

Svitlana Yurchuk
practical psychologist,
Higher Vocational School of Tulchyn,
lanaks90@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8449-5809>

STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY COPING STRATEGIES ACCORDING TO THE METHODOLOGY SACS BY S. HOBFALL: THE RATIO OF ACTIVE AND PASSIVE BEHAVIOR PATTERNS IN EARLY YOUTH

У статті представлено результати емпіричного дослідження стратегій подолання стресу (копінг-поведінки) особистості за допомогою багатовимірної моделі SACS (Strategic Approach to Coping Scale) С. Хобфолла, проведеного на базі закладу професійної освіти. На основі аналізу 40 респондентів визначено структуру та домінуючі тенденції вибору моделей поведінки в ситуаціях психологічного напруження.

Визначено структуру та домінуючі тенденції у виборі моделей поведінки в ситуаціях психологічного стресу. Загальний профіль досліджуваної групи визначено як тип адаптації «соціально обережний», що базується на поєднанні сильної соціальної орієнтації та переважання пасивних стратегій адаптації.

Наукова новизна полягає у виявленні конфліктних профілів адаптації, серед яких виділяються деструктивні типи: «соціальний маніпулятор», «прихована напруга» та «ризикований активіст». Аналізується проблема дефіциту асертивності, як фактора, що перешкоджає конструктивному захисту власних меж і спричиняє перехід до стратегій уникнення або непрямого впливу.

Практичне значення цієї роботи полягає в обґрунтуванні необхідності впровадження програм розвитку впевненої поведінки, які дозволяють перейти від пасивної очікувальної позиції до активного та відкритого вирішення життєвих проблем.

Загальний профіль вибірки визначено як «соціально-обережний» тип адаптації. Основними характеристиками цього типу є домінування стратегії «Обережні дії», що свідчить про схильність респондентів до ретельного зважування ризиків перед прийняттям будь-яких рішень. У поєднанні з показником «Уникнення», це формує стійку вичікувальну позицію групи у стресових умовах. Сильною стороною вибірки є висока соціальна спрямованість: показники «Вступ у соціальний контакт» та «Пошук соціальної підтримки» є стабільно високими, що виступає своєрідним «буфером», який утримує деструктивні тенденції (агресію та асоціальність) у межах норми.

Наукова новизна дослідження полягає у виявленні суперечливих копінг-профілів, які охоплюють 40% респондентів. Незважаючи на те, що 60% вибірки демонструють збалансовану модель поведінки, значна частина групи схильна до специфічних акцентуацій. Проаналізовано три деструктивні типи:

1. «Соціальний маніпулятор»— особи з високим рівнем соціального контакту, які віддають перевагу непрямим діям. Вони використовують соціальні навички для досягнення цілей «чужими руками», уникаючи прямої відповідальності, що стає компенсаторним механізмом при дефіциті суб'єктивності в юнацькому віці.

2. «Схована напруга»— найбільш ризикований профіль, що базується на поєднанні високої агресії та уникнення. Ця пасивно-агресивна модель веде до швидкого психологічного вигорання та виникнення психосоматичних розладів.

3. «Ризикований активіст» — деструктивний профіль, де висока імпульсивність поєднується з асоціальністю за майже повної відсутності обережності.

Критичною проблемою вибірки визначено дефіцит асертивності. Показник впевненої поведінки (10,75%) значно поступається маніпулятивним та обережним стратегіям. Зокрема, у 25% опитаних рівень асертивності є критично низьким (менше 9%), що заважає конструктивному захисту власних кордонів та провокує перехід до стратегій уникнення чи непрямого впливу.

Дослідження підкреслює значний розрив між індивідуальними показниками.

У висновках наголошується на необхідності впровадження програм з розвитку асертивності, що дозволить змістити акцент із «обхідних шляхів» та пасивного очікування на активне та відкрите

вирішення життєвих проблем. Результати дослідження мають практичне значення для психологів та фахівців з управління персоналом при формуванні стратегій командної взаємодії.

Ключові слова: копінг-стратегії, асертівність, соціальна підтримка, пасивно-агресивна поведінка, маніпулятивність, обережні дії, психосоматичні ризики, SACS.

The article presents the results of an empirical study of stress coping strategies (coping behavior) using S. Hobfoll's multidimensional SACS (Strategic Approach to Coping Scale) model, conducted at a vocational education institution. Based on the analysis of 40 respondents, the structure and dominant trends in the choice of behavior models in situations of psychological stress were determined.

