

UDC 159.9.07

**KAPRANOV Yan** – Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Professor at Korunets Department of English Philology and Translation, Kyiv National Linguistic University, 73, Velyka Vasylkivska str., Kyiv, 06150, Ukraine (skinner@ukr.net)

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2915-038X>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2021.47.11>

**To cite this article:** Kapranov, Ya. (2021). Kontseptsiiia zhyttiezdatsnosti vs. rezylentnosti u konteksti psykhohinvistychnoi triady “resurs – potentsial – vitalnist” [Viability concept as manifestation form of activity and adaptability of systems in context of philosophical triad “resource – potential – vitality”]. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats Drohobytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Seriiia “Filolohiia” – Problems of Humanities. “Philology” Series: a collection of scientific articles of the Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 47, 82–92.* doi: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2021.47.11> [in English].

## VIABILITY VS. RESILIENCE CONCEPT IN CONTEXT OF PSYCHOLINGUISTIC TRIAD “RESOURCE – POTENTIAL – VITALITY”

**Summary.** The article has an attempt to describe viability vs. resilience concept as manifestation form of activity and adaptability of systems in context of psycholinguistic triad “resource – potential – vitality”.

First, the definition of “viability” has been given: “the ability to retain important personality traits for a long time, but in the short term – less important, but more relevant here and now; combination of system stability and its adaptability, self-identity and conformity, usefulness, suitability, optimality and suboptimality” (according to E. Rylska).

Second, the philosophical triad “resource – potential – vitality” has been characterized: a) resource(s) include everything that can be used by a person for effective existence and maintaining the quality of life; b) potential is the means that are available, as well as the means that can be mobilized, used to achieve a certain goal, to solve a problem; c) the vitality category is associated with flexibility, resilience, the ability to take any necessary form.

Third, the key properties of viability have been fixed: a) resilience to life is the structure of attitudes and strategies that facilitate the process of transforming stressful circumstances from potentially destructive to growth opportunities (S. Maddi); b) resilience as the ability to recover from stressful situations, the ability to regenerate, to post-traumatic growth; c) sense of coherence (A. Antonovsky) is “a person’s ability to coherently, cognitively and emotionally, perceive what is happening as controlled by him” (T. Ivanova); d) optimism as a positive personality trait associated with success, joy, well-being and satisfaction; e) self-efficacy is a cognitive assessment of one’s own ability to perform effectively and cope with difficult situations (A. Bandura); f) tolerance to uncertainty is a neutral or positive attitude of a subject to uncertain situations (unfamiliar, complex, changeable, ambiguous); g) control of one’s behaviour is considered a personal characteristic that predicts the success of an activity and well-being, including in the long term.

**Key words:** viability, activity and adaptability of systems, philosophical triad, resource, potential, vitality.

**КАПРАНОВ Ян** – доктор філологічних наук, доцент, професор кафедри англійської філології і перекладу імені професора І. В. Корунця, Київський національний лінгвістичний університет, вул. Велика Васильківська, 73, Київ, 06150, Україна (skinner@ukr.net)

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2915-038X>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2021.47.11>

**Бібліографічний опис статті:** Капранов, Я. (2021). Концепція життєздатності vs. резилентності в контексті психолінгвістичної тріади «ресурс – потенціал – вітальність». *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: збірник наукових праць Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія «Філологія», 47, 82–92.* doi: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2021.47.11>

© Kapranov Yan, 2021

## КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ЖИТТЄЗДАТНОСТІ VS. РЕЗИЛЕНТНОСТІ В КОНТЕКСТІ ПСИХОЛІНГВІСТИЧНОЇ ТРІАДИ «РЕСУРС – ПОТЕНЦІАЛ – ВІТАЛЬНІСТЬ»

**Анотація.** У статті описано концепцію життєздатності й резилентності як форми прояву активності та адаптивності систем у контексті філософської тріади «ресурс – потенціал – вітальність».

По-перше, надано визначення поняття «життєздатність» як здатності впродовж тривалого часу зберігати важливі властивості особистості, а в короткостроковій перспективі – менш важливі, проте більш актуальні тут і зараз; поєднання стійкості системи та її адаптивності, самоідентичності й відповідності, корисності, придатності, оптимальності та неоптимальності (за Е. Рильською).

По-друге, охарактеризовано філософську тріаду «ресурс – потенціал – вітальність», де: а) ресурс(-и) – це допоміжні засоби, до яких належить усе, що може бути задіяне людиною для ефективного існування й підтримки якості життя; б) потенціал – це наявні засоби, а також засоби, які можуть бути мобілізовані, використані для досягнення певної мети чи вирішення певного завдання; в) категорія вітальності асоціюється з гнучкістю, пружністю, здатністю прийняти будь-яку необхідну форму.

По-третє, зафіксовано ключові ознаки життєздатності, зокрема: а) життєстійкість – структуру установок і стратегій, які полегшують процес перетворення стресогенних обставин із потенційно руйнівних на можливості для зростання (S. Maddi); б) резилентність – здатність відновлюватися після стресових ситуацій, здатність до регенерації, посттравматичного зростання; в) почуття зв'язності (A. Antonovsky) – «здатність людини узгоджено, когнітивно й емоційно сприймати те, що відбувається як контрольоване нею» (Т. Іванова); г) оптимізм – позитивну особистісну рису, пов'язану з успіхом, радістю, благополуччям і задоволеністю; д) самоефективність – когнітивну оцінку власної здатності до ефективної діяльності та оволодіння важкими ситуаціями (A. Bandura); е) толерантність до невизначеності – нейтральне або позитивне ставлення суб'єкта до невизначених ситуацій (незнайомих, складних, мінливих, неоднозначних); ж) контроль власної поведінки – таку особистісну характеристику, що забезпечує успішність діяльності та благополуччя, зокрема, у довгостроковій перспективі.

