

UDC: 159.923.2; 17.022; 378.016  
 ORCID.ORG / 0000-0002-7257-6477  
 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-4665-2017-9-6>

**Ihor Halian,**  
 PhD (Candidate of Psychological Sciences), professor,  
 Department of Practical Psychology,  
 Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University,  
 24, Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine

## METHODOLOGICAL BASES OF DISTINGUISHING TYPES OF VALUE-SENSE SELF-REGULATION IN FUTURE TEACHERS

*The paper considers the phenomenon of self-regulation, which is studied in the psychological science in the activity (focus on the regulation of actions), behavioural (behavioural regulation) and personality aspects. The study on self-regulation in the personality aspect which touches upon the transformation of human attitudes towards different types of activities, towards other people, oneself, prompted the differentiation of such a variety as value-sense self-regulation. The main peculiarity of its functioning is self-determination of the agent's actions. In the context of our study, it is self-determination of the value-sense choice in different decision-making situations. The abovementioned has determined the need to single out a typology of value-sense self-regulation, which does not exist in psychology nowadays. Therefore, the aim of this study is to substantiate the methodology of distinguishing and analysing the types of value-sense self-regulation in personality. There have been made a comparative analysis of the obtained empirical results which helped to determine the criteria on the basis of which the types of value-sense self-regulation were singled out. Among them: the experience of the agent's activity and regulatory competence, as well as personality factors in decision-making. There have been distinguished the following types of value-sense self-regulation: emotional-modelling, rational-programming, rational-planning, emotional-integrative. It is noted that each of these types is characterized by a specific set of personality features and characteristics that distinguish their carriers from the others. There has been ascertained the existence of individual peculiarities of self-regulation determined by various functioning of regulatory links and personality-regulatory features. The prospect for further research is the in-depth analysis of rationality and emotionality as personality factors of the value-sense choice.*

**Keywords:** values, sense, value-sense self-regulation, value-based choice, type of value-sense self-regulation.

### Introduction

The issue of self-regulation is quite relevant in psychology. It is studied in different aspects: activity-based (the focus is placed on regulation of activities), behavioural (regulation of behaviour), personal (transformation of human attitudes to different types of activities, to others, or oneself). It is the personality self-regulation which is based on the self-determination of person's actions that is the basis for the development of its another type – value-sense self-regulation. The latter is considered as self-determination of value-sense choice in different decision-making situations. This is quite a complicated process, as the value-sense sphere of a person consists of various components that are not only complementary but also determine the intrapersonal contradictions, resulting from differences in the importance of value for a person and the possibility of achieving it. This, after all, makes us consider the need to single out a typology of value-sense self-regulation, which has not been elaborated in modern psychology yet.

In psychological literature the issue of typology is presented in the studies that are based on different principles. The most common is the principle of taking into account the higher nervous activity or individual personality structures (orientation, etc.) as the final ones in the process of making a typology. Typological studies on this

issue will not solve the problem of successful teachers training, developing a professional (successful) style. It is important to take into account other aspects, including the value-sense formations, their coordination and contradiction, capacity for self-regulation, personality factors (rational and emotional) of decision making and so on [3; 4; 5; 6]. Singling out these components as the criteria for the typology, in our opinion, will contribute to expanding the grounds for building it in general and the development of the typology of value-sense self-regulation in particular.

The **aim** of our study is to substantiate the methodology of singling out and analysing the typology of value-sense self-regulation in future teachers.

### Research Methods

The experiment involved 217 female students majoring in Primary Education aged from 17 to 23.

The research is based on Self-Regulation Behavior Style Inventory by V. Morsanova. The following criteria have been assessed: planning, modelling, programming, results evaluation, flexibility, independency. We evaluated the level of their maturity in scores as follows: 1-4 points – low level, 5-8 scores – medium level, 9-12 scores – high level.

Building a typology has a certain regulatory basis, i.e. clarifying a typical structure of regulatory features and their specificity in different groups under study. The best

statistical method for compilation and analysis of typical profiles of regulation is cluster analysis. In our study, two main methods were used: to determine the optimal number of clusters we used a method of communication between the groups, and then, after the previous clustering with the help of hierarchical methods, the method of k-means was used.

The determination of rationality / emotionality was carried out on the basis of expert evaluation (5 persons with academic degree in psychology) of students' explanations of their value-semantic priorities, as well as value-based choices made on their basis when dealing with moral dilemmas (Method for assessing the level of moral consciousness maturity (Kohlberg dilemmas) adapted to the goals and objectives of our study).

