



ISSN 2450-6486

<http://ehs.eeipsy.org>DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38014/ehs-ss.2025.1.09>

This publication was made with the funds of a joint Grant of
EEIP (Ukraine - France) and ChF "Education: Future"



Oksana HERASYMCHUK

Aggression as an adaptive mechanism

OKSANA HERASYMCHUK. Aggression as an adaptive mechanism. *This article presents a theoretical analysis of scientific approaches to the study of aggressive behavior, specifically examining the concepts of frustration-aggression, social learning, and humanistic psychology. The author explores aggression as a multifaceted phenomenon that can function not only as a destructive force but also as an adaptive mechanism for protection and frustration management.*

The evolution of frustration-aggression theory is analyzed, beginning with the classical works of J. Dollard and L. Berkowitz, to its contemporary modifications. The contributions of A. Bass to the study of instrumental and hostile aggression, as well as A. Bandura's socio-behavioral approach to aggression as socially learned behavior, are considered.

Particular attention is given to F. Perls's humanistic perspective, which viewed aggression as a necessary component of adaptation and personal growth. It is determined that aggression can be used for the "constructive demolition" of outdated behavioral patterns and the integration of new experiences.

Based on the analysis of scientific sources, a conclusion is drawn regarding the potential of aggression as an adaptive mechanism that facilitates protection, frustration management, and goal attainment. Prospects for further research are identified, including the study of the neurobiological mechanisms of

aggression, the influence of social context, the development of practical methods for the constructive use of aggression, as well as the investigation of ethical aspects and positive functions of aggression.

This article contributes to a deeper understanding of aggression as a complex social phenomenon and its role in adaptation and personality development.

Keywords: *aggression, frustration, aggression theory, aggressive behavior.*

1. Problem Statement

The study of aggression as an adaptive mechanism is extremely important for psychological science and practice. Aggression, traditionally viewed as a destructive force, can serve as an adaptive strategy for protecting personal boundaries, overcoming frustrating states, and achieving goals. While aggression has traditionally been perceived as a destructive force, mounting evidence suggests that, within specific contexts, it may function as an adaptive strategy. This perspective facilitates a more profound understanding of the mechanisms underlying aggressive behavior and its functional roles, as well as the identification of avenues for channeling aggressive energy constructively. Research endeavors may elucidate methods for redirecting aggressive energy toward positive outcomes, thereby enabling individuals to cultivate salutary coping mechanisms for expressing discontent and overcoming obstacles. The recognition of frustration as a precursor to aggression facilitates the development of effective violence prevention methodologies, particularly salient in environments characterized by social instability.

2. Analysis of the Research Problem

Aggression, as a phenomenon and a specific behavioral modality, has been extensively examined by psychologists and other domestic and international scholars, including jurists, political scientists, philosophers, and sociologists. Notable contributors such as A. Bandura, L. Berkowitz, R. Baron, N. Grishina, J. Dollard, D. Zillmann, A. Zelinsky, V. Pavelkiv, A. Rean, D. Richardson, V. Rybalka, E. Skyba, V. Tymoshenko, S. Feshbach, E. Fromm, and O. Shliakhtina have provided foundational insights into the essential characteristics of aggression. However, the precise delineation of aggression as a determinant of unlawful conduct and the formulation of effective intervention strategies remain subjects requiring further empirical investigation. This imperative has informed the selection of the present article's thematic focus, underscoring its relevance and timeliness within the contemporary context of armed conflict and escalating social crises.

Article Aim: The primary objective of this article is to elucidate the potential of aggression as an adaptive mechanism utilized for the protection of personal boundaries and mitigation of frustration states.

3. State of Development

The problem field within which aggression is considered is exceptionally broad. Various aspects of it fall within the scope of interests of such branches of scientific knowledge as psychology, biology, sociology, and conflictology. Despite the significant research on the problem, the dichotomy of this concept remains. This is primarily due to the contradictory and paradoxical nature of aggression, and secondly, the multitude of approaches, each of which has its problem field reduced to phenomena of biological, psychological, social, and conflictological order, resulting in a problem of understanding aggression.

In the history of psychology, we can encounter various concepts of understanding aggression, from its destructive pole to the constructive one. In contemporary psychology, aggression is understood as motivated destructive behavior that contradicts the norms and rules of human existence in society, causing harm to the objects of attack.

While the word "aggression" originates from the word *aggredi*, whose root comes from *adgradi* (*gradus* means "step," and *ad* means "towards"), that is, the original meaning of this word could imply "to move towards," "to attack." Thus, "to be aggressive" means "to move towards a goal without delay, without fear or doubt" [11].

The problems of studying aggression and aggressive behavior have been touched upon by various psychological directions, each school highlighting its methodological approaches to studying this problem. Among the main ones are:

Evolutionary-genetic approach (Z. Freud's, A. Adler's, E. Fromm's expedient instinct; K. Lorenz's ethological approach);

Behavioral approach (A. Bass's theory of aggression; J. Dollard's and N. Miller's theory of frustration aggression; Leonard Berkowitz's "frustration-aggression" theory; A. Bandura's social learning theory);

Humanistic approach (self-actualization as resistance to aggression – the ideas of A. Maslow, A. A. Rean, C. Rogers, V. Frankl).

