

SENSE OF OWNERSHIP AS A FACTOR FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL SPACE AND PRIVACY FORMATION

Iryna H. Hubeladze

PhD in Psychology, senior researcher

Institute for Social and Political Psychology of National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine,

ORCID ID 0000-0001-8023-6408

ResearcherID J-5910-2017

irynaqubeladze@gmail.com

The article is devoted to the study of the peculiarities of the formation of psychological space and privacy of a person through a sense of ownership. Sense of ownership is considered as a subjective emotional experience of a person's belongings to certain targets of ownership, which reflects the content and meaning that have real or abstract, concrete or generalized targets of ownership, all that can be called as their own. It provides privacy and the formation of the psychological space of the individual, and is a unique psychological experience, without which the existence of the individual is impossible.

Key words: *psychological ownership, sense of ownership, privacy, psychological space, personalization, targets of ownership, information society, virtual space.*

Introduction

In current information society, the issue of the individual's privacy and psychological space formation and preservation is especially acute. If in a traditional society of solitude, the preservation of privacy was a necessary process for maintaining the psychological integrity and well-being of the individual, then in the age of the information society, these emphases have shifted significantly. By presenting information about oneself, creating as if one's own unique, personalized information space, a person becomes more and more public, open, non-confidential for others, thus moving away from the classical understanding of privacy. What seems to belong only to me can be replicated many times and with incredible speed, and thus maintaining a sense of ownership of such objects becomes problematic, as well as maintaining psychological space and privacy.

Theoretical background. The issue of privacy, psychological space, and their role in the functioning of the individual is not new to psychological science. It was developed by several scientists. In particular, the theoretical and methodological basis of our study is the theory of privacy (I. Altman [1], N. Khazratova [7; 8]; M. Wolfe [17]), the theory of human sovereignty (S. Narotova-Bochaver [10]), the theory of intimacy (V. Tatenko [16]), the theory of personality authenticity (O. Kochubeynyk [9]). Altman I. defines privacy as the selective control of access to oneself, which is achieved by transforming the environment [1]. Wolfe M., continuing the ideas of Altman I. made a significant step forward from the environmental paradigm to the humanistic, distinguishing two main elements: the regulation of interaction and the regulation of information. The latter meets the need to have personal, "undivided" information, such as being in a place that no one knows a person can be there [17]. Khazratova N. in his scientific research focuses on the psychological reactions of man to the violation of privacy, considering their levels from mild frustration to deprivation [8, p. 11-12]. However, little is known about the manifestation of a sense of ownership and its role in shaping the privacy and psychological space of the individual in the information society.

The purpose of the paper is to analyze the manifestation of a sense of ownership in the



process of formation, construction, formation of the individual's privacy and preservation of the psychological space in the information society.

The statement of the main research material. The sense of ownership as a social-psychological phenomenon originates and is based on the instinctive, innate human need for possession, but then it is realized depending on various socio-psychological factors and can vary in levels, forms, and ways of manifestation at different stages of human ontogenesis (Beaglehole, 1931 [2]; James, 1991 [7]; Pierce, Kostova & Dirks, 2002 [12]; Pipes, 2008 [13]; Khazratova, 2010 [8]). A sense of ownership is closely linked to the experience of privacy and intimacy. It is an experience that makes it possible to distinguish oneself from others, supporting personification, awareness of belonging to something to only one person, which is confirmed by studies of Israeli kibbutz (Bettelheim, 1969 [3]; Spiro, 1958 [15]). An important psychological feature of property is its ability to provide privacy, which is not only a behavioral phenomenon, but also a unique psychological experience, without which the existence of the individual is impossible (Nartova-Bochaver, 2008 [10]; Khazratova, 2010 [7]). According to the methodology of the approach of S. Nartova-Bocharova the subject is considered in the unity of its corporeality, territoriality, personal belongings, habits, social contacts and tastes, based on the general scientific principles of system, development, determinism, subject and integrity (integration and synergetics) [10, p.13].

Close to the concept of privacy, own is the category of "intimate", because, according to V. Tatenko [16], the intimate characterizes the aspect of human life that is deeply personal. That is, intimate means "Mine and only Mine" or "Ours and only Ours". The experience of privacy is genetically linked to such an ancient, basic formation of the emotional realm as a sense of ownership. Proprietary traits have a deep, instinctive nature; under the influence of upbringing, they only change, acquire prosocial forms. But there are not destroyed and do not reduce their intensity. Ownership for one's lifetime, the right to structure one's life at one's own discretion, is also a kind of sense of ownership, which, in fact, is the basis for experiencing privacy and forming the individual's psychological space.