The statements of the respondents in the process of dealing with moral dilemmas were taken as the criteria for assessing rationality / emotionality. Signs of rationality / emotionality were based on the understanding of their essence, presented in the literature, as well as taking into account the additions and clarifications made by the experts. Consequently, the signs of rationality are logics of statements (absence of logical errors), clarity and clearness, argumentation, comparison of two or more situations, assessment of the correspondence of statements to the motives and needs of the respondent. Emotionality of expressions was determined by the following features: the emotional saturation of the message (the use of epithets, descriptions, phraseological units, etc.), the absence or insignificant number of logical arguments, the expression of emotional attitude to the situation, etc. The frequency of representation of the mentioned signs in every respondent was the unit of manifestation of emotionality and rationality of expressions.

The degree of consistency of expert assessments is determined by the Pearson correlation coefficient. The reason for the objectivity of the evaluation of each statement was the consensus of at least five experts at the level  $r = 0.7-0.9$ .

In addition, the rationality component was determined on the basis of the rationality scale according to questionnaire Personality Factors of Decision Making Inventory by T. Kornilova.

### Discussion

The idea of the need to single out the typology appeared in the course of analysing the relationship between self-regulation processes and the system of personality's values. In our publications we have described sense-creation systems [2] of personality, revealed their regulatory features [1]. The identified differences in the characteristics of self-regulation and manifestations of personality properties allowed us to assume the possibility of drawing the typology of value-sense self-regulation and point out specific complexes of psychological properties.

By analyzing the empirical results of the research on value-sense self-regulation we have concluded that there is some similarity in the manifestation of regulatory personality properties and structural and functional characteristics of respondents with different types of sense-creation

systems. In particular, people under investigation who have a coordinated type of the sense-creation system are characterized by the dominance of the regulatory process of "modelling". Respondents with a contradictory non-realized type have a high index according to the processes of "planning" and partly "programming". And those with a contradictory realized type demonstrate a high or moderate level of the development of all regulatory links, except for the "evaluation of the results". Therefore, when making regulatory and value-sense typology we took into account these features, and that has been ultimately reflected in the content characterization of the presented regulatory types.

Building a typology has a certain regulatory basis, i.e. clarifying a typical structure of regulatory features and their specificity in different groups under study. The best statistical method for compilation and analysis of typical profiles of regulation is cluster analysis. In our study, two main methods were used: to determine the optimal number of clusters we used a method of communication between the groups, and then, after the previous clustering with the help of hierarchical methods, the method of k-means was used. The output variables, according to which we carried out the categorization of both groups, were indicators of self-regulation (planning, modelling, programming, evaluation of the result, flexibility, autonomy).

According to the results of clustering different sense-creation types we have singled out clusters that differ in the degree of manifestation of the basic parameters of self-regulation (Table 1).

Thus, in the *coordinated* self-creation type the clusters that were formed showed the dominance of such a regulatory level as "modelling", which served as the basis to point out the "modelling" regulatory type. In the *contradictory* sense-creation type the domination of such a level of the regulatory process of "programming" was the basis to single out the *programming* type of regulation. The regulatory structure of the respondents with the *contradictory non-realized* sense-creation type, which is represented by the domination of the average level of manifestation of the regulatory link of "planning", contributed to the distinguishing of the planning regulatory type. Another type of sense creation – *contradictory realized* – involves the respondents with different manifestations of regulatory links of "planning", "programming" that somehow are manifested in "modelling". With this in mind, we can say that this type represents properties of the coordinated and contradictory sense-creation types, and so it was called by us *the integrative regulatory type*.

The process of value-sense self-regulation is based on value-sense choice as a rational or irrational process of choosing alternatives. The decision-making mechanism is quite difficult, because decisions can be made consciously (rationally) and intuitively (irrationally) [4; 5; 6]. The results have shown the lowest level of "rationality" in respondents with the coordinated type of sense creation, partially with the contradictory realized type, and therefore there is a tendency to use emotion-focused strategies.

Future teachers with the distinct contradictory type (contradictory and non-realized contradictory) turned out to be more “rational”. Those who are “emotional” tend to act more intuitively, follow the events, take values from the outside, etc., while those who are “rational” are more prone to cognitive coping strategies. It is important to note that while contrasting properties of rationality and

emotionality in the context of decision-making situations, we do not claim that the existence of one of them implies the absence of the other, we just ascertain the different extent of manifestation of the above mentioned properties and the predominance of one of them in a single respondent.

