Типологические особенности субъективного благополучия современной молодежи

Введение. Интерес к теме исследования связан с запросом преподавателей вузов, работодателей относительно личностных и регуляторных ресурсов современной молодежи. Умение ставить цель и стремиться к ее достижению, реалистично оценивать свои ожидания и развивать свой потенциал раскрывается в данном исследовании через понятие субъективного благополучия. Целью исследования стало определение индивидуально-типологических особенностей молодых людей с учетом их субъективного благополучия, осознанной саморегуляции и толерантности к неопределенности. Мы предположили, что тот или иной тип во многом обусловлен развитием регуляторно-когнитивных процессов и отчасти специфичным комплексом регуляторно-личностных свойств, а также личностными установками на толерантность к неопределенности.

Участники и методы исследования. Выборку исследования составила обучающаяся молодежь в возрасте от 18 до 35 лет (средний возраст 20,7±3,5 лет, N=1435). Использовались методики для диагностики субъективного благополучия личности, осознанной саморегуляции, толерантности/интолерантности к неопределенности. Математико-статистическая обработка данных включала предварительную обработку количественных данных в виде нормирования (стандартизации) исходных значений при помощи z-преобразования, кластерный анализ методом k-средних, конфигурационно-частотный анализ распределения выделенных кластеров.

Результаты. Кластерный анализ позволил выявить 7 групп обучающихся статистически значимо различающихся по всем диагностируемым параметрам. Проведен сравнительный анализ выделенных групп, дана их психологическая характеристика. Установлено, что в основе проявления типологических особенностей субъективного благополучия лежат, с одной стороны, определенные структурно-функциональные особенности осознанной саморегуляции, а с другой – сформированность установки на толерантность к неопределенности. Доказано, что высокий уровень осознанной саморегуляции, упорство и решительность в достижении поставленной цели деятельности (настойчивость) в психологически напряженных условиях жизнедеятельности выступают значимыми факторами субъективного благополучия, препятствуя и/или нивелируя развитие неблагополучных состояний.

Практическая значимость. Представленные результаты эмпирического исследования достаточно ярко демонстрируют возможность применения дифференциально-типологического подхода к субъективному благополучию, позволяют описать дифференциальные аспекты взаимосвязи субъективного благополучия, осознанной саморегуляции, установок на толерантность к неопределенности и определить основные направления практической работы с молодыми людьми в направлении развития осознанной саморегуляции и повышения их субъективного благополучия.
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Introduction. Interest in the research topic is associated with the request of university drivers, employers regarding the personal and regulatory resources of today’s youth. The ability to set a goal and strive for its implementation, to realistically assess expectations and develop one's potential, reveals one's experiences through the solution of an experimental analysis. The aim of the study was to determine the individual typological characteristics of young people, taking into account their subjective wellbeing, conscious self-regulation and tolerance for uncertainty. We assumed that this or that type is largely due to the development of regulatory-cognitive processes and, in part, a specific set of regulatory-personal properties, as well as personal attitudes towards tolerance for uncertainty.

Participants and research methods. The study sample consisted of young students aged 18 to 35 (average age 20.7±3.5 years, N=1435). Techniques were used to diagnose the subjective perception of a person, conscious self-regulation, tolerance/intolerance to uncertainty. Mathematical and statistical data processing includes standardizing, k-means clustering and configuration-frequency analysis of the distribution of selected clusters.

Results. Cluster analysis revealed 7 groups of students who differ statistically significantly in all the diagnosed parameters. A comparative analysis of the selected groups was carried out, their psychological characteristics were given. It is established that the manifestation of typological features of subjective well-being is based, on the one hand, on certain structural and functional features of conscious self-regulation, and on the other hand, on the formation of an attitude of tolerance to uncertainty. It is proved that a high level of conscious self-regulation, perseverance and constancy in achieving the goal of activity in psychologically stressful conditions of life are significant factors of subjective well-being, preventing and/or leveling the development of dysfunctional states. It has been proven that a high level of conscious self-regulation, perseverance and sensitivity in the goal of activity (perseverance) in conditions of stressful states of life are identified as sensitive factors of subjective passage, preventing and/or leveling the development of dysfunctional vessels.