According to S. Nartova-Bochaver [10], the key place in the phenomenology of psychological space is occupied by the integrity of its boundaries, namely physical and psychological markers that separate the zone of personal control and privacy of one person from the same zone of another one. Based on theoretical analysis and consultative practice S. Nartova-Bochaver singled out six dimensions of the individual's psychological space, which reflect the physical, social, and spiritual aspects of human existence: one's own body; territory; personal belongings (artifacts); time mode; social ties; tastes (values) [10, p.138]. In our opinion, during the intensive development of information technology, it would be appropriate to add to this list the individual's virtual space. Also, the psychological ownership is studied in the organization [12] and relations with the state.

The personality's psychological space is a subjectively significant fragment of the life, which determines the actual activity and strategy of human life. It includes a set of physical, social, and purely psychological phenomena with which a person identifies him/herself (territory, personal things, social contacts, attitudes). These phenomena become significant in the context of the psychological situation, acquiring a personal meaning for the subject, and begin to be protected by all physical and psychological means [10, p. 136-137].

The individual's psychological space is developed in ontogenesis due to the emergence of new dimensions of human existence and the sense of ownership manifestation of them, the transfer of its boundaries within the existing dimensions, and filling them with different psychological content in accordance with the experience and tasks of adulthood. Defining "one's own", establishing appropriate boundaries between oneself and others is the most acute, difficult, sometimes even painful and at the same time resourceful issue of personal development on the path to sovereignty. However, in this way a person can and must have a dialogue with the world. Privacy, autonomy,



sovereignty is not only a personal but also a social value [10, p. 9-10]. According to A. Simmel, the life cycle of the individual is an alternation of conflicts and reconciliations with society, and each individual builds and destroys the boundaries between himself and the world, alternating privacy and interaction [14].

The higher the level of privacy and sovereignty, the more responsible a person becomes in his own life. However, the more intense and intense human contact with the world, the more relevant for him is the task of maintaining its own privacy, not publicity in all spheres of existence [10, p. 11; 8, 2018]. This issue is especially acute for the villagers, who are in closer communication with the environment. They have a higher need to experience their own privacy, as it is usually violated. Citizens find themselves in close physical contact with many people, but they are more isolated, creating and protecting the privacy of their own homes, spaces, and so on.

Unlike animals, people have not only the biological need to their own territory to feel safe and provide food, but also satisfies social functions by performing social roles, defining the boundaries of "ours" and "others", categorization, and differentiation. People mark their territory symbolically, personalizing it by placing personal belongings, specific arrangement of space, use of partitions, doors, signs, etc. At the same time, they build their own boundaries not only physically and socially, but also symbolically through verbal communication, expression and even metaphor [1].

The feeling of privacy does not appear by itself with the birth of a baby. But it is built and protected, maintained throughout a person's life. In early childhood, the child has no privacy: both time and space of its existence are determined and controlled by adults [1, p.83]. Children lack a sense of their own boundaries and the boundaries of others. There is no established privacy, which can be manifested in obsessive behavior, hugs, sleeping together, using common things without permission, and so on. Beginning to interact and form and show a sense of ownership of various objects (mom, toys, things, etc.), the child seems to spread, extrapolate his self to these objects. Controls, manages, learns to monitor them, and take responsibility for them. In this way, a sense of ownership to targets, self-identification with them and a sense of belonging and territoriality is formed. It is the basis for constructing privacy and psychological space of the individual. What a person considers his/her own becomes part of his/her psychological space. Based on social categorization, the human world is divided into "own" and "others". Sense of privacy is formed based on the formation of "own" space.

According to I. Altman, the main functions of privacy are the regulation of contacts between the individual and the society, the connection between the "Self" and the social world, self-determination, and maintenance of personal identity's signs [1]. Privacy involves the appropriation of something for one's own use, that is, the separation of one's personal from the common or no one's. It correlates with the corresponding need: the lack of the necessary degree of privacy makes a person "deprived" also in social terms. The self-esteem, quality of communication, overall success suffers. Personalization, on the other hand, is taking oneself outside, endowing oneself with personal traits that were not previously noted by them. In fact, a deep human existential need for the symbolic overcoming of the finiteness of individual existence is realized in it.

To have a sense of ownership to some target, it should be firstly psychologically appropriated, including through personalization. If in Western industrial and post-industrial society personal and "private" were highly valued, in socialist society the "public face" was the most value. At the same time, empirical studies have considered the objects of privacy mainly as spatial-territorial, and the objects of personalization – as social, which adds additional nuances to the related concepts: privacy first meets the adaptive goals and only then the needs of growth, personalization leads to fulfilling of existential needs. Other components of the environment (values of the idea, material culture, and personal corporeality) as objects of privacy-personalization were not considered in the studies.