Table 1.

**Meaning of self-regulation indicators in clusters of a group of**

	X	$\sigma$	D	X	$\sigma$	D	X	$\sigma$	D
<b>coordinated type of intelligence</b>									
	Cluster 1 (42,85%)			Cluster 2 (28,57%)			Cluster 3 (28,57%)		
Planning	5.66	1.15	1.33	4.5	2.12	4.5	3.5	3.53	12.5
Modelling	7.33	0.57	0.33	8	0	0	5	0	0
Programming	5.33	0.57	0.33	3.5	2.12	4.5	2.5	0.70	0.5
Evaluate the result	4.33	1.15	1.33	5.5	0.70	0.5	3	0	0
Flexibility	6.66	1.15	1.33	7.5	0.70	0.5	4.5	0.70	0.5
Independence	4	1	1	4.5	2.12	4.5	4.5	0.70	0.5
<b>contradictory sense-creating type</b>									
	Cluster 1 (30%)			Cluster 2 (40%)			Cluster 3 (30%)		
Planning	5.33	2.08	4.33	4.25	0.5	0.25	6	3	9
Modelling	4.33	1.52	2.33	3	0.81	0.66	6.66	0.57	0.33
Programming	6.33	1.15	1.33	3.75	0.5	0.25	7	1	1
Evaluate the result	5.33	1.52	2.33	2	0.81	0.66	5	1	1
Flexibility	5.66	0.57	0.33	4.25	0.95	0.91	5.66	1.52	2.33
Independence	7	0	0	5	1.15	1.33	3	1	1
<b>controversially-unrealized sense-creating type</b>									
	Cluster 1 (43.33%)			Cluster 2 (30.0%)			Cluster 3 (26.66%)		
Planning	5.84	1.40	1.97	4.55	1.81	3.27	7.57	1.25	1.57
Modelling	5.07	1.03	1.07	5	1	1	7.28	0.78	0.61
Programming	5.07	1.25	1.57	3	1.32	1.75	5.85	0.89	0.80
Evaluate the result	3.46	1.33	1.76	2.33	1	1	5	1.15	1.33
Flexibility	3.69	1.10	1.23	5.77	0.97	0.94	4.71	1.25	1.57
Independence	4.23	1.53	2.35	4	1.11	1.25	2.42	1.13	1.28
<b>contradictory-realized sense-creating type</b>									
	Cluster 1 (26.1%)			Cluster 2 (30.43%)			Cluster 3 (43.47%)		
Planning	5.16	1.72	2.96	3.14	0.69	0.47	6	1.24	1.55
Modelling	5.66	1.36	1.86	4.14	1.06	1.14	6.5	1.08	1.16
Programming	3	1.26	1.6	5.28	1.11	1.23	5.9	0.99	0.98
Evaluate the result	4.66	1.21	1.46	3.71	1.60	2.57	4.3	1.63	2.67
Flexibility	5.83	1.83	3.36	6.14	1.67	2.80	6	1.41	2
Independence	4	2.09	4.4	4	1.63	2.66	4.8	1.47	2.17

Note: here and below: X - average;  $\sigma$  - standard deviation; D - dispersion.

Regulatory features of the respondents with different sense-creation types and manifestation of rationality/emotions in decision-making situations that were identified on the basis of cluster analysis are presented in Table 2.

As it is shown in Table 1, among the main components of value-sense self-regulation in the respondents with the dominance of rational processes, strong links (that are formed at a rather high level) are the ones of planning and programming and a low level of regulatory flexibility. These peculiarities of self-regulation in “ra-

tional” subjects show that they have sustainable ways of organizing, constructing and managing the value-sense choice, the specific character of which correlates with their individual characteristics.

As for “emotional” participants, their characteristic feature is a high level of regulatory flexibility maturity and the average manifestation of regulatory personality properties of autonomy. In the process of cluster analysis we have identified characteristic regulatory profiles of “emotional” subjects, which later made two regulation types for this group: *modelling* and *integrating* ones.

Table 2.