Practical significance. The presented results of an empirical study clearly demonstrate the possibility of applying a differential typological approach to subjective well-being, allow us to describe the differential aspects of the relationship between subjective well-being, conscious self-regulation, attitudes to tolerance for uncertainty and identify the main directions of practical work with young people in the direction of developing conscious self-regulation and improving their subjective well-being.
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INTRODUCTION

The quality of education is traditionally discussed through the prism of academic achievements, assessment of students' knowledge and skills necessary for full-fledged future functioning in society. Moreover, the learning process itself is subjected to a thorough assessment, although the criterion of the well-being of a person who gets into the education system was not popular in assessing the quality of education. Today, a new educational discourse of "the well-being of students" is trending. The influential large-scale PISA project implemented by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [1] raises the question of supporting a gradual shift of attention from educational system's ability to ensure high achievements to the creation of conditions that support the well-being of students, presenting education as a form of living their own lives. The importance of well-being, psychological safety and well-being of students outside of their connection with achievements is recognized [2].

Currently, the necessary criterion for the effectiveness of the educational system is ensuring the well-being of students, due to the influence of:

- external factors such as technostress [3], parental [4] and school pressure [4; 5],
- as well as internal factors, or individual predictors, such as conscientiousness [6], self-efficacy, interest, test anxiety [5], which determine the possibility of using a student-centered approach to ensure the well-being of students [7].

Recently, the recognition of individual differences, individual sensitivity to the requirements of the educational environment is another aspect of a modernized view of education. The issues of individual differences in learning [8; 9], individual experience [10], individual characteristics of student engagement [11] are considered.

The problem of an individualistic approach to education has long been a subject of concern to scientists, psychologists and practical teachers. The differential approach is essential for practice, its undoubted advantage is revealed when creating predictive models of learning success and well-being. Thus, the relationship was established between the level of development of working memory in students and their performance in mathematics [12], between the level of subjective well-being of schoolchildren and academic performance [13]. Predictive models of the learning performance of students who are passionate about virtual reality [14] and have a time management strategy [15] were proposed. The role of the level of conscious self-regulation in the school performance of adolescents [16], the importance of using a neural network [17] and machine learning algorithms in teaching [18] were considered.

From the standpoint of this approach, the presented work explores not only general patterns, but also reveals the typology of the relationship of subjective well-being with the features of conscious self-regulation, personal attitudes to uncertainty.

The construct of "subjective well-being"

The concepts of "well-being", "life satisfaction", "quality of life", "subjective well-being", "psychological well-being", "happiness" are the main targets of research in humanitarian sciences and the positive aspects of human being. A number of concepts focus on the role of positive emotions in the assessment of well-being [19], cognitive reassessment of emotions [20], positive mood [21], positive emotion up-regulation [22], attachment, empathy [23],
rethinking experience [24]. Other researchers attach particular importance of intrinsic need satisfaction that lead to well-being [25], the role of striving and resilience in achieving subjective well-being [26], the balance of needs that lead to well-being [27].

N. Bradburn distinguished the ratio of positive and negative affects in response to environmental events in the structure of well-being [28]. Developing the ideas of N. Bradburn, E. Diener argued that life satisfaction is not purely based on emotional assessment, but includes a moment of cognitive assertion, reflexive-evaluative attitudes towards oneself and the surrounding reality [29]. E. Diener suggests a three-component structure of subjective well-being: life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect. M. Argyle generalizes the proposed structure and deduces the concept of "happiness", which equates to well-being [30]. In approaches where scientists assign the key role in achieving well-being to the ratio of positive and negative affects, a hedonistic concept of subjective well-being lies. However, it is obvious that even a low quality of life can be compensated by its meaningfulness, eudemonistic happiness. Feelings of fulfillment in life, active involvement in certain activities consistent with deep values are the basis of eudemonistic concepts of well-being.

Through synthesizing hedonistic and eudemonistic approaches, we understand subjective well-being as "the emotional and evaluative attitude of a person to his life, personality, relationships with others and processes that are important to them from the point of view of the acquired normative-value ideas about a "prosperous" external and internal environment, expressed in satisfaction with it, a sense of happiness" [31].

Subjective well-being can be characterized by high stability. Nevertheless, there are a number of external (situational, objective) and internal (values, basic needs, personal characteristics) factors that have an effect on the level of subjective well-being.

In the crisis of socio-political, economic, and environmental conditions, the issues of finding human resources to successfully cope with new challenges in the changing conditions of life are significantly turning to the problem of resources for assuring the well-being of students: regulatory and personal resources [32], coping behavior [33, 34], happiness [35], resilience [36]. It was found that significant factors affecting the stability of subjective well-being are the regulatory abilities of the subject [16], their attitudes to the perception of situations of uncertainty [37], stress resistance [38], intellectual potential [39], self-regulation's reliability [40], social support [41] and basic psychological needs satisfaction [42].