**Ключові слова:** життєздатність, активність та адаптивність системи, філософська тріада, ресурс, потенціал, вітальність.

**Problem statement.** In the era of continuous globalization modern society in general and every person in particular are in constant adaptation to economic, cultural, political, social changes, events, situations, etc., which have a negative impact on his/her life in general and emotional, moral, mental, psychological and physical health in particular. In other words, all members of society are trying to achieve *harmony of the viability concept*, i. e. they are looking for ways to overcome problems of various kinds in order to preserve well-being, internal balance, etc.

An important role in solving these and other problems belongs to psychology, because, according to L. Antsyferova, “it is the work of psychologists to identify constructive, unconstructive and self-generating strategies in dramatic living conditions that has led to the identification of personal characteristics that either contribute, or prevent the individual from coping with a situation that poses a threat to human

values: life, health, self-esteem, the content of existence” (Анцыферова, 1994, p. 4). At the same time, some scholars (Ye. Rylskaya et al.) are convinced that the answers to these and other disputable and problematic questions must be sought in philosophy.

Today it is proved that *viability as a form of activity and adaptability of systems* is a broad concept in scientific knowledge, which includes *invulnerability* (A. Antony, N. Garmezy, D. Lasley, P. Hill, D. Clarke), *hardiness* (K. Allred, T. Smith, R. Brooks, D. Evan, J. Pellizzari, B. Culbert, M. Metzger, E. Florian, M. Mikulincer, O. Taubman, D. Koshaba, S. Maddi, S. Kobasa), *resistance* (C. Carver, J. Ionesky), *resilience* (M. Bernard, D. Hellerstein, J. Kidd, A. Masten, J. Powell, M. McCubbin, H. McCubbin, M. Neenan, F. Norris, J. Richman, M. Fraser, M. Ungar, E. Werner), *self-efficiency* (A. Bandura), *sense of coherence* (A. Antonovsky, M. Bergstein, M. England, B. Artinian, Z. Dilani, J. Golembiewski,

A. Weizman), *subjective vitality* (R. DeCharms, R. Ryan, E. Deci), *thriving* (V. O'Leary, J. Iscovich, M. Seligman).

**The aim** of the article is to present the viability vs. resilience concept as a manifestation form of activity and adaptability of systems in the context of psycholinguistic triad “resource – potential – vitality”.

**The following objectives** of the article are to be solved: 1) to interpret the “viability” concept as a philosophical category; 2) to consider the “viability” concept in the context of psycholinguistic triad “resource – potential – vitality”; 3) to name the key viability properties.

**“Viability” concept as psycholinguistic category.** Ye. Rylskaya interprets the “viability” concept, referring to O. Razumovsky (Разумовский, Хазов 1998), who understands it as “the ability to retain important personality traits for a long time, but in the short term – less important, but more relevant here and now; combination of system stability and its adaptability, self-identity and conformity, usefulness, suitability, optimality and suboptimality” (Рыльская, 2013, p. 3–7).

From the linguistic standpoint of view “viability” is a complex lexical unit which contains two components – “life” and “ability”, which was also mentioned by Ye. Rylskaya (Рыльская, 2013).

According to A. Bergson, the French philosopher, *life* is considered as “the experience of their own existence, but to exist means to change constantly, to feel constantly changing” (Бергсон, <http://www.philosophy.ru/library/berg/5.html>). It actualizes one more concept that is “change”, which is a qualitative process to improvement and development of life. F. Bergson is convinced that the cause of any change is “a life impulse or a life principle that has a certain energy, which <...> is directed in different directions. <...> The scholar gives an example to prove his position: he compares the life impulse with a rocket fired from fireworks. At a certain point in time it explodes and it is divided into parts that symbolize the various beginnings of life: if some of them (symbols of the material world) cool down faster, others (symbols of the spiritual world) continue to burn” (Бергсон, <http://www.philosophy.ru/library/berg/5.html>).

Let us also recall the opinion of A. Bodaiev, who notes that life is a struggle: “if we leave

alone the class struggle and clashes on national grounds, then life is a struggle of man for himself with external circumstances, for the realization of his vocation, not only material, but also the spiritual well-being of your loved ones, for justice and respect for man” (Бодаев, 2008, p. 6). In order to solve life’s problems related to change, a person needs to go through the process of coping with the trials that life dictates, which will help to achieve a positive result.

From a philosophical point of view, *ability* is interpreted as “any ability, strength or talent of a person to act or suffer. <...> The topic of ability is represented in two sections of philosophy: anthropology – in the analysis of the subsequently changing nature or essence of a man; ethics – when the reasoning about what is the duty of a man is associated with the question of his ability to implement the proposed action” (Ивин et al., 2004). Due to the fact that the ability can be innate or acquired, hidden or active (Ивин et al., 2004), a person constantly develops these skills to solve life’s problems. Aristotle spoke of ability as a potential opportunity to acquire general principles of knowledge for relevant skills. That is why the ability is often defined as potential personality traits that are actualized under certain circumstances (Ивин et al., 2004).