**Correlation between emotions and rationality in the structure of the self-regulation process of future teachers with different sense-creation types**

Types of sense-creation systems	Domination of regulatory links	Emotions – rationality
Coordinated	Modelling	Emotional
Contradictory	Programming	Rational
Non-realized contradictory	Planning	Rational
Realized contradictory	Programming Planning Modelling	Emotional and rational

The main component of the regulatory system of “modelling” subjects (a coordinated sense-creation type) is a high index according to the links of modelling meaningful conditions and regulatory flexibility, and a low index (as compared to the scale of “modelling”) according to the links of planning aims and objectives, and programming operations. Specific features of the modelling processes in people of this type are characterized by awareness and clear ideas of activity conditions, adequate reflection of their real value, ability to take into account the significant features under not only specific circumstances but also on account of possible scenario. Low-level reflection of aims and objectives as well as insufficient awareness of the planned operations are determined by the focus on the current situation which is characteristic of this type.

Another subtype of “emotional” participants of the regulatory process is represented by the contradictory realized sense-creation type. It is characterized by the maturity of the following links in the self-regulation process: flexibility, planning and programming, the low-level of the “results assessment” link and the average, with a tendency to low, “modelling” link. These features of self-regulation indicate a clear need for planning one’s activities, developing a program of actions in decision making processes. In case of low awareness of self-regulation, they can fail to form stable ways of organizing, constructing and management of value-sense activity. However, due to a middle or high level of regulatory flexibility there is an easy orientation in a dynamically changing environment, flexibility of behaviour and adaptation to changing conditions.

What causes the dominance of rationality or emotions in decision making? In our opinion, these are certain personal characteristics that determine an appropriate mental state. We believe that “emotional” subjects differ from “rational” ones by clearer indicators of extraversion, impulsivity. Extraversion directs them to the outside world, creates the need for communication and social contact, a tendency to consider other people’s opinion, follow pieces of other people’s advice, the rules adopted by social norms when making decisions. Expressed impulsivity of “emotional” persons contributes to hasty decisions (without careful analysis of the situation), the desire to determine the decision made (though not always

correct) as soon as possible. Therefore, decisions are usually made easily, not giving much thought to that, and, in fact, it ensures their value-sense coordination.

“Rational” people have a highly developed logic, prudence and introversion. Introversion causes isolation, solitude, and therefore encourages autonomous decision-making. A logic approach ensures a detailed analysis of available information based on facts, rules and laws when making decisions. Prudence encourages careful evaluation of the alternatives when making decisions and involves deliberation, caution in the final choice of desirable alternatives.

Thus, the condition for rational decision-making is the formation of main regulatory skills. And due to highly developed self-regulation, “emotional” persons can adjust the intensity of their emotional displays, creating more conditions for rational choice and understanding of the situation. Therefore, we can assume that the relationship between the properties of rationality and emotions in decision-making situations is not one-sided, dichotomous. It is a quite complex, multi-level relationship that is not limited to a developed system of conscious self-regulation.

Summarizing theoretical developments and results of empirical research studies has made it possible to suggest a typology of value-sense self-regulation of future teachers as decision-making process subjects. Thus, the *emotional-modelling type* includes those with the coordinated sense-creation type when the regulatory link of “modelling” conditions of the value-sense choice and emotion in the decision-making process prevail. Since this type is composed of the respondents with the coordinated type of sense-creation, when the importance of the value and its availability are coordinated, then their value-sense sphere includes only what is available and mastered, and thus, important. The unavailable goes beyond its limits and the field of perception. Living space built according to this strategy is subjectively experienced by them as mastered, and therefore they are psychologically at the center of that space, they live “here and now”, and therefore do not seek its extension.

*Rational-programming type* comprises the contradictory type of the sense-creation system with a developed link of programming actions and rational decision-making in situations of the value-sense choice. Sense-creation

processes of the respondents in this group are rather contradictory. Low functional maturity of the regulatory process of modelling meaningful environment demonstrates difficulty in adequate assessment of really important internal conditions and external circumstances, requirements and conditions of the situation, in identifying the most essential things. However, the perception of values as inaccessible in real life increases their importance (which may indicate their high propensity for risk), giving them additional sense, which is related to the barriers to their implementation.

*Rational-planning type* is formed by the contradictory non-realized sense-creation system with the dominance of the regulatory link of “planning” and rational decision-making. A characteristic feature of this type of respondents is a contradictory value-sense system with negative correlation between the importance of values and the availability of their achievement. While organizing their living space they include the distant, inaccessible, and thus, important things. The available and mastered things are not perceived, noticed or appreciated. This is the type which indicates orientation at expanding living space, mastering everything that lies beyond the learned and accessible things. These people have a clear need to plan their activities and there is no flexibility in the choice of alternative decisions. Regulatory processes of this type have a high level of awareness.