**Conscious self-regulation**

Based on the theoretical positions of O.A. Konopkin, conscious self-regulation is understood as "the general ability to self-regulate, which manifests itself primarily in the successful mastery of new (including more complex) types and forms of activity, in the successful solution of non-standard tasks and effective overcoming of atypical, unfamiliar situations at every stage of mastering various types of activities and spheres life, in productive independence, in persistence and persistence in achieving the accepted goal" [43].

Self-regulation manifests itself through the functioning of regulatory and cognitive processes (goal setting and planning, modeling of significant conditions for achieving goals, programming actions, evaluating results). It is characterized by a specific set of regulatory and personal properties (flexibility, reliability, persistence), the individual originality of which forms the overall level of self-regulation of activity [32], which in ultimately contributes to the achievement of subjective well-being. The relation between self-regulation and academic performance has been studied quite thoroughly. In
particular, the role of self-regulation [44], self-control [45] and motivation [46] in achieving the subjective well-being of young people was revealed, the relationship between life satisfaction [47], self-esteem, subjective well-being [48], self-regulated learning [49] and academic performance was proved.

These data indicate the need to disclose various individual typological features of the subjective well-being of students.

**Uncertainty tolerance**

Uncertainty stress could negatively influence various aspects of students’ life such as psychological well-being [50], social anxiety [51] and even suicidal ideation [52].

We view tolerance of uncertainty as a significant personal resource, as a key characteristic of a person, as a life position, as socio-psychological stance including cognitive, affective and spiritual aspects [53; 54]. At the root of this attitude are two fundamental motivations: the motivation of "Being-in-the-world" and the motivation of "The Value of life" [55]. When accepting being and realizing its value, a person accepts uncertainty and instability as integral characteristics of the modern world. Researchers Virginia M. DeRoma, Kanetra M. Martin, Maria Lynn Kessler found that uncertainty tolerance affects the level of learning efficiency and the level of comfort in learning. The authors concluded that it is necessary to organize the learning process while simultaneously considering individual tolerance for uncertainty. Virginia M. DeRoma believes that uncertainty in the structure of education is an optimal phenomenon and that student needs to accept this idea, then they will be more motivated to complete tasks in the learning process [56]. Thus, considering uncertainty tolerance as the ability to perceive unstructured situations «not as threatening, but as containing a challenge» [57], it can be assumed that it will act as a kind of shock absorber for the destructive impact of disadvantage.

Earlier, the authors of the article identified and described structural models of the features of the relationship between conscious self-regulation, tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty, stress levels and subjective well-being, which serve as an essential basis for understanding the psychological mechanisms of ensuring subjective well-being under the stress of uncertainty [58]. The essential results of the study are the data obtained on the direct contribution and mediator role of conscious self-regulation, tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty in achieving and maintaining subjective well-being under stress.

The models of the relationship between these indicators constructed by us in previous studies are certainly not practical enough and limit the possibility of predicting the behavior of a young person in achieving and maintaining their well-being. Such a task cannot be solved without studying the individual typological features of the manifestation of the revealed general patterns.

Following the justifications and conclusions presented above, we assumed that there are several groups (types) of young people based on the level of their subjective well-being. Each of the types depends on the development of regulatory and cognitive processes (goal setting and planning, modeling of significant conditions for achieving goals, programming actions, evaluating results) and partly on a specific set of regulatory and personal properties. Personal attitudes towards tolerance /intolerance of uncertainty also have an impact on the experience of subjective well-being, as an amortization of the lack of development of regulatory and cognitive processes.

The purpose of the study is to consider individual typological features of students considering their subjective well-being, conscious self-regulation and uncertainty tolerance.
The aims set in the study:
• to identify and describe groups of students in accordance with the level of subjective well-being;
• to conduct a comparative analysis of the expressiveness of regulatory and personal characteristics, attitudes towards tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty in the selected groups;
• to establish the estimated incidence of selected clusters depending on the gender of the subjects.

SAMPLE

The study was conducted on a sample of young people aged 18 to 35 years (average age 20.7 ± 3.5 years).

The data was collected anonymously using Google Forms*. The study involved 1,797 respondents. We selected 1,435 responses, excluding unreliable answers on indicators, from the subjects according to the target audience of the study (young students), the completeness of filling out the questionnaire, attentiveness and willingness to cooperate. All respondents are residents of various regions of Russia, including the Karachay-Cherkess Republic (305, 33.4% of the group selected), the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic (302, 51.3% of the group selected), the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania (204, 11.8% of the group selected), Stavropol Krai (391, 44.8% of the group selected), Moscow and Moscow region (233, 44.6% of the group selected).