Sense of ownership provides a person with a sense of belonging, self-efficacy, identity and a sense of security, which is manifested through control over the property, the ability to dispose of,



influence (resulting in responsibility or irresponsibility of the property), unique, exceptional knowledge of target of ownership and self-investment in it. The more a person invests own resources in the targets of ownership, the stronger its sense of ownership [11; 12]. In this way the personality's psychological space is formed. It is important to note that a person feels the psychological space as his/her own, assigned or created by him/herself, and therefore as something that has individual value. It can control and protect everything that is inside the individual's psychological space. However, the last one, as well as the sense of ownership, is not reflected without the emergence of complex or even threatening situations, they are transparent, and therefore difficult to positively describe [10].

The formed sense of ownership and privacy is the key to successful psychological maturation, which is manifested in autonomy, sense of competence and confidence and sense of support from others. That is, the privacy of an adult largely depends on the extent to which he as a child received independence and the possibility of privacy, autonomy from adults and grows with increasing respect for her own, her needs and property. Therefore, as S. Nartova-Bochaver defines, privacy is a "personal matter", the experience of separation from the physical stimulation of adults and the social environment, the ability to control the events of their lives, the ability to choose and be responsible for it [10, p. 68]. Based on this, we conclude that for the formation of a responsible adult it is necessary from early childhood to maintain a healthy ownership of the child, to promote a sense of ownership of various targets of ownership, which will be expressed in control, self-investment of time, effort, and resources, as well as in-depth knowledge of a particular property.

Manifestation of privacy, its development and dynamics largely depend on the socio-cultural context, strength and direction of personal growth, quality of social interaction, life cycle of the individual and due to certain life events, that may increase or decrease sensitivity to privacy, control and freedom of choice, and ritualization of privacy [17, p. 357]

The problem of privacy is exacerbated by the active digitalization of our lives and wide representation in the information space. In the age of the information society, the issue of the possibility of maintaining privacy in terms of widespread representation in the information space is acute. So, active posting, reporting on various events and details of your life, presenting your life in public is a deliberate violation of your privacy, or a demonstration of your property (I have a family, a car, an interesting trip, etc.) and showing a sense of ownership of their virtual space. Very often, seeking solitude and distancing from social noise, people, on the contrary, immerse themselves in the virtual space of social networks. So, seeking privacy, they violate it themselves.

According to the results of the empirical study conducted by the author, it was found that social networks, digital accounts are perceived by users as a space for the realization of a sense of ownership with all the attributes of ownership. At the same time, the phenomenology of experiencing property, identity of the subject, whose mental functions are increasingly activated not in the conditions of traditional dialogic communication, but in the information-saturated media space, in a situation of hyperreality and hypertext, is changing. A sense of ownership of a virtual space is understood as a psychological feeling that this space, account, created content, etc. belongs to you and a person can mark it with the word "mine". Signs of the psychology of cyberspace are expressed in increased personalization, identification with the Internet community, motivation/demotivation of activity in social networks, involvement, empathy and insurance losses. Sense of ownership of virtual space has the same characteristics as in real one, namely self-investment, territoriality or platform, self-identification or virtual identity, self-efficacy, protection, ability to control, personalization, and fear of losing. In general, women have a higher level of ownership of the information space compared to men. They are more actively involved in the creation of author's content, discussions, more acutely experiencing the effect of possession, psychological desire for appropriation and fear of loss. Virtual space, own account in the minds of users of social networks is associated with the area, and then – with a thing. Young Internet users



have a strong sense that their virtual space belongs only to them. They show a much higher level of identification with their own profile, fear of losing it, willingness to create content than the older generation. There is a significant distortion of virtual identity, which consists in a biased assessment of the representation of their person and others' lives on social networks. Three paradoxes were noted in the process of realizing a sense of ownership in social networks: 1) by voluntarily creating an account and posting private information, users show a high level of dissatisfaction that anyone can find and use their data; 2) the more a person is involved in activities in the virtual space, content creation, the stronger his sense of ownership in this area, and therefore increases the sense of control over it, but at the same time increases dependence and real inability to control their activity to the extent involvement in social networks; 3) creating a more attractive image of oneself and not recognizing it for oneself on the one hand, and fixing such inconsistency for others – on the other [Hubeladze, 2020].