The viability of both society and the individual is manifested in their dynamic stability of development in the environment, the ability of the subject to ensure his/her survival through self-improvement, the ability to exist, reproduce and develop within the framework of sustainable development of society.

**“Viability” in context of psycholinguistic triad “resource – potential – vitality”.** The “viability” concept is considered through the prism of the both philosophical and philological triad “resource – potential – vitality” (see the works of Ye. Rylskaya (Рыльская, 2013)). Every link of this triad is fully or partially helps to approach the understanding of the mechanisms of viability in general and later up to the psychomental phenomenon of “resilience” in particular.

Ye. Rylskaya suggests considering *resource* or *potential* for philosophical understanding of the viability concept in a generalized form (Рыльская, 2013, p. 19). It should be noted that the definitions for the two concepts are not traced in lexicographic psychological, phil-



osophical sources (dictionaries and reference books): they are either absent altogether or they are represented in the context of other concepts. We find a general understanding of them in lexicographic explanatory sources: **resource** is 1) a source of supply or support: an available means, a natural source of wealth or revenue, a natural feature or phenomenon that enhances the quality of human life, computable wealth, a source of information or expertise; 2) something to which one has recourse in difficulty; 3) a possibility of relief or recovery; 4) a means of spending one's leisure time; 5) an ability to meet and handle a situation (Meriam-Webster Dictionary Online, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resource>); **potential** is 1) something that can develop or become actual; 2) any of various functions from which the intensity or the velocity at any point in a field may be readily calculated, the work required to move a unit positive charge from a reference point (as at infinity) to a point in question (Meriam-Webster Dictionary Online, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/potential>). Almost all interpretations include human mental activity.

In a broad sense *resources* (from French *ressource* "an auxiliary means") include everything that can be used by a person for effective existence and maintaining the quality of life (Hobfoll, Vaux, 1993, p. 685–705). Resources are understood as property, material objects, stocks, opportunities, money, social ties, abilities that an individual, a group or a community possesses. V. Tolochek considers resources not as "objects" and "subjects", but as processes of actualization of external and internal conditions, contributing to the involvement of new components in the activity of the subject, establishing links between new and old components and leading to the generation of new structures and states (Толочек, 2015).

According to T. Ivanova, an important role is the systemic organization and dynamic interaction of resources: firstly, if we talk about the systemic organization, then different kinds of resources do not exist separately from each other, but represent a system that is a common resource reserve, which is constantly replenished, accumulated or depleted; secondly, together with dynamic interaction, a person is able to save, use, acquire, exchange, lose resources in the process

of life (Иванова, 2016, p. 14). The scholar also suggests the metaphor of "resource rotation" as an analogy with the circulation of natural resources proposed by S. Hobfoll.

In this context *the resource approach* (J. Brown, E. Poulton, M. Posner, S. Boies) is also updated. According to it the "human system" has a number of opportunities to convert energy and information, which are called resources that determine the resource and contribute to its efficiency (Бодров, 2006). The emphasis here is on the fact that there is a set of key resources that manage and direct the general fund of resources, but the process of their allocation explains the fact that some people manage to stay healthy and successfully adapt despite different life circumstances (Логина, 2009, p. 21). S. Mykutyuk notes that *the resource approach* is aimed at taking into account the continuous changes in the properties and abilities of the subject, which in combination with natural inclinations, talents, constitute the resources of the individual. In this approach, human development is determined by the development of its abilities (according to S. Rubinstein), which are formed as a result of assimilation of the products of human activity and in the process of creating them by man (Микитюк, 2010, p. 84).

In general, the concept of "**potential**" is the means that are available, as well as the means that can be mobilized, used to achieve a certain goal, to solve a problem. For example, the potential is military, vital, economic, etc. (Мещеряков, Зинченко et al., 2003).

We make sure that *the resource* and *potential* reflect the hidden knowledge, capabilities, strength of man, which only complement the viability category and actualize the inner capabilities of man, the body's resources, i.e. the reserves of the psyche.

Another concept that should be placed next to *viability* is the *philosophical problem of vitality*, which in recent decades, according to Ye. Ryl'skaya, has become the subject of special studies, conferences and symposia (Рыльская, 2013, p. 20).

In philosophical interpretations, **the vitality category** is associated with *flexibility, resilience, the ability to take any necessary form*, such as creativity, adaptability of people to a particular social order and/or the ability to resist it (Рыль-

ская, 2013, p. 20). The positions of many scholars coincide in the interpretation of the general understanding of vitality, which is qualified as the ability to “participate in progress”, modernization, civilization, as the ability to resist barbarism, and considering, for example, the problem of social vitality, A. Kara-Murza interprets it from classical positions of philosophy, within the dilemma of “civilization – barbarism” (Капа-Мурза, 1995). In this context, the “vitality” concept is actualized as the “survival” of society in general and a particular person in particular, i. e., according to Ye. Rylskaya, those qualities that determine the ability “to stay on the edge of the abyss” (Рыльская, 2013, p. 20).