The study was approved by the Supervisory Board of the Psychology and Pedagogical Faculty of the North-Caucasus Federal University. All participants gave their consent before filling out the questionnaire.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Within the framework of the research objectives, we used a set of diagnostic techniques aimed at assessing subjective well-being, conscious self-regulation, tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty.

The assessment of subjective well-being was carried out using a technique for diagnosing subjective well-being of an individual [59]. The methodology includes 34 questions that make up five indicators of subjective well-being: emotional well-being, existential activity well-being, ego well-being, hedonistic and socio-normative well-being, which are constitute the integrative scale of subjective well-being. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for the scales of the methodology in our sample were 0.69-0.93 and 0.96 for the integrative scale.

To assess the development of conscious self-regulation, we used "Self-Regulation Profile Questionnaire – SRPQM 2020" by V.I. Morosanova [60]. The questionnaire consists of 28 statements that make up the scales: goals planning, modeling, programming, evaluation of results, regulatory flexibility, persistence, reliability and the integrative scale of general level of self-regulation. The reliability coefficients for the scales of the methodology were 0.72, 0.60, 0.70, 0.64, 0.71, 0.81, 0.78 and 0.85 for the integrative scale respectively.

The questionnaire of tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty [61], a modification of S. Badner’s questionnaire, was used to assess the attitude to uncertainty. The questionnaire

* https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfzJ592hy1TlytT0U9i4APjXmNWNh_1kl5NoD7mKa7UsADIMA/viewform
contains 12 statements that make up 2 scales: uncertainty tolerance and intolerance of uncertainty. The a-Cronbach reliability coefficient for the scales of the methodology in our sample was 0.72 for the intolerance of uncertainty scale and 0.69 for the uncertainty tolerance scale.

Mathematical and statistical data processing included:
- preliminary processing of quantitative data in the form of normalization (standardization) of initial values using the z-transformation $z = (x - \bar{x})/SD$.
- cluster analysis by the k-means method, the significance of differences between cluster averages for each of the initial variables was also evaluated using ANOVA.
- configural frequency analysis of the distribution of selected clusters depending on the gender and ethno-regional affiliation of the subjects (chi-squared test).

RESULTS

At the first stage, a cluster analysis using the k-means method was carried out in order to identify groups of students who differ in the expressiveness of levels of subjective well-being, conscious self-regulation and uncertainty tolerance. The basis for the inclusion of these parameters in the division of groups was the data that self-regulation is a significant mechanism for maintaining subjective well-being, including being a mediator of the relationship between well-being and uncertainty tolerance [58]. As a result of clustering of a mixed sample of 1,435 respondents, 7 groups were generated. All seven clusters were significantly differ in all diagnosed parameters (see Figure 1).

The first cluster included 320 respondents (22.3%), the second one, as well as the sixth, include 129 people (9%), the third cluster – 223 (15.5%), the fourth – 293 (20.4%), the fifth – 270 (18.8%), and, in the last, seventh – 181 participants (12.6%). The first cluster was the most represented by the number of respondents, both for men and for women.

The comparison of the data of well-being, the values of conscious self-regulation and the intensity of attitudes of tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty allows us to describe the individual psychological characteristics of the selected typological groups.

All 7 types were conditionally divided into subjectively prosperous and subjectively disadvantaged. Consider the disadvantaged groups.

I. Subjectively disadvantaged.
Group 1. Stable.
This is the group with the lowest indicators of subjective well-being. Representatives of this group are characterized by a passive reaction to what is happening (low indicators of tolerance / intolerance of uncertainty). Passive reaction is confirmed by low values of regulatory flexibility ($m = -0.94$), low ability to program their activity ($m = -1.05$ for programming), low persistence ($m = -1.26$). This passive reaction is combined with a relatively high level of reliability ($m = 0.76$). Reliability, as the stability of the qualities of conscious self-regulation of mental activity and practical activity in stressful conditions, acts as a kind of leveling the development of stressful states.

Group 2. Disbalanced.
Characterizing this typological group, primarily, we should talk about a low level of subjective well-being in all indicators. In this group, in comparison with other groups, the lowest values of such self-regulation indicators as: planning, modeling, evaluation of results
and reliability are noted. At the same time, we note that attitudes towards tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty have values above average. Thus, there is an imbalance between regulatory and personal properties and the requirements that type 2 imposes on society. This empirical fact seems to us to be rather unexpected: the more respondents are at ease to uncertain situations, the less pronounced their needs are to make plans for the future, to be sustainable in achieving them, to take into account the results obtained. It’s possible an algorithm is already available to solve the problem (m = 0.29 for intolerance of uncertainty), so planning, modeling and evaluation is not needed for this cluster.