The structure and dominant trends in the choice of behavior models in situations of psychological stress were determined. The general profile of the study group was defined as a "socially cautious" type of adaptation, based on a combination of strong social orientation and a predominance of passive adaptation strategies.

The scientific novelty lies in the identification of conflicting adaptation profiles, among which the destructive types stand out: "social manipulator," "hidden tension," and "risky activist." The problem of assertiveness deficit is analyzed as a factor that hinders the constructive protection of one's own boundaries and causes a transition to avoidance or indirect influence strategies.

The practical significance of this work lies in substantiating the need to implement programs for the development of confident behavior, which will allow a transition from a passive, expectant position to an active and open solution of life problems.

The overall profile of the sample is defined as a "socially cautious" type of adaptation. The main characteristics of this type are the dominance of the "Cautious Action" strategy, which indicates the respondents' tendency to carefully weigh risks before making any decisions. Combined with the "Avoidance" indicator, this forms a stable wait-and-see position of the group in stressful conditions. The strength of the sample is its high social orientation: the indicators "Establishing social contact" and "Seeking social support" are consistently high, acting as a kind of "buffer" that keeps destructive tendencies (aggression and antisocial behavior) within normal limits.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the identification of conflicting coping profiles, which cover 40% of respondents. Although 60% of the sample demonstrates a balanced behavior model, a significant part of the group is prone to specific accentuations. Three destructive types were analyzed:

1. "Social manipulator"—individuals with a high level of social contact who prefer indirect actions. They use social skills to achieve goals "through others," avoiding direct responsibility, which becomes a compensatory mechanism for a lack of subjectivity in adolescence.

2. "Hidden tension" — the most risky profile, based on a combination of high aggression and avoidance. This passive-aggressive model leads to rapid psychological burnout and the emergence of psychosomatic disorders.

3. "Risky activist" — a destructive profile where high impulsivity is combined with antisocial behavior and an almost complete lack of caution.

A critical problem in the sample is a lack of assertiveness. The indicator of confident behavior (10.75%) is significantly lower than manipulative and cautious strategies. In particular, 25% of respondents have a critically low level of assertiveness (less than 9%), which prevents them from constructively defending their boundaries and provokes a shift to avoidance or indirect influence strategies.

The study highlights a significant gap between individual indicators.

The conclusions emphasize the need to implement assertiveness development programs, which will shift the focus from "workarounds" and passive waiting to active and open resolution of life problems. The results of the study are of practical importance for psychologists and human resource management specialists in the formation of team interaction strategies.

Keywords: coping strategies, assertiveness, social support, passive-aggressive behavior, manipulativeness, cautious actions, psychosomatic risks, SACS.

Relevance of the topic. In today's environment of constant social and psychological challenges, the problem of choosing effective strategies for overcoming stress is becoming particularly important. An individual's ability to adapt depends not only on the availability of internal resources, but also on dominant patterns of behavior in conflict situations.

Of particular interest is the study of the balance between prosocial behavior, active problem solving, and passive forms of defense, such as avoidance or caution.

Analysis of recent studies and publications. The theoretical basis of this study is S. Hobfall's multidimensional model of coping behavior, which allows us to evaluate coping strategies along the axes of "activity-passivity" and "prosociality-asociality." According to this model, the effectiveness of adaptation is determined by the ability of an individual to flexibly combine active actions with social support [2, p. 142].

Despite a significant number of studies, the issue of forming contradictory coping profiles, where high social orientation is combined with destructive or passive strategies, remains insufficiently studied. In particular, the mechanism by which a lack of assertiveness (confident behaviour) is compensated for by indirect actions or manipulative tactics needs to be analysed.

Stephen Hobfall's multidimensional model (SACS) plays a central role in this work. It explores adaptive behaviour along the axes of 'activity-passivity' and 'prosociality-antisociality.' Hobfall emphasises the preservation and expansion of personal resources, where the effectiveness of adaptation is determined by the ability to flexibly combine active behaviour with social support [5, p.76].

From a cognitive-behavioural perspective, the approach refers to Richard Lazarus' classic theory, according to which a situation of stress and uncertainty leads to a primary cognitive assessment of threat or loss of control. This leads to a choice between problem-oriented coping (active actions) and emotion-oriented coping (avoidance).