Considering the “vitality” concept as “survival” one Ye. Rylskaya (Рыльская, 2013) also mentions the position of A. Akhiezer, who distinguishes between two aspects of vitality: “1) survival and 2) viability. Survival as a statement that there is a certain process coinciding with life (“real life”), is the life of the individual, the life of society, the life of the community. Survival corresponds to the inertia of life; it comes down to the fact that the subject survives due to what exists. <...>. In this case, the life of any person is determined by the ability to overcome the limitations of existing experience, to constantly transform and enrich it. To characterize such a phenomenon, the “viability” category seems more adequate, i.e. as an opportunity to ensure survival through self-improvement” (Ахиезер, 1996, p. 58, 59).

In philosophy, attempts are also made to determine the specific determinants of human vitality, which include, for example, a certain ratio of selfish and altruistic in human behaviour. R. Dawkins, characterizing this relationship from the standpoint of the theory of classical evolution, wrote that general happiness is impossible without careful control of selfishness: “The common good – perhaps the greatest altruistic system ever known to the animal world. However, any altruistic system is internally unstable, because it is not protected from abuse by selfish individuals who are ready to exploit it” (Докинз, 1993, p. 819).

**Key viability properties.** The designated triad “resource – potential – vitality” convinced that “vitality” as a phenomenon of scientific knowledge requires the obligatory involvement of a person as an individual, because it is he/she who will help to show how psychological

well-being is maintained and successfully coped with stress and overcoming difficult life situations. To do this, it is necessary to turn to the main components of vitality, suggested by T. Ivanova (Иванова, 2016).

In the context of coping with stresses and overcoming difficult life situations, S. Maddi and S. Kobasa (Maddi, Kobasa, 1984) developed a construct of **resilience to life** as a common life disposition, which is a system of beliefs about oneself, about the world, about relations with the world (see also: Maddi, 2006; Леонтьев, Рассказова, 2006). According to F.A. Cowdrey, S.L. Walters, S. Maddi, **resilience to life** is a structure of attitudes and strategies that facilitate the process of transforming stressful circumstances from potentially destructive into opportunities for growth (Cowdrey et al., 2013). According to S. Maddi, the basic concept that underlies the resilience to life concept is the “existential courage” or “courage to be” concepts introduced by P. Tillich, the existential philosopher (Cowdrey et al., 2013). The scholar defines the structure of vitality, which includes three components: involvement, control and acceptance of the challenge.

The origins of the idea of variability and unpredictability of life events, the need to endure and live life situations of various kinds, accepting variability as a given and as a stimulus for further development are found in the works of Heraclitus, the ancient Greek philosopher. One of the main postulates of it is the struggle of opposites. He proclaims “war”, i. e. the struggle the father and mother of everything (Причепий et al., 2001, p. 61). The philosophers of *Stoicism* (Zeno, Diogenes, Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius) substantiated the rational nature of man and the need for a stoic attitude to life events. They emphasized the importance of man (the idea of self-worth), the importance of approaching a virtuous life practical “wisdom” or “strength of spirit” (Ивин et al., 2004) and its individual choice, called for courage to endure the blows of fate (Причепий et al., 2001, p. 71).

The works of philosophers and theologians of the Middle Ages also raise the idea of free choice and the courage to make choices, in particular Aquinas, the prominent Italian theologian, emphasized the ability to know and the ability to make free choice, free from external

factors of will as basic human virtues (cit. in: Тиллих, 1995).

The origins of the phenomenon viability are directly connected with later ideas, in particular in the context of *the philosophy of existentialism* (K. Jaspers, M. Heidegger, M. Buber, J.-P. Sartre, A. Camus, W. Frankl, M. Berdyaev, etc.). This direction in philosophy emphasizes the individuality and uniqueness of the person in its inseparability with the world, man is seen in the process of becoming as experiencing anxiety, conflict, alienation from himself, but taking responsibility for his own life, accepting the challenge, he is able to become by itself, free from any prejudice. It is necessary to recall the teachings of P. Tillich, the existentialist philosopher, who in developing the vitality concept gradually reveals the essence of the courage concept, analysing it from the standpoint of various philosophical schools and trends. The author argues that virtually all metaphysical concepts that have been developed throughout the history of human thought, are based on “overcoming something that, at least potentially, threatens a person or denies him” (Тиллих, 1995). The author adds that courage is self-affirmation “contrary”, but courage to be oneself is self-affirmation of the Self as oneself (Тиллих, 1995).

Resilience to life includes three basic beliefs, reflecting involvement in the life process that is characterized by the presence of connections with the world and a low level of alienation, an internal locus of control (control) and acceptance of the “challenges” of life (risk taking). It allows us to positively assess those situations with faced by a person (for example, to find benefits in difficult life situations and opportunities to overcome difficulties) (Иванова, 2016: 19).

A similar construct, which is often viewed as a synonym for resilience to life, is **resilience** as the ability to recover from stressful situations, the ability to regenerate, to post-traumatic growth (Masten, 2001; Richardson, 2002). Although the terms are used as synonyms, however, they have a difference in their internal content, which T. Ivanova explains in the following way: “unlike resilience to life, resilience is not a personal disposition (trait), but a state characterized by the ability to correctly allocate and use resources in difficult situations that contribute to the maintenance of psychological well-being” (Иванова,

2016, p. 20). The scholar clarifies that “in the context of successfully coping with stress, **resilience to life** is seen as a resource that helps to maintain the existing level of functioning, but **resilience** is more associated with the ability to rise above the previous level of functioning, with post-traumatic growth” (Иванова, 2016, p. 20).