**Group 3. Passive**

The profile of representatives of this group is the most common (320 people). The expressiveness of all indexes is at an average level, indicators of the regulatory process programming (m = -0.43) and regulatory-personal persistence (m = -0.52) are below the average. That is, these respondents are not set up to plan their activities, do not show persistence in achieving their goals. They are relatively satisfied with themselves, their character, appearance (m = -0.04 for ego well–being), satisfied with acceptable housing conditions, available income (m = 0.00 for hedonistic well-being. They do not plan to change anything in their lives (m = -0.35 for planning).

**II. Subjectively flourishing.**

**Group 4. Normative**

The profile of representatives of this cluster ranks second in the prevalence rating among the subjects. This group, like the previous one, is characterized by average values of indicators of subjective well-being, tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty and ambivalent values of indicators of conscious self-regulation. The expressed values of the regulatory functions such as planning, programming, evaluation of results and regulatory persistence are noted. Simultaneously, the existential-activity and socio-normative components of well-being are more pronounced (m = 0.22 and m = 0.34, respectively). They reflect normative-value and semantic ideas about well-being, the semantic certainty of life, the conformity to life’s to social norms, moral values of the individual.

**Group 5. Adaptive**

The profile of this group is present in 9% of the subjects (129 people). The level of subjective well-being is above average. The regulatory-personal profile of such subjects is characterized by high indicators of the ability to model external and internal conditions for achieving the goal (m = 0.99 for modeling), regulatory flexibility (m = 0.80) and reliability (m = 0.80) in combination with a relatively pronounced persistence in achieving the goal (m = 0.47). Representatives of this group differ in the average values of uncertainty tolerance, i.e. willingness to look for ways to solve the problem despite the uncertainty. The resource of well-being is the tactics of conformism, adaptation.

**Group 6. Passionate.**

The profile of representatives of this group differs in indicators of subjective well-being above the average level. They are in the second place in terms of subjective well-being compared to respondents of other groups, as they have the highest levels of tolerance and intolerance of uncertainty (m = 0.70 and m = 0.72, respectively), i. e., they actively react to what is happening, express their point of view. The regulatory and personal profile of this group is below average. To achieve subjective well-being, a low level of self-regulation is compensated by high, in comparison with all other groups, indicators of tolerance / intolerance of uncertainty.
Figure 1 Arithmetic means for generated clusters

*Note.* WB - well-being, Exist_a - existential activity, Int_U - intolerance of uncertainty, Unc_tolerance - uncertainty tolerance. No.1 – stable type, No.2 – disbalanced type, No.3 – passive type, No.4 – normative type, No.5 – adaptive type, No.6 – passionate type, No.7 – harmonious type.

**Group 7. Harmonious.**

The profile of the representatives of the fourth subjectively flourishing group is characterized by the highest values of subjective well-being. In the prevalence rating, this group ranks second among men. A high level of self-regulation allows them to achieve high indicators of subjective well-being without excessive declaration of their social position (an average level of tolerance and intolerance of uncertainty). The regulatory profile of this cluster of subjects is the most harmonious in comparison with other selected types, characterized by high formation of conscious self-regulation, in which all regulatory processes reach the highest values.

**Distribution of the resulting clusters depending on gender.**

Statistically significant differences in the distribution of the selected types depending on gender were researched (see Table 1).

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed sample</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1 – stable type, 2 – disbalanced type, 3 – passive type, 4 – normative type, 5 – adaptive type, 6 – passionate type, 7 – harmonious type.
Primarily, young women occupy type 4 (23%), which we named a normative type. In the male sample, type 3 is more common, that is the passive type (24%). Approximately in equal proportion among young women and men there are representatives of the sixth type – passionate: 16% and 15% respectively. The frequency of occurrence of most other types varies by 3-5 percent. The number of successful types (harmonious, adaptive type) is higher in the male sample. For a mixed sample, 3 priority positions on the representation of respondents in a particular cluster are occupied by: cluster 3 – passive type (22%), cluster 4 – normative type (19%) and the third position is occupied by cluster 6 – passionate (16%).

DISCUSSION

The results of the clustering of respondents confirm the previously obtained data on the leading role of regulatory persistence [62] in achieving subjective well-being, since the ranking of clusters by indicators of subjective well-being fully reflect their dynamics in terms of persistence. The more prosperous the selected types are, the higher their regulatory personal indicator of persistence.