The adaptive approach in domestic psychology is characterised by its use for the theoretical justification of the dynamic nature of coping strategies depending on life circumstances (L. Antsiferova) [4, p. 88]. In T. Titarenko's approach, she believes that 'latent tensions' are important for analysis. She notes that the accumulation of internal tension without the possibility of its release is a critical factor in the deterioration of mental health and the development of psychosomatic disorders. O. Blinova and O. Kononenko study coping strategies in conditions of disturbed social stability, which is the context of their research [7, p. 85].

The purpose of the article is to analyse the structure of stress coping strategies in a sample of respondents and to identify specific destructive behaviour patterns that affect the overall level of social adaptation.

The study was conducted using the SACS (Strategic Approach to Coping Scale) questionnaire. Preliminary analysis allowed us to determine the general type of adaptation of the group as 'socially cautious.' The highest indicator in the sample belongs to the 'Cautious Actions' strategy (11.96%), which indicates the dominance of a wait-and-see position and careful risk analysis. At the same time, a significant social resource of the group was identified: high scores for 'Social Contact' (11.38%) and 'Seeking Social Support' (11.29%) act as a 'buffer' that restrains the level of aggression and antisocial behaviour.

However, analysis of the average values indicates a significant problem. The level of assertiveness (10.75%) is significantly lower than the indicators of indirect and cautious actions, which creates the risk of unconstructive protection of personal boundaries [3, p. 84]. The article pays particular attention to the fact that 40% of the sample have pronounced accentuations, the most common of which are 'Social Manipulator' and 'Hidden Tension'. The latter profile is the most energy-intensive and poses high risks to psychosomatic health due to a combination of internal aggression and external avoidance.

This study allows us not only to describe the structure of coping strategies, but also to suggest ways to correct behaviour through the development of direct and confident interaction skills.

Analysis of the average sample indicators using S. Hobfall's methodology allows us to identify the most and least popular strategies for coping with stress in this group. (Table 1) The most popular strategies are:

Table 1

Average indicators of stress coping strategies (MP%):

Coping strategy (Coping)	Mean (%)	Type of strategy
Assertive actions	10.75%	Active /Adaptive
Entry into social contact	11.38%	Prosocial
Search for social support	11.29%	Prosocial
Caution	11.96%	Passive
Impulsive actions	10.87%	Direct /Risky
Avoidance	11.04%	Passive
Indirect action	11.46%	Indirect (manipulative)
Asocial actions	10.51%	Asocial
Aggressive actions	10.74%	Antisocial

Caution (11.96%) — is the most popular strategy among respondents. It indicates the tendency of the group to carefully weigh risks before making any decisions.

Indirect action (11.46%) — ranks second in popularity. This indicates that instead of open problem solving, respondents often choose manipulative tactics or «workarounds».

Entering into social contact (11.38%) and Seeking social support (11.29%) — these prosocial strategies also have high rates, which shows people's willingness to cooperate and seek help in stressful situations.

The least popular strategies are:

Asocial actions (10.51%) — is the least used strategy in the group. This suggests that egocentric methods of coping with stress are not a priority for the interviewees.

Aggressive actions (10.74%) — also have one of the lowest rates, indicating a low tendency of the group to open conflict and destructive behavior.

Assertive actions (10.75%) — although this indicator is not the lowest, it is significantly inferior to cautious and indirect actions. This is considered a «weakness of the group because people lack confidence in directly protecting their rights.

The group demonstrates a «socio-cautious» type of adaptation. The most characteristic of them is the position of waiting and weighing risks, while openly aggressive or antisocial methods are used the least often. However, a significant part of respondents (40%) have certain accentuations where popular strategies can be combined into conflicting profiles, such as «social manipulator» or «hidden tension»

High caution combined with a pronounced social orientation forms a specific «socio-cautious» type of adaptation in the sample. This affects the behavior of the group, there is a predominance of the expected position and risk analysis, since «Careful actions» is the dominant strategy (11.96%), respondents tend to carefully weigh all risks before making a decision or starting to act. Influencing behavior in stressful situations, the group often takes a wait-and-see position. There is a danger of «getting stuck in thinking about the problem, which prevents its active and timely solution.

