovannia.* *51.* 212-217. https://college.nuph.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/%D0%A8%D0%BF%D0%B0%D0%BA.pdf [in Ukrainian]

Smulson, M. (2015). *Intellectual development of adults in the virtual educational space.* K.: Pedahohichna dumka. https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/10064/1/%D0%9C%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0 [in Ukrainian]

Vasylieva, O. (2022). Psychological features of distance learning in the training of future psychologists. *Naukovyi visnyk Izmailskoho derzhavnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriia: Pedahohichni nauky.* *58.* 36-44. http://visnyk.idgu.edu.ua/index.php/nv/article/view/541 [in Ukrainian]

Yanovska, S.G., Sevost`yanov, P.O., Turenko, R.L. (2023). Psychometric indicators and adaptation of Ch. Osgood's method "Semantic Differential" (Ukrainian version of the method). *Visnyk V.N.Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series "Psychology", 74.* 24-30. https://doi.org/10.26565/2225-7756-2023-74-03 [in Ukrainian]

С.Г. ЯНОВСЬКА (Яновська Світлана Германівна)
кандидат психологічних наук, доцент ЗВО кафедри прикладної психології
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна
майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, Україна
E-mail: sgyanovskaya@karazin.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5439-5269
С.А. РЕВА (Рева Сергій Анатолійович),
аспірант лабораторії екологічної психології,
Інститут психології імені Г. Костюка НАПН України,
вул. Паньківська, 2, Київ, Україна.
E-mail: revas2312@gmail.com
Р.Л. ТУРЕНКО (Туренко Римма Леонардівна)
старший викладач ЗВО кафедри англійської мови
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна
майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, Україна
E-mail: tyrenco@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6948-4339
Н.М. КОНОНЕНКО (Кононенко Неллі Миколаївна)
старший викладач кафедри фізичного виховання, спорту та реабілітації
Національного аерокосмічного університету імені М. Є. Жуковського «Харківський авіаційний інститут» вул. Чкалова, 17, м. Харків, Україна.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3915-4248
Н.С. БІЛОУС (Білоус Наталія Сергіївна)
старший викладач кафедри фізичного виховання, спорту та реабілітації
Національного аерокосмічного університету імені М. Є. Жуковського «Харківський авіаційний інститут» вул. Чкалова, 17, м. Харків, Україна
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7803-8936
Р.В. ЗУБ (Зуб Руслан Вадимович)
магістр психології
E-mail: ruslan.zub.zs@gmail.com

ТИПИ МЕРЕЖЕВИХ ГРУП ТА ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЇХ УЧАСНИКІВ

Метою роботи є визначення типів мережевих груп та психологічних особливостей їх учасників. Було використано такі методи дослідження: метод анкетування для діагностики ставлення учасників до мережевих груп, в яких вони перебувають (розроблений нами) та україномовна версія методу семантичного диференціалу. У дослідженні взяли участь 193 особи (113 осіб чоловічої і 80 – жіночої статі у віці від 18 до 40 років), які залучалися через різні он-лайн платформи: соцмережі, месенджери, форуми, ігрові ресурси, навчальні платформи тощо. Опитування проводилося за допомогою Гугл-форм. За результатами проведеного

дослідження було виділено такі мережеві групи: групи у соціальних мережах; групи у месенджерах; навчальні групи; групи знайомств; Інтернет-форуми та ігрові групи. Учасники кожної з груп мають певні психологічні особливості. Було визначене спільне та відмінне у мотивації учасників он-лайн груп. Найбільш виразним мотивом учасників груп соцмереж, месенджерів навчальних груп та груп знайомств є мотив спілкування, а в учасників Інтернет-форумів та ігрових груп виразним мотивом є розважальний мотив. Крім того в кожній з означених груп було виявлено другий виразний мотив: в учасників груп соцмереж мотив приналежності, в учасників груп месенджерів - коротання часу, в учасників навчальних груп – пізнання, груп знайомств - розважальний мотив, Інтернет-форумів – колекціонування, ігрових груп – ігровий мотив. Було визначено два типи ставлення користувачів до мережевих груп: «Лояльне», за якого вони високо оцінюють ці групи, і визначають ступінь їхньої високої значущості та значної інтенсивності взаємодії з ними та «Байдуже», для якого характерне невизначене ставлення до мережевих груп. При цьому «Лояльні» групи більшою мірою проявляють розважальні та ігрові мотиви перебування у мережевих групах; проте, для користувачів «Байдужого» типу ставлення до онлайн-груп більш виразними є шопінг-мотиви.