A similar trend, though not so clear, is observed in the relationship of such a regulatory-personal indicator as flexibility: clusters with a low level of subjective well-being have lower regulatory flexibility than clusters with a high level of subjective well-being. At the same time, group profiles allow us to judge individual styles of maintaining subjective well-being within a given clusters.

The stable type. Characteristic of the results obtained suggests that the respondents of this group are at the limit of their resources. Attitudes towards the future as a source of discomfort and potential dangers cause a feeling of fear, anxiety, uncertainty and confusion (uncertainty tolerance m = -1.26; intolerance of uncertainty m = -1.17). Unformed ability to consciously plan their activities (m = -1.05 for programming), flexibly rearrange plans in dynamically changing conditions of life (regulatory flexibility m = -0.94) and lack of persistence in achieving their plans (m = -1.26) lead to a feeling and the experience of insolvency, dysfunctionality. Considering that their persistence, flexibility and programming are at a low level, this type may be living at the limit of resources and any activity stops when the opportunity presents itself. These young people can work under stressful conditions, but they will not make excessive efforts either on the physical level (low persistence) or on the mental level: low tolerance and intolerance of uncertainty, unwillingness to act according to an algorithm (m = -1.05 for programming), inability to rebuild plans and programs of performing actions and behavior (m = -0.94 for flexibility). This tactic helps to conserve resources and reduce stress levels, although in the end it will lead to the fact that important values for the subject will not be achieved.

An insignificant resource for maintaining one's condition is the desire to take into account the prevailing external and internal conditions (the average level of the regulatory process "modeling" is m = 0.09), the willingness to evaluate the results of activities (the average level of the regulatory process of evaluation of results is m = -0.15). Although the most important resource is a high level of regulatory reliability. i. e. the ability to continue activity in emotionally difficult, stressful conditions. Reliability acts as an obstacle, leveling the development of stressful states. Since the subjects of this type of modeling and evaluation of results are at an average level, it can be assumed that it is enough for them to understand the task (modeling) in general terms, assess the possibility
of its implementation (evaluation of results) and continue to act even in conditions of violating established rules and traditions. It is reflected in an exceptionally low level of socio-normative well-being ($m = -1.91$). This typological group we called dysfunctional but stress-resistant. This group includes approximately the same number of young men (60 people) and young women (69 people). In order to achieve subjective well-being, students of this group can be recommended for organizing educational and practical actions, developing such competencies as: to clearly structure and plan their actions (planning), to rebuild them in a mobile way in changed conditions (regulatory flexibility), to develop strong-willed qualities (persistence), to look for approaches to solving the problem despite its uncertainty (uncertainty tolerance). First, to give a template, a sample, a ready-made algorithm for solving a particular problem, then gradually moving away from ready-made solutions. To encourage decision-making whilst taking into account the variability and inconsistency of the context, to make a choice, to get a new experience that evokes a sense of anticipation; readiness for creativity, experimentation and improvisation.

**Disbalanced type.** This group belongs to the category of disadvantaged. The level of subjective well-being is low in all indicators. Respondents of this group are also characterized by low values of all regulatory and personal properties and processes indicators, with the exception of the average values of programming. Representatives of this type perceive the future as a source of discomfort and potential dangers, causing a sense of fear, anxiety and uncertainty. They are in search of a given model of life activity, which is confirmed by the willingness to find a sample, an algorithm of actions in a situation of uncertainty ($m = 0.29$ for intolerance of uncertainty). They often tend to act reactively, impulsively, which is confirmed by the lowest reliability of conscious self-regulation in the sample (reliability $m = -0.79$). We assume that the resource for such young people is the willingness to consciously build methods and algorithms of their actions (programming $m = -0.20$), as well as a variable that allows you to persevere in achieving long-term goals — uncertainty tolerance, which M.S. Lane, K. Klenke call a meta-cognitive strategy [53]. Scientists note the practical significance of using meta-strategy in uncertainty management. It can be stated that the respondents of this group are constantly in search of solutions, answers, ways to solve a particular problem, despite the uncertainty. In these conditions, one of the ways to maintain an internal balance is to create and maintain certainty within oneself. It is important to rely on the rules, norms, algorithms that they have developed themselves or those that society offers them (socio-normative well-being, uncertainty tolerance). In psychologically stressful conditions, they will experience difficulties due to their low ability to promptly assess significant conditions of activity and build action programs adequate to rapidly changing circumstances.