High rates of «Introduction to social contact» (11.38%) and «Search for social support» (11.29%) indicate that the youth in the sample are able and ready to cooperate, share experiences and seek help. Social resources act as «buffer» against destructiveness. As long as social bonds remain strong, they act as a «buffer», which keeps aggression and antisociality scores low. This ensures high social adaptability and low conflict in the team.

The combination of high caution and social orientation with low assertiveness (self-confidence) creates a certain behavioral skew: respondents often choose «workarounds» or manipulative tactics (strategy «Indirect actions» — 11.46%). The group profile has a tilt towards social dependence, where it is important to maintain relationships, even at the cost of abandoning direct conflict resolution. In 17.5% of

the sample, this is transformed into the profile «Social manipulator», where social skills are used to achieve the goals of «with other people's hands». (Table 2)

Table 2

Distribution of conflicting behavior profiles

Profile type	Criterion (indicator > 13%)	Number of persons	% of the sample
«Hidden voltage»	high aggression + high avoidance	5	12,5%
«Social manipulator»	high social. contact + indirect actions	7	17,5%
«Risky activity »	high impulsivity + antisociality	4	10,0%
«Balanced profile»	indicators within the norm	24	60,0%

Despite general politeness and caution, under excessive pressure, behavior can change: a young person either finally closes in «caution», or emits flashes of «impulsive aggression» when the resource of patience is exhausted. 12.5% of respondents are characterized by «hidden tension», where internal aggression accumulates behind the external avoidance of conflicts. This passive-aggressive model leads to rapid psychological burnout and the emergence of psychosomatic disorders. As noted by T. Tytarenko, long-term accumulation of internal tension without the possibility of its release is a critical factor in the destruction of the psychological health of the individual [5, p.44].

This combination of strategies makes the group stable and capable of teamwork (60% have a balanced profile), but limits their ability to act quickly, decisively and openly due to excessive fear of error and dependence on the opinion of others

The development of assertiveness in this group is a critical task, as 25% of respondents have a critically low level of self-confidence (less than 9%). This results in people not being able to constructively defend their own borders and often opting for avoidance or manipulation strategies.

Based on sample analysis and recommendations in the sources, the development of assertiveness should occur through the transition from «indirect» to «direct» actions in the group, the indicator of «Indirect actions» (11.46%) exceeds the level of assertiveness (10.75%). It is important to teach respondents to use open statements of their position instead of hints, «workarounds and manipulative tactics. This will help reduce the level of manipulativity in the «Social Manipulator» profile, where social skills are now used to achieve «goals with other people's hands».

It is necessary to promote the transformation of caution into active problem solving, since it is possible for the «group to get stuck in thinking about risks due to high caution (11.96%). Development of the ability to act confidently in conditions of uncertainty without waiting for ideal circumstances. Shifting the emphasis from a wait-and-see attitude to constructive, active strategies, which will allow for faster and more effective problem-solving.

Every fourth person in the group does not know how to protect their rights constructively at all, which makes them prone to «hidden tension», so the priority is to develop the skill to directly and openly declare their needs and rights without violating the rights of other people. This will reduce the number of cases of «hidden tension» (where a person accumulates anger and then «explodes with aggression») and avoid psychosomatic disorders. Since the sample has high rates of «Introduction to social contact» (11.38%) and «Search for social support» (11.29%), these strengths should be used for training. Developing assertiveness through group interaction and support, where people can practice confident behavior in a safe social environment, will bring positive results. The development of assertiveness will shift the group profile from «socio-cautious» and manipulative to balanced-active, which will increase the efficiency of teamwork and reduce the risk of burnout in 40% of respondents with conflicting profiles

The group with a profile of «hidden tension», which includes 12.5% of respondents (5 people in the sample), is at the greatest risk of psychosomatic disorders.

The main risks and mechanisms of their occurrence for this group include psychosomatic risk due to a deep internal contradiction: a person simultaneously has a strong desire to escape from the problem (high

«Avoidance» — 14.58%) and feels significant internal anger (high «Aggression» — 13.19%). Since aggression does not find a way out due to the constant avoidance of conflicts, it accumulates inside, which creates a critical level of tension for the body.

Because people with high levels of avoidance often have critically low self-confidence (assertiveness less than 9%), they are unable to defend their borders constructively. This forces them to constantly be in a state of chronic stress, which is the basis for the development of somatic diseases.

The main risk for this group is that external politeness and caution are only a mask that hides high internal conflict, which gradually destroys physical health and leads to emotional exhaustion.