As Khazratova N. noted, one of the transformations of privacy is the "tracking" of the individual from home content in spatial publicity, which is due to the frustration of ownership on the territory and the significant media task of home life and the spread of social network [8]. Peculiarities of intensification of such transformations we noted during the period of quarantine restrictions of COVID-19 pandemics. It was significantly reflected in the forecasting of property for various business entities and for living and protection of private and psychological space. Such data suggest that in threatening unstable conditions, the human psyche, which seeks certain foundations for security and stability, including through the reconstruction of the hierarchy of significance of certain objects of psychological property. A person seeks psychological support to control the activities of these facilities, to which he has access, and who can show a sense of ownership in the current situation. Under conditions of quarantine restrictions, the deprivation of privacy is manifested precisely because of the lack of space and the possibility of eliminating every person living in the common area. Forced gathering in a small area, queues in the toilet and bathroom, in addition, cause constant emotional tension in the relationship, dissimilar attention or inefficiency from one another. The instinct of territoriality is often manifested because of greater family ties, friendships, or relationships. Deprivation of "home" privacy means not only an increase in the instinct of territoriality; it determines the increased control by society and restrictions on individual freedom [8].

Conclusions

The person's psychological space and privacy are formed through his contact with potential targets of ownership and the emergence of a sense of ownership to them. Defining certain objects as their own, a person expands the "Self" as well as the psychological space. Then it becomes a platform for the privacy, intimacy, and autonomy manifestation. Building one's own psychological space and sense of privacy are important factors in a person's psychological well-being and determine his/her proactive life position, responsibility, and efficiency. Thus, supporting the formation of a child's sense of ownership from an early age will contribute to a better development of its psychological space and the formation of privacy. And it will have a positive impact on its vital activity and success.

References

1. Altman, I. (1975). *The environment and social behavior: Privacy, personal space, territory and crowding*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
2. Beaglehole, E. (1931/2015) *Property: A Study in Social Psychology*. London. Psychology Press.



3. Bettelheim, B. (1969). *The Children of the Dream*, New York, McMillan.
4. Hubeladze, I. (2020). Psychological features of sense of ownership realization in social networks. *Habitus*. 20. 214-219. DOI:[10.32843/2663-5208.2020.20.39](https://doi.org/10.32843/2663-5208.2020.20.39)
5. Introna, L. D. (1997). Privacy and the Computer: Why We Need Privacy in the Information Society. *Metaphilosophy*, 28(3), 259–275. doi:10.1111/1467-9973.00055
6. James, W. (1991). *Psykhologhyya* [Psychology]. Moscow. (in Russian)
7. Khazratova, N. (2010). Pochuttya vlasnosti i problema porushen' pryvatnosti u povsyakdennomu zhytti [Sense of ownership and the problem of privacy violations in everyday life]. *Psykhologhiya osobystosti* [Personality Psychology]. 1. 124-131. (in Ukrainian)
8. Khazratova, N.V. (2018). Psykhologhichni reaktsiyi osobystosti na porushennya pryvatnosti [Psychological reactions of the individual to the violation of privacy]. *Modern scientific researches*. 6. 3. 11-19. DOI: 10.30889/2523-4692.2018-06-03-080 (in Ukrainian)
9. Kochubeynyk, O.M. (2010). *Avtentychnist' osobystosti u yiyi zhyttyevomu sviti: modusy, protsesy, statusy* [The authenticity of the individual in the life world: modes, processes, statuses]. Monohrafiya. K: Vydavnytstvo pedahohichnoho universytetu im. M.P. Drahomanova. 272. (in Ukrainian)
10. Nartova-Bochaver, S.K. (2008). *Chelovek Suverenny: Psykhologhycheskoe Issledovaniye Subiekta v Eho Bytii* [Man is Sovereign: the Psychological Study of the Subject in His Being]. St. Petersburg: Peter. (in Russian)
11. Noguti V., Bokeyar A.L. (2014). Who am I? The relationship between self-concept uncertainty and materialism. *International Journal of Psychology*. 49 (5). 323-333. DOI: 10.1002/ijop.12031
12. Pierce, J.L., Kostova, T. & Dirks, K.T. (2002). *The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research*. Review of General Psychology. 7(1). DOI: 10.1037//1089-2680.7.1.84
13. Pipes R. (2008). *Sobstvennost i Svoboda* [Ownership and Freedom]. M.: Moscow School of Political Studies. (in Russian)
14. Simmel, A. (1971). Privacy is not an isolated freedom. *Privacy*. Eds. J. Pennock, J. Chapman. NY.
15. Spiro, M. E. (1958). *Children of the Kibbutz*. Cambridge.
16. Tatenko V.O. (2013). *Psykhologhiya Intymnoho Zhyttya* [Psychology of Intimate Life]. Monograph. Kirovograd: Imex-LTD. (in Ukrainian)
17. Wolfe, M. (1978). *Childhood and Privacy*. Eds. I. Altman, J. Wohlwill. NY.-London, 175-255.