With such a combination of personal and regulatory features, this type is the most vulnerable to maintaining subjective well-being. This type mainly includes young women (127 people), the lowest number of young men occupy this type in comparison with other ones (54 people). To achieve subjective well-being by students of this group, it is important to develop problem-oriented coping strategies: the ways to overcome difficult life situations through changing their assessment of the situation, searching for information about how best to proceed. It is important that these respondents receive constructive feedback, an external assessment of their performance with clear criteria, to increase self-esteem and readiness to evaluate the results of behavior and activity independently.

At the same time, in comparison with the first cluster, representatives of this type have an increase in indicators of hedonistic and socio-normative well-being (I feel safer when I understand and accept social norms and rules).
**Passive type.** The last cluster from the dysfunctional group. This type is most common in the presented sample (320 people). The expressiveness of all factors is at an average level. Respondents in this group are relatively satisfied with themselves (ego well-being \( m = -0.04 \)), all basic needs are summoned in security, in acceptable housing conditions, they are sufficiently satisfied in income (hedonistic well-being \( m = 0.00 \)). There is an unexpressed stability of conscious self-regulation in difficult living conditions (reliability \( m = 0.01 \)). The data obtained allow us to draw the following conclusion: under normal conditions of life, representatives of this type feel quite satisfied. However, representatives of this group have the lowest index of persistence of conscious self-regulation, which suggests that in psychologically stressful conditions, in conditions of uncertainty, they will not take any action, will not show persistence and determination in achieving their goals (persistence \( m = -0.52 \)). Unformed goal-setting abilities (planning \( m = -0.35 \)), building action programs in changing circumstances (programming \( m = -0.43 \)), lack of criticism towards their actions, self–doubt (evaluation of results \( m = -0.30 \)), inability to act in the absence of clear guidelines (\( m = -0.34 \) for uncertainty tolerance ) eventually lead to discomfort, stress and the experience of subjective distress. With such combination of personal and regulatory resources, this type is the most vulnerable to maintaining its well-being. Modeling situations of uncertainty and emphasizing how personal achievements are associated with the study of inaccuracies and risk-taking, the development of strong-willed qualities, cognitive processes of conscious self-regulation together can have a positive effect in achieving subjective well-being.

**Normative type.** The values of subjective well-being indicators are close to those of group No. 3. Representatives of this group differ in normative-value and semantic ideas about well-being, they understand the semantic certainty of life, the conformity of life to social norms, moral values of the individual (the expression of existential-activity and socio-normative components of well-being). Indicators of the perception of uncertainty, tolerant and intolerant, are of equal importance and present variants of the psychological norm. Representatives of this type, most likely, carefully plan before making a decision, build out their action programs, weigh in all the pros and cons, adequately evaluate themselves and the results of their activities. However, they have low regulatory reliability (\( m = -0.48 \)). Hence, in psychologically stressful conditions they lose self-confidence. In the absence of significant stress, young people of this group feel well. In situations where their plans are violated, however, when they experience discomfort in the semantic uncertainty of the situation, this is accompanied by an experience of an egoistic and hedonistic state of well-being, which can lead to instability of self-regulation and difficulties in maintaining purposeful activity aimed at achieving the tasks set. For students of this group, as well as for students of passive group No. 3, an important psychological and pedagogical condition is the creation of a favorable psychological climate and situations for achieving success in educational activities. Stimulating mentor assistance is important, focusing on the formation of such regulatory competence as reliability, which is a universal and special regulatory resource for the sustainability of achieving goals and error-free actions in psychologically stressful conditions, which was proven in various studies [63].

**Adaptive type.** The next group in terms of subjective well-being is group No. 5, conventionally designated by us as adaptive. As we noted above, the level of subjective well-being in all indicators is above average, the average values of attitudes towards uncertainty tolerance are noted, which indicates the willingness to look for ways to solve the problem despite the uncertainty. High indicators of regulatory flexibility and reliability...
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in combination characterize the regulatory and personal profile of this group with a relatively pronounced ability to model external and internal conditions for achieving the goal. With such expression of personal resources (flexibility, persistence, reliability), acting on the inner call: "I value life and can influence the situation to mitigate the negative consequences" (uncertainty tolerance), representatives of this type are well oriented both in unexpected, rapidly changing situations and in day-to-day conditions of activity. They maintain the stability of their activities in psychologically stressful situations, taking into account changes in external and internal conditions in a timely manner. They have the ground under their feet and consider themselves safe in any critical situation. For students of this group, it is important to create conditions for the development of their action program and to assess the possibility of its implementation for further actions, as well as to be more successful.