Ключові слова: *мережеві групи, соціальні мережи; месенджери; навчальні групи; групи знайомств; Інтернет-форуми; ігрові групи.*

Список використаних джерел

Васильєва О. Психологічні особливості дистанційного навчання в підготовці майбутніх психологів. *Науковий вісник Ізмаїльського державного гуманітарного університету. Серія: Педагогічні науки.* 2022. Вип. 58. С. 36-44. http://visnyk.idgu.edu.ua/index.php/nv/article/view/541

Голованова Т.М. Вплив використання віртуального простору на когнітивний розвиток особистості. *Наука і освіта.* 2015. № 1. С. 20-24. Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NiO_2015_1_6.

Лесто К.А. Психологічні особливості користувачів соціальних сайтів. *Вісник психології і соціальної педагогіки.* 2010. Вип. 3. С. 75-91. https://www.psyh.kiev.ua/%D0%9B%D1%94%D1%81%D1%82%

Назар М.М. Характерні психологічні особливості дистанційного навчання з використанням мережі Інтернет. *Медіаосвіта в Україні: наукова рефлексія викликів, практик, перспектив.* 2013. № 1(1). С. 264-274. https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/1524/1/Article.pdf

Немеш О. М. Психологічні основи інтернет-комунікації. *Актуальні проблеми психології.* 2014. Вип. 14(5). С. 138-146. http://www.appsychology.org.ua/data/jrn/v5/i14/16.pdf

Прахова С.А., Даценко О.А., Семенов К.А. Дистанційне навчання у просторі сучасних освітніх систем: психологічний контекст. *Вісник Університету імені Альфреда Нобеля. Серія «Педагогіка і психологія».* 2020. № 2 (20). С. 260-264. http://repo.dma.dp.ua/id/eprint/7417

Радчук Г., Адамська З., Олексюк В. Психологічні особливості впровадження дистанційного навчання студентів. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія психологічні науки.* 2022. Вип. 12. С. 107-114. https://doi.org/10.30970/PS.2022.12.12

Смульсон М. Інтелектуальний розвиток дорослих у віртуальному освітньому просторі. К.: Педагогічна думка, 2015. 119 с. https://lib.iitta.gov.ua/10064/1/%D0%9C%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0

Шпак А., Бобокал О. Психологічні особливості взаємодії учасників дистанційного навчання в освітньому процесі. *Теорія та методика навчання та виховання.* Харків : ХНПУ імені Г. С. Сковороди, 2019. Вип. 51. С. 212–217. https://college.nuph.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/%D0%A8%D0%BF%D0%B0%D0%BA.pdf

Яновська С.Г., Севост`янов П.О., Туренко Р.Л. Психометричні показники та адаптація методу Ч. Осгуда «семантичний диференціал» (українська версія методу). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія Психологія*, 2023. 74. С. 24-30. https://doi.org/10.26565/2225-7756-2023-74-03

Burton C. Top 10 Different Types of Online Communities. The thinkific: веб-сайт. https://www.thinkific.com/blog/types-of-online-communities. (дата звернення: 09.06.2023)

Garbrecht P. The 3 Types of Online Communities. *Khoros* : веб-сайт. https://khoros.com/blog/3-types-online-communities (дата звернення: 14.06.2023).

Kula P. The six types of online communities you should know about. *Zapnito* : веб-сайт. https://zapnito.com/insights/the-six-types-of-online-communities-you-should-know-about (дата звернення: 12.06.2023).

Porat M. 11 Types of Online Communities That Thrive. *Mightynetworks* : веб-сайт. https://www.mightynetworks.com/resources/types-of-online-communities. (дата звернення: 10.06.2023)