Lower than average totals in the overall sample profile, both strategies have some of the lowest values: impulsive actions — 10.87%, and aggressive actions — 10.74%. This suggests that for most of the group, destructive and risky methods of coping with stress are not a priority. Despite the general «socio-cautious» orientation, under the condition of excessive stress pressure, the containment mechanisms may not work. In such cases, respondents tend to issue «impulsive aggression».

In this sample, aggression and impulsivity are usually restrained by social resources and caution. However, they are closely interconnected as a reactive mechanism: high impulsivity in the absence of caution leads to open destructive behavior, and the accumulated tension in «restrained» individuals can break out in the form of sudden aggressive outbursts.

Conclusions. The general analysis of the research results allows us to draw the following conclusions about the peculiarities of the coping behavior of the studied group. The dominant type of adaptation in the sample is the «socio-cautious» type of adaptation. The most popular strategy is «Careful actions», which indicates a pronounced tendency of respondents to carefully weigh risks and take a waiting position in stressful situations. The group has a high level of social adaptability thanks to the strategies of «Introduction to social contact» and «Search for social support». These indicators act as a psychological «buffer, which keeps the level of open aggression and antisocial actions at the lowest marks in the general profile. The weak side of the group is an insufficient level of assertiveness, which is inferior to the indicators of «Indirect actions». This indicates that instead of directly defending their rights, respondents often resort to workarounds, hints or manipulations. This problem is especially acute for 25% of respondents, whose level of self-confidence is critically low. Although 60% of the sample has a balanced profile, the other 40% show conflicting behavior patterns. Among them, the most common are «Social manipulators» (17.5%), who are prone to intrigue, and individuals with «Hidden tension» (12.5%), who are at high risk of psychosomatic disorders and emotional burnout due to the accumulation of internal aggression.

To increase the stress resistance of the group, it is recommended to focus on the development of assertiveness. Learning confident behavior will help shift the emphasis from passive caution and manipulative tactics to direct and constructive problem solving, which will contribute to better personal well-being and effective teamwork.

References

- [1] Blinova O. E., Kononenko O. AND. Coping strategies and psychological well-being of the individual in conditions of social instability. Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Series: Psychological sciences (s). 2021. № 2. S. 45-52. (For theoretical justification of the choice of strategies in stressful conditions).
- [2] Vodopyanova N. IS. Psychology of stress and coping behaviour: teaching manual 2nd ed. Kyiv: Karavela, 2018. 284 p. (A updated manual describing and interpreting SACS methodology C. Hobfall).
- [3] Grechuk O. IN. Peculiarities of coping behavior of student youth with different levels of assertiveness. Habitus (. 2022. Vip. 37. S. 84-89. (Direct confirmation of your assertiveness deficiency theses).
- [4] Korolchuk M. S., Korolchuk V. V., Berezovska L. AND. Psychological resistance of an individual to stress in professional activity: monograph. Kyiv: KNTEU, 2020. 264 p. (To analyze social support as «buffer» and burnout mechanisms).

[5] Liashch, O., and Yatsyuk, M. (2024). Development of the cognitive aspect of creativity in adolescents through group psychological training. *Personality and Environmental Problems*, 3 (1), 76-83.

[6] Tytarenko T. M. Psychological health of the individual: means of self-help in conditions of long-term traumatization. Kyiv: Department, 2023. 212 p. (Context of «hidden tension» and psychosomatic risks in modern realities).

[7] Chuyko O. IN. Socio-psychological factors of the development of manipulative behavior in youth. *Psychological journal*. 2019. T. 5, № 8. S. 112-126. (Foundation for profile description «Social manipulator»).

[8] Hobfoll SE *Tribalism: The Evolutionary Origins of Modern Social Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. 288 p.

[9] Schwarzer R., Luszczynska A. Reactive, Anticipatory, Preventive, i Proactive Coping: A Theoretical Synthesis. *The Handbook of Stress and Health*. 2017. P. 101-114

[10] Yusoff MS *Stress, Coping Strategies and Psychological Well-being of Young Adults*. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 2021. Vol. 12(3). P. 145-158.

[11] Zautra AJ, Hall JS, Murray KE *Resilience: New Definition of Health for People and Communities*. *Handbook of Adult Resilience*. Guilford Press, 2023. P. 3-29.

Review received 11.12.2025