**Passionate type.** Respondents of group No. 6 clearly consider themselves prosperous. The achievement of well-being occurs both due to the prompt search for solutions, readiness to gain new experience (uncertainty tolerance), as well as due to activity in the search for maximum clarity, a ready-made algorithm for solving the problem (intolerance of uncertainty). A person's willingness to act in conditions of lacking information, lack of explicit guidelines and ready-made templates, willingness to rebuild, change strategies and make non-standard decisions, acts as a compensatory mechanism for the lack of development of regulatory abilities that ensure the achievement of subjective well-being. High indicators of interpersonal emotional intelligence accompany uncertainty tolerance. That is, a person with a high level of uncertainty tolerance understands other people's emotions better and knows how to manage them, which is confirmed by the research of G. U. Soldatova, L.A. Shaigerova [64], and T. V. Kornilova, M. A. Chumakova [61] and the data presented. In addition, regulatory flexibility acts as a personal resource. In the event of unforeseeable circumstances, such subjects easily rearrange plans and programs of performing actions and behaviors, are able to quickly assess changes in significant conditions and rebuild the program of actions, as well as be quite persistent in achieving their goals (persistence m = 0.29). In order to maintain well-being and achieve its higher levels, these students need to develop competencies in planning and programming of their activities in an objective self-assessment of the results of their activities.

**A harmonious type.** The last, the seventh group includes respondents with high values of subjective well-being and conscious self-regulation, average values of tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty, thus they are harmoniously prosperous. Representatives of this cluster are distinguished by a high level of regulatory abilities. Mental self-regulation is a system of psychological resources: cognitive, personal and regulatory competencies, which respondents of this group consciously use as a means of solving problems of achieving subjective well-being. The regulatory profile of the subjects of this cluster is more harmonious in comparison with other selected types as all regulatory processes reach the highest values. Representatives of this group can be effective both autonomously and in-group forms of work. With such a regulatory and personal resource, they are least susceptible to the development of various forms of disadvantage. This group of young people possess competencies in determining significant conditions when solving tasks, are able to evaluate the results obtained correctly and have stable regulation mechanisms. To maintain the subjective well-being of these respondents, they can be included in project activities that have great opportunities for self-realization.
CONCLUSION

The concept of subjective well-being is considered from the perspective of resource and differential typological approaches. Significant resources affecting the stability of subjective well-being are the regulatory features of the subject, their attitudes to the perception in situations of uncertainty. From the standpoint of the differential-typological approach, we suggest that there are several groups (types) of young people according to the level of subjective well-being. Their specific type is largely summed up by the development of regulatory-cognitive processes and partly to a specific set of regulatory-personal properties. Personal attitudes towards tolerance/intolerance of uncertainty additionally have an impact on the experience of subjective well-being as a depreciation of the lack of development of regulatory and cognitive processes.

As a result of the cluster analysis using the k-means method, 7 groups of students were identified, differing in the expressiveness of the levels of subjective well-being. The individual psychological features of the selected typological groups were described. It is established that the manifestation of typological features of subjective well-being is based, on the one hand, on certain structural and functional features of conscious self-regulation, and, on the other hand, on the formation of an attitude towards tolerance for uncertainty.

It is proved that a high level of conscious self-regulation, persistence and determination in achieving the goal of activity (persistence) in psychologically stressful conditions of life are significant factors of subjective well-being, preventing and/or leveling the development of dysfunctional states.

In conclusion, the results of empirical research presented in this article clearly demonstrate the possibility of applying a differential typological approach to subjective well-being. The results allow us to describe the differential aspects of the relationship between subjective well-being, conscious self-regulation, attitudes to uncertainty tolerance and identify the main directions of practical work with young people in the direction of developing conscious self-regulation and improving their subjective well-being.

Limitations of the study

The results of the study have some limitations. First, the sample consists of young people aged 16 to 35 years. The results may not be representative for a sample with a wider age range. Second, the sample is characterized by a wide ethnic diversity; it is limited by the representation of the ethnic population of the Russian Federation. Third, the data obtained are based solely on self-reports of the study participants. A number of social factors may influence the results of the study: the effect of social desirability, the influence of gender and ethnic stereotypes; as well as economic ones: the standard of living in the region, employment, the prevailing sphere of professional activity. Longitudinal studies will be important for next steps of our research. It is planned to study the impact of trainings on the development of conscious self-regulation on subjective well-being.

Nevertheless, the obtained typological data will allow individualizing of approaches and trajectories of the development of subjective well-being of young people. Simultaneously, from the standpoint of an ecological approach in psychology, in
conditions where we consider each cluster as a group of respondents with an established system of maintaining subjective well-being in the context of interaction with their social environment at various levels, we should approach the formation of self-regulation skills in order to increase subjective well-being carefully, taking into account the risks of the violation of already-established system of relations.
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