Another difference, which T. Ivanova mentions, concerns the peculiarities of their development: “if the resilience concept was originally proposed to designate a specific group of beliefs that contribute to coping with stress (i. e., they represent a necessary, but perhaps not sufficient list of), then the resilience concept was used to denote any features that contribute to overcoming stress, which led to a less clear structure, but a greater breadth of the construct” (Иванова, 2016, p. 20).

The next concept, which was proposed by A. Antonovsky, is the **sense of coherence** (Antonovsky, 1987). T. Ivanova understands it as “the ability of a person to perceive what is happening in a coordinated, cognitive and emotional way, as being controlled by him” (Иванова, 2016, p. 20). This terminological concept includes three components: 1) *comprehensibility* is the degree of a person’s perception of information coming to him/her as ordered, clear and structured or, conversely, alarming, chaotic, unpredictable, which contributes to the perception of a stressful event not as accidental, but as a link in the chain of life events; 2) *controllability* characterizes the measure of an individual’s perception of his own resources as sufficient to adequately respond to the requirements of the environment; 3) *meaningfulness* is determined by what meaning is given to the current situation, how much the individual evaluates the problems and requirements represented to him/her as deserving energy costs (Иванова, 2016, p. 20).

Research shows that a high sense of connectedness demonstrates both physical health and psychological well-being. According to A. Antonovsky, there are three possible ways that feelings of connectedness can affect health (Antonovsky, 1987). First, a sense of connectedness can lead to physiological changes in the body, i. e. the normalization of the endocrine and immune systems (its effect is inversely the physiological effect of stress). Second, people with a high sense of connectedness tend to avoid

risk-taking behaviours and practice health-promoting and health-promoting behaviours. Third, the sense of connectedness affects the cognitive assessment of the events that are taking place: they are perceived as less threatening and more controllable. Feelings of connectedness are negatively correlated with anxiety, depression and the level of perceived stress, burnout and neuroticism, and positively – with various indicators of mental and somatic health (Осин, 2007).

The fourth concept is **optimism**. It is understood as a positive personality trait associated with success, joy, well-being and satisfaction. Today, two concepts of optimism are traced, in which optimism has different meanings and different functions (Гордеева, 2011). In the concept of dispositional optimism, C. Carver and M. Scheier view optimism as a positive attitude towards the future (Carver, Scheier, 2002). Such an attitude promotes the activity and effective activity of the subject, it is also one of the most important translators of coping with the stresses caused by chronic diseases (Carver, Gaines, 1987). However, if optimism is too high, a positive reassessment of the future can also have negative consequences: illusory expectations may not be justified, but a person may expose himself/herself to unjustified risks.

An alternative approach to understanding the nature of optimism is proposed by M. Seligman, C. Peterson, N. Kaslow, R. Tanenbaum, L. Alloy, L. Abramson, who considers optimism as an attributive style. The optimistic attributive style is associated with the explanation of positive events through a reference to causes that are stable in time, referring to all spheres of life and related to the subject himself, and negative events, on the contrary, through a reference to temporary, private and external reasons. Studies by M. Seligman et al. show that success in various types of activities is more often associated with an optimistic attributive style, which acts as a resource for maintaining motivation, and only in certain types of activities (for example, jurisprudence) the pessimistic attributive style is productive (Seligman et al., 1984).

Self-esteem as a characteristic of self-attitude that expresses a person's attitude towards oneself (positive or negative), is also an important resource (Baumeister, 2003). In contrast to the understanding of self-esteem in psychology

(Бодалев, 2008), some studies use a narrower construct of “self-esteem”, reflecting a special type of self-attitude, i. e. a sense of the value of one's personality and the need for other people. The self-esteem concept rather corresponds to the term “self-worth” (in the sense of the perception of one's own personality as a value that other people need), in contrast to the broader concept of self-evaluation. However, not all scholars agree on the overall positive connotation of this construct. For example, there has been a direct link between high self-worth and narcissism. There is also an opinion that it is a high sense of self-worth that is a prerequisite for the development of. In general, these data are consistent with the results of a study of self-awareness in borderline personality disorders in pathopsychology (Соколова, 1989). Thus, as in the case of optimism, the resource role of self-esteem is determined by its level.

A. Bandura developed the **self-efficacy construct** (Bandura, 1977). It is more a cognitive assessment of one's own ability to function effectively and cope with difficult situations, as opposed to resilience as a personal disposition, resilience as a state and optimism as an attitude. According to scholar, confidence in one's own effectiveness predicts not only the success of an activity, but also psychological well-being and physical health.

**Tolerance to uncertainty** is a neutral or positive attitude of the subject to uncertain situations (unfamiliar, complex, changeable, ambiguous). In early studies, it was considered as a personality characteristic associated with early exit from the solution of the problem, resistance to changing unstable stimuli, and a “black-and-white” view of the world. Modern operationalizations of tolerance to uncertainty (Корнилова, Чумакова, 2014) regard it as a stable personal disposition. Several studies have shown links between tolerance to uncertainty and psychological well-being and job satisfaction; individuals with low tolerance to uncertainty level are more susceptible to stress, risk aversion and more sensitive to negative feedback from colleagues.