The *emotional-integrative type* involves the respondents with the contradictory realized sense-creation type, who have equally well-developed regulatory processes of “programming”, “planning” and a marked increase in the process of “modelling”. They possess qualities of different regulatory groups, and therefore, have absorbed some of their characteristics. Contradictions emerging in the value-sense sphere are easily solved through a “constructive” approach to their interpretation. Important values are perceived as available, and decreased availability makes them less important, contributing to the implementation of value-sense preference. An emotional criterion dominates in their choice. On the other hand, the contradictory value system predisposes them to a rational approach to their value-sense choice. Combination of characteristics of various regulatory links makes it possible to effectively resolve contradictions in the value-sense field, making it quite effective in this situation.

## REFERENCES

1. Halian, I.M. (2013). Psykholohichniy analiz osoblyvostei protsesu samorehuliatcii maibutnikh pedahohiv [Psychological analysis of the peculiarities of the self-regulation process in future teachers]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mykolaivskoho derzhavnogo universytetu imeni V.O.Sukhomlynskoho: zbirnyk naukovykh prats – Scientific Bulletin of V.O.Sukhomlynskyi Mykolaiv State University: scientific collected works*, 11 (99), 63–66 [in Ukrainian].

## Conclusion

The peculiarity of the functioning of value-sense self-regulation is self-determination of the person's actions. This is a rather complicated process, because the value-sense sphere of a person consists of various components that not only complement each other but also determine intrapersonal contradictions, which cause the difference in the importance of value for the person and the possibility of achieving it.

Types of value-sense self-regulation are characterized by a specific set of individual-typical features of the system of thinking, self-regulation and personality. In particular, people with a coordinated system of values seek not to go beyond the limits of their enclosed space, which enables them to keep their own system of values integral. Subjectively important values are perceived by them as easily accessible, and therefore do not create meaningful contradictions. Controversial system-creating types are characterized by differences in the importance of values and the possibilities of their achievement, as a result of which there arise various interpretations of them and expressions of sense.

Since the basis of value-sense self-regulation is the rational and irrational choice of alternatives, the mechanism of decision-making is rather difficult, as it can be taken consciously (rationally) and intuitively (irrationally). A prerequisite for rational decision-making is the formation of the main parts of the system of self-regulation. The domination of “rational” subjects of regulatory planning and programming units and the low level of regulatory flexibility indicate that they have sustainable ways of organizing, constructing and managing value-based choices. “Emotional” people are characterized by a high level of regulatory flexibility maturity with the average manifestation of such a regulator-personal property as independence. With the development of self-regulation, “emotional” subjects are given the opportunity to regulate the intensity of their emotional manifestations, thereby creating more conditions for rational choice and understanding the situation. Therefore, one can assume that the relationship between the properties of rationality and emotionality in the decision-making situation is not unilateral, dichotomous. This is a rather complex, multilevel interconnection, which is not limited only to the development of a system of conscious self-regulation.

The prospect for further research is the in-depth analysis of rationality and emotionality as personality factors of the value-sense choice.

2. Halian, I.M. (2015). Typy smysloutvorennya maibutnikh pedahohiv [Types of sense-creation in future teachers]. *Naukovyi visnyk of Chernivetskyi universytet: zbirnyk naukovykh prats, Pedahohika ta psykholohia – Scientific Bulletin of Chernivtsi University: scientific collected works, Pedagogy and Psychology*, 743, 37-41 [in Ukrainian].

3. Kornilova, T.V. (2005). Metodologicheskie problemy psikhologii priniattia reshenii [Methodological issues

of the psychology of decision-making]. *Psikhologicheskii zhurnal – Psychology journal*, 26 (1), 3-20 [in Russian].

4. Kornilova, T.V., Stepanosova, O.V., & Grigorenko, E.L. (2006). Intuitsiia i ratsionalnost v urovnevoi reguliatsii verbalnykh prognozov pri priniatii reshenii [Intuition and rationality in the multi-level regulation of verbal prediction in decision making]. *Voprosy psikhologii – Issues of Psychology*, 2, 126-138 [in Russian].

#### ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Галян І.М. Психологічний аналіз особливостей процесу саморегуляції майбутніх педагогів / І.М. Галян // Науковий вісник Миколаївського державного університету імені В.О.Сухомлинського: збірник наукових праць / за ред. С.Д.Максименка, Н.О.Євдокимової. – Т.2. – Вип. 11 (99). – Миколаїв: МНУ імені В.О.Сухомлинського, 2013. – С. 63-66.

2. Галян І.М. Типи смислоутворення майбутніх педагогів / І.М. Галян // Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету: зб. наук. праць. Вип. 743. Педагогіка та психологія. – Чернівці: Чернівецький нац. ун-т, 2015. – С. 37-41.

3. Корнилова Т.В. Методологические проблемы психологии принятия решений // Психологический журнал. – 2005. – Т.26. – №1. – С.3-20.

5. Akinci C., & Sadler-Smith E. (2012). Intuition in management research: A historical review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14, 104-122 [in English].

6. Cabantous L., & Gond J. P. (2011). Rational decision making as performative praxis: Explaining rationality's Éternel Retour. *Organization Science*, 22, 573-586 [in English].

4. Корнилова Т.В. Интуиция и рациональность в уровневой регуляции вербальных прогнозов при принятии решений / Т.В. Корнилова, О.В. Степаносова, Е.Л. Григоренко // Вопросы психологии. – 2006. – № 2. – С. 126-138.

5. Akinci C., & Sadler-Smith E. Intuition in management research: A historical review / C. Akinci, & E. Sadler-Smith // *International Journal of Management Reviews*. – 2012. – 14. – 104-122.

6. Cabantous L., & Gond J. P. Rational decision making as performative praxis: Explaining rationality's Éternel Retour. / L. Cabantous, & J. P. Gond // *Organization Science*. – 2011. – 22. – 573-586.

*Ігор Михайлович Галян,*

*кандидат психологічних наук, професор кафедри практичної психології,  
Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка,  
вул. І.Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна*

#### МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ОСНОВИ ВИОКРЕМЛЕННЯ ТИПІВ ЦІННІСНО-СМИСЛОВОЇ САМОРЕГУЛЯЦІЇ МАЙБУТНІХ ПЕДАГОГІВ

У роботі розглянуто феномен саморегуляції, що вивчається у психологічній науці в діяльнісному (орієнтація на регуляцію дій), поведінковому (регуляція поведінки) та особистісному аспектах. Показано, що дослідження саморегуляції в особистісному аспекті, який торкається питань перетворення ставлень людини до різних видів діяльності, до інших людей, самої себе, спонукало до виокремлення такого її різновиду як ціннісно-сміслова саморегуляція. Головною особливістю її функціонування є самодетермінація дій суб'єкта. У контексті нашого дослідження це самодетермінація ціннісно-сміслового вибору у різних ситуаціях прийняття рішень. Вищезначене детермінувало потребу побудови типології ціннісно-сміслової саморегуляції, якої під сучасну пору в психології немає. Відтак метою публікації є обґрунтування методології виокремлення та аналіз типів ціннісно-сміслової саморегуляції особистості. Для досягнення поставленої мети застосовано загальнонаукові методи теоретичного й емпіричного дослідження. Було проведено порівняльний аналіз отриманих емпіричних результатів, що посприяло визначенню критеріїв, на основі яких виокремлювалися типи ціннісно-сміслової саморегуляції. Серед таких: досвід суб'єктної активності та регуляторної компетентності, а також особистісні фактори прийняття рішень. Виокремлено такі типи ціннісно-сміслової саморегуляції, як: *емоційно-моделювальний, раціонально-програмувальний, раціонально-планувальний, емоційно-інтегративний*. Показано, що кожному з них властивий специфічний комплекс особистісних якостей і властивостей, які вирізняють їх носіїв з-поміж інших. Констатовано наявність індивідуальних особливостей саморегуляції, детермінованих різним функціонуванням регуляторних ланок і особистісно-регуляторних властивостей. Перспективою подальшого дослідження є поглиблений аналіз раціональності та емоційності як особистісних чинників ціннісно-сміслового вибору.

**Ключові слова:** цінності, смисли, ціннісно-сміслова саморегуляція, ціннісний вибір, тип ціннісно-сміслової саморегуляції.

*Sumbitted on July, 11, 2017*

*Reviewed by Doctor of Psychology Z. Kovalchuk*