The ability to control one's behaviour is considered a personality trait that predicts performance and well-being, including in the long term. As a result of the experiment, it was shown that children with a higher level of self-control



and able to postpone pleasure for the sake of subsequent reward after a certain time are more prosperous in the future, have higher incomes and achieve success in their careers (Hagger et al., 2010).

**Conclusions.** In conclusion, it should be stated that the “viability” concept as “the ability to retain important personality traits for a long time, but in the short term – less important, but more relevant here and now; combination of system stability and its adaptability, self-identity and conformity, usefulness, suitability, optimality and suboptimality” (according to Ye. Rylyskaya (Рыльская, 2013)) can be described from the standpoint of three components:

1) interpretation of two components: a) life, which is “the experience of their own existence, but to exist means to change constantly, to feel constantly changing”; b) ability is “any ability, strength or talent of a person to act or suffer”;

2) a description of the philosophical triad “resource – potential – vitality”, where a) resource(s) include everything that can be used by a person for effective existence and maintaining the quality of life; b) “potential” is the means that are available, as well as the means that can be mobilized, used to achieve a certain goal, to solve a problem; c) the vitality category is associated with flexibility, resilience, the ability to take any

necessary form, such as creativity, adaptability of people to a particular social order and/or the ability to resist it, i. e. the ability to “participate in progress”, modernization, civilization, as the ability to resist barbarism;

3) fixation of key properties of viability, among which: a) viability is the structure of attitudes and strategies that facilitate the process of transforming stressful circumstances from potentially destructive to growth opportunities (S. Maddi); b) resilience as the ability to recover from stressful situations, the ability to regenerate, to post-traumatic growth; c) sense of coherence (A. Antonovsky) is “a person’s ability to coherently, cognitively and emotionally, perceive what is happening as controlled by him” (T. Ivanova); d) optimism as a positive personality trait associated with success, joy, well-being and satisfaction; e) self-efficacy is a cognitive assessment of one’s own ability to perform effectively and cope with difficult situations, in contrast to resilience as a personal disposition, resilience as a state and optimism as an attitude (A. Bandura); f) tolerance to uncertainty is a neutral or positive attitude of a subject to uncertain situations (unfamiliar, complex, changeable, ambiguous; g) control of one’s behaviour is considered a personal characteristic that predicts the success of an activity and well-being, including in the long term.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Анцыферова Л.** Личность в трудных жизненных условиях: переосмысливание, преобразование и психологическая защита. *Психологический журнал*. 1994. Т. 1. № 1. С. 3–9.
- Ахизер А.** Жизнеспособность российского общества. *Общественные науки и современность*. 1996. № 6. С. 58–66.
- Бергсон А.** Творческая эволюция. URL: <http://www.philosophy.ru/library/berg/5.html>.
- Бодалев А.** Быть борцом – значит быть человеком. *Педагогика*. 2008. № 3. С. 3–6.
- Бодров В.** Психологический стресс: развитие и преодоление. Москва : ПЕР СЭ, 2006. 528 с.
- Большой психологический словарь / под ред. Б. Мещерякова, В. Зинченко. Санкт-Петербург, 2003. 672 с.
- Гордеева Т.** Самоэффективность как составляющая личностного потенциала. *Личностный потенциал: структура и диагностика* / под редакцией Д. Леонтьева. Москва : Смысл, 2011. С. 241–266.
- Гордеева Т., Осин Е., Шевяхова В.** Диагностика оптимизма как стиля объяснения успехов и неудач: опросник СТОУН. Москва : Смысл, 2009. 152 с.
- Докинз Р.** Эгоистичный ген. Москва : Наука, 1993. 318 с.
- Иванова Т.** Функциональная роль личностных ресурсов в обеспечении психологического благополучия : дисс. ... канд. психол. наук : 19.00.01. Москва, 2016. 206 с.
- Кара-Мурза А.** «Новое варварство» как проблема российской цивилизации. Москва : ИФРАН, 1995. 212 с.
- Корнилова Т., Чумакова М.** Шкалы толерантности и интолерантности к неопределенности в модификации опросника С. Баднера. *Экспериментальная психология*. 2014. № 1. С. 92–110.
- Леонтьев Д., Рассказова Е.** Тест жизнестойкости. Москва : Смысл, 2006. 63 с.



- Логінова М.** Жизнестійкість як внутрішній ключовий ресурс особистості. *Вестник Московського університету МВД Росії*. 2009. № 6. С. 19–22.
- Микитюк С.** Витоки наукових основ ресурсного підходу. *Педагогіка, психологія та медико-біологічні проблеми фізичного виховання і спорту*. 2010. № 2. С. 83–88.
- Осин Е.** Чувство зв'язності як показатель психологічного здоров'я і його діагностика. *Психологічна діагностика*. 2007. № 3. С. 22–40.
- Разумовський О., Хазов М.** Проблема життєспособності систем. *Гуманитарні науки в Сибіри*. 1998. № 1. С. 3–7.
- Рыльская Е.** Психологічна концепція життєспособності людини : монографія. Челябінськ : Полиграф-Мастер, 2013. 336 с.
- Соколова Е.** Самосвідомість і самооцінка при аномаліях особистості. Москва : МГУ, 1989. 216 с.
- Тилліх П.** Мужество быть / пер. Т. Вевюрко. *Тилліх П. Избранное*. Москва : Юрист, 1995. С. 7–131.
- Толочек В.** Стили діяльності: ресурсний підхід. Москва : Інститут психології РАН, 2015. 365 с.
- Філософія : учебник / отв. ред. : В. Губин, Т. Сидорина, В. Філатов. 2-е изд., перераб и доп. Москва : ТОН – Остожье, 2001. 704 с.
- Філософія: енциклопедический словарь / под ред. А. Ивина. Москва : Гардарики, 2004. URL: [https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc\\_philosophy/1149/СПОСОБНОСТЬ](https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/1149/СПОСОБНОСТЬ).
- Філософія : посібник для студентів вищих навчальних закладів / Є. Причепій, А. Черній, В. Гвоздецький, Л. Чекаль. Київ : Видавничий центр «Академія», 2001. 576 с.
- Antonovsky A.** Unraveling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass, 1987. 238 p.
- Attributional style and depressive symptoms among children / M. Seligman, C. Peterson, N. Kaslow, R. Tanenbaum, L. Alloy, L. Abramson. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 1984. Vol. 93. P. 235–238.
- Bandura A.** Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychological Review*. 1977. Vol. 84. P. 191–215.
- Baumeister R.** Ego depletion and self-regulation failure: A resource model Self Control. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2003. Vol. 27. № 2. P. 281–284.
- Carver C., Gaines J.** Optimism, pessimism, and postpartum depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 1987. Vol. 11. P. 449–462.
- Carver C., Scheier M.** Optimism. *Handbook of Positive Psychology* / ed. by C. Snyder, S. Lopez. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2002. P. 221–244.
- Cowdrey F., Walters S., Maddi S.** Hardiness, Turning Stressful Circumstances into Resilient Growth. *Applied Research Quality Life*. 2013. Vol. 8. P. 265–267. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-013-9230-1>.
- Ego Depletion and the Strength Model of Self-Control: A Meta-Analysis / M. Hagger, C. Wood, C. Stiff, N. Chatzisarantis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2010. Vol. 136. № 4. P. 495–525.
- Hobfoll S., Vaux A.** Social support: social resources and social context. *Handbook of stress: theoretical and clinical aspects* / ed. by L. Goldberger, S. Breznitz. New York, 1993. P. 685–705.
- Maddi S.** Hardiness: the courage to grow from stresses. *Journal of Positive Psychology*. 2006. Vol. 1. № 3. P. 160–168.
- Maddi S., Kobasa S.** The hardy executive: health under stress. Homewood, IL : Dow Jones-Irwin, 1984. 168 p.
- Masten A.** Ordinary magic: resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*. 2001. Vol. 56. № 3. P. 227–238.
- Potential. *Meriam-Webster Dictionary Online*. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/potential>.
- Resource. *Meriam-Webster Dictionary Online*. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resource>.
- Richardson G.** The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2002. Vol. 58. № 3. P. 307–321.

## REFERENCES

- Antsyferova, L.** (1994). Lichnost v trudnykh zhiznennykh usloviyakh: pereosmyslivaniye, preobrazovaniye i psikhologicheskaya zashchita [Personality in difficult living conditions: rethinking, transformation and psychological protection]. *Psikhologicheskii zhurnal*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–9 [in Russian].
- Akhiyezer, A.** (1996). Zhiznesposobnost rossiyskogo obshchestva [The viability of Russian society]. *Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost*, no. 6, pp. 58–66 [in Russian].
- Bergson, A.** *Tvorcheskaya evolyutsiya* [Creative evolution]. Retrieved from: <http://www.philosophy.ru/library/berg/5.html> [in Russian].

- Bodalev, A.** (2008). Byt bortsom – znachit byt chelovekom [To be a fighter means to be a man]. *Pedagogika*, no. 3, pp. 3–6 [in Russian].
- Bodrov, V.** (2006). *Psikhologicheskiiy stress: razvitiye i preodoleniye* [Psychological stress: development and overcoming]. Moscow: PER SE [in Russian].
- Meshcheryakov, B., Zinchenko, V.** (eds.) (2003). *Bolshoy psikhologicheskiiy slovar* [Comprehensive psychological dictionary]. Saint Petersburg [in Russian].
- Gordeyeva, T.** (2011). Samoeffektivnost kak sostavlyayushchaya lichnostnogo potentsiala [Self-efficacy as a component of personal potential]. *Leontyev D. (ed.) Lichnostnyy potentsial: struktura i diagnostika*. Moscow: Smysl, pp. 241–266 [in Russian].
- Gordeyeva, T., Osin, Ye., Shevyakhova, V.** (2009). *Diagnostika optimizma kak stilya obyasneniya uspekhov i neudach: oprosnik STOUN* [Diagnostics of optimism as a style of explaining successes and failures: STONE questionnaire]. Moscow: Smysl [in Russian].
- Dokinz, R.** (1993). *Egoistichnyy gen* [The selfish gene]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- Ivanova, T.** (2016). Funktsionalnaya rol lichnostnykh resursov v obespechenii psikhologicheskogo blagopoluchiya [Functional role of personal resources in providing psychological well-being]. *Candidate's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].
- Kara-Murza, A.** (1995). “Novoye varvarstvo” kak problema rossiyskoy tsivilizatsii [“New barbarism” as a problem of Russian civilization]. Moscow: IFRAN [in Russian].
- Kornilova, T., Chumakova, M.** (2014). Shkaly tolerantnosti i intolerantnosti k neopredelennosti v modifikatsii oprosnika S. Badnera [Scales of tolerance and intolerance to uncertainty in the modification of S. Badner's questionnaire]. *Ekspperimentalnaya psikhologiya*, no. 1, pp. 92–110 [in Russian].
- Leontyev, D., Rasskazova, Ye.** (2006). *Test zhiznestoykosti* [Test of vitality]. Moscow: Smysl [in Russian].
- Loginova, M.** (2009). Zhiznestoykost kak vnutrenniy klyuchevoy resurs lichnosti [Resilience to life as an internal key resource of the individual]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta MVD Rossii*, no. 6, pp. 19–22 [in Russian].
- Mykytyuk, S.** (2010). Vytoky naukovykh osnov resursnoho pidkhodu [Origins of scientific bases of resource approach]. *Pedahohika, psykhohohiya ta medyko-biolohichni problemy fizychnoho vykhovannya i sportu*, no. 2, pp. 83–88 [in Ukrainian].
- Osin, Ye.** (2007). Chuvstvo svyaznosti kak pokazatel psikhologicheskogo zdorovya i yego diagnostika [Feeling connectedness as an indicator of psychological health and its diagnostics]. *Psikhologicheskaya diagnostika*, no. 3, pp. 22–40 [in Russian].
- Razumovskiy, O., Khazov, M.** (1998). Problema zhiznesposobnosti sistem [The problem of the viability of systems]. *Gumanitarnyye nauki v Sibiri*, no. 1, pp. 3–7 [in Russian].
- Rylskaya, Ye.** (2013). *Psikhologicheskaya kontseptsiya zhiznesposobnosti cheloveka: monografiya* [The psychological concept of human vitality: monograph]. Chelyabinsk: Poligraf-Master [in Russian].
- Sokolova, Ye.** (1989). *Samosoznaniye i samoosenka pri anomalnykh lichnosti* [Self-awareness and self-esteem in personality anomalies]. Moscow: MGU [in Russian].
- Tillikh, P.** (1995). Muzhestvo byt [The courage to be], transl. by T. Vevyurko. *P. Tillikh (ed.) Izbrannoye*. Moscow: Yurist, pp. 7–131 [in Russian].
- Tolochek, V.** (2015). *Stili deyatelnosti: resursnyy podkhod* [Styles of activity: a resource approach]. Moscow: Institut psikhologii RAN [in Russian].
- Gubin, V., Sidorina, T., Filatov, V.** (eds.) (2001). *Filosofiya: uchebnik* [Philosophy: textbook]. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Moscow: TON – Ostozhye [in Russian].
- Ivin, A.** (ed.) (2004). *Filosofiya: entsiklopedicheskiy slovar* [Philosophy: an encyclopedic dictionary]. Moscow: Gardariki. Retrieved from: [https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc\\_philosophy/1149/SPOSOBNOST](https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/1149/SPOSOBNOST) [in Russian].
- Prychepiy, Ye., Cherniy, A., Hvozdetzkiy, V., Chekal, L.** (2001). *Filosofiya: posibnyk dlya studentiv vyshchyykh navchalnykh zakladiv* [Philosophy: a guide for students of higher educational institutions]. Kyiv: Akademiya [in Ukrainian].
- Antonovsky, A.** (1987). *Unraveling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass [in English].
- Seligman, M., Peterson, C., Kaslow, N., Tanenbaum, R., Alloy, L., Abramson, L.** (1984). Attributional style and depressive symptoms among children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, vol. 93, pp. 235–238 [in English].
- Bandura, A.** (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychological Review*, vol. 84, pp. 191–215 [in English].

- Baumeister, R.** (2003). Ego depletion and self-regulation failure: A resource model Self Control. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 281–284 [in English].
- Carver, C., Gaines, J.** (1987). Optimism, pessimism, and postpartum depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, vol. 11, pp. 449–462 [in English].
- Carver, C., Scheier, M.** (2002). Optimism. *Snyder C., Lopez S. (eds.). Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 221–244 [in English].
- Cowdrey, F., Walters, S., Maddi, S.** (2013). Hardiness, Turning Stressful Circumstances into Resilient Growth. *Applied Research Quality Life*, vol. 8, pp. 265–267. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-013-9230-1> [in English].
- Hagger, M., Wood, C., Stiff, C., Chatzisarantis, N.** (2010). Ego Depletion and the Strength Model of Self-Control: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 136, no. 4, pp. 495–525 [in English].
- Hobfoll, S., Vaux, A.** (1993). Social support: social recourses and social context. *Goldberger L., Breznitz S. (eds.). Handbook of stress: theoretical and clinical aspects*. New York, pp. 685–705 [in English].
- Maddi, S.** (2006). Hardiness: the courage to grow from stresses. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 160–168 [in English].
- Maddi, S., Kobasa, S.** (1984). *The hardy executive: health under stress*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin [in English].
- Masten, A.** (2001). Ordinary magic: resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 227–238 [in English].
- Potential. *Meriam-Webster Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/potential> [in English].
- Resource. *Meriam-Webster Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resource> [in English].
- Richardson, G.** (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 307–321 [in English].