In the psychoanalytic school, the phenomenon of aggression is revealed by the theory of drives. The founder of this theory is Sigmund Freud. He believed that aggressive behavior is instinctive and inevitable by nature. Psychoanalytic theories of aggression are now considered

limited. Since excessive emphasis on biological determinants ignores social factors and does not consider the diversity of aggression, its functional role, and the possibility of constructive use. In contrast to existing theories, J. Dollard proposed a "frustration theory," in which aggressive behavior is presented not as an evolutionary, but as a situational process. The founder of this direction of research on human aggression, J. Dollard, put forward a scientific proposition that "aggression is always a consequence of frustration" [10, p. 28].

According to his theory, aggression is invariably the result of frustrators, i.e., insurmountable barriers that stand in the way of achieving a goal, causing confusion or frustration. According to the scientist's views, aggression is a drive that does not automatically arise in the human body, but a reaction to frustration: an attempt to overcome an obstacle on the way to satisfying needs, achieving satisfaction, and emotional balance.

The aggression-frustration scheme is based on four basic concepts: aggression, frustration, inhibition, and displacement. The researcher understands aggression as an intention to harm another with one's action, as an act of purposeful reaction that harms the body. Frustration occurs when an obstacle appears to carry out the reaction. The magnitude of frustration depends on the strength of motivation to perform the desired action, the significance of the obstacle to achieving the goal, and the number of purposeful actions after which frustration occurs. Inhibition is the tendency to limit or curtail actions due to expected negative consequences. It is established that the inhibition of any act of aggression is directly proportional to the strength of the expected attack. The inhibition of acts of aggression is an additional frustration that causes aggression against a person who is perceived as the culprit of inhibition, and an enhancing incentive to other forms of aggression. Displacement is the desire to engage in aggressive actions directed against some other person, rather than the true source of frustration.

Frustration theory has undergone certain changes since its inception, particularly as a result of extensive experimental research practice. Already in the 1940s, the authors modified the formulation of their hypothesis. Aggression was now seen as a natural but not inevitable consequence of frustration. It was assumed that non-aggressive responses to frustration could be acquired through learning. However, aggression was still considered the dominant reaction to frustration, and a non-aggressive response could only occur if aggressive reactions had not been rewarded or punished before, and thus aggressive behavior was eliminated. The

greatest attention of supporters of the frustration-aggression hypothesis is attracted by the study of the conditions under which a frustration situation leads to aggressive actions. Important variables they identified that affect both the occurrence and inhibition of aggression include the similarity-difference of aggressors and victims, the justification-unjustification of aggression, as well as aggressiveness as a personal characteristic of the subjects. The disadvantage of this approach is, first of all, the lack of clarity in the understanding of frustration, as a result of which the emphasis in experimental studies shifted from the analysis of the causes of frustration and then aggression to the study of variables that contribute to the occurrence and inhibition of aggression. It is important to emphasize that in this modification of the original hypothesis, frustration was still seen as an inevitable antecedent of aggression, i.e., if there was an aggressive act, it was assumed that frustration was always present as a provocative condition.

A. Bandura, S. Rosenzweig, and others point out that frustration is not the only factor that leads to the expression of aggressiveness. Over time, the idea of an inseparable, obligatory connection between aggression and frustration was not confirmed, i.e., the idea that aggression is always the result of frustrators (barriers to the goal), and frustration inevitably leads to aggression [4; 5]. However, it would be more correct to talk about its superstructure, about various additions to it.

Leonard Berkowitz's "frustration-aggression" theory is a modified form of the theory of aggression's conditionality by frustration. As a determining factor of actions, the scientist singled out the influence of socio-psychological parameters—social environment, relationships with other social subjects—on the manifestation of aggressiveness in human actions [9].

The researcher posits that frustration is one among a multitude of diverse aversive stimuli capable of merely provoking aggressive reactions, rather than directly inducing aggressive behavior. Instead, frustration primarily engenders a readiness for aggressive actions. Such behavior manifests solely in the presence of pertinent aggression cues, such as environmental stimuli associated with current or antecedent anger-provoking or generally aggression-inducing factors.

According to Berkowitz's theory, stimuli acquire the propensity to provoke aggression (i.e., the potential to elicit aggression) through a process akin to classical conditioning. A stimulus may attain aggressive significance if it is linked to positively reinforced aggression or associated with previously experienced discomfort and pain. Stimuli consistently associated with aggression-provoking factors or aggression itself may

gradually predispose previously provoked or frustrated individuals to aggressive actions. Given that a broad spectrum of stimuli satisfies these criteria, numerous stimuli may acquire significance as aggression cues. Under specific conditions, individuals with particular character traits and even physical objects may function as aggression cues. Furthermore, the scholar suggests that individuals with physical anomalies are, in a sense, destined to attract suffering and become targets of hostility, as their defect or illness, associated with suffering and pain, may provoke aggression-prone individuals to specific actions [9].

Another significant modification introduced by Berkowitz to the frustration-aggression theory pertains to the conditions requisite for the attenuation of aggressive drive. The scholar asserted that in highly frustrated individuals, aggressive drive may diminish solely upon inflicting harm upon the frustrator. Catharsis occurs not due to the aggressor discharging a quantity of aggressive energy that presumably lacked an outlet, but rather due to the aggressor achieving their aggressive objective, thereby completing a specific sequence in response to aggression instigation. Unsuccessful attempts to inflict harm upon the frustration instigator are inherently frustrating, potentially augmenting rather than attenuating the inclination to act aggressively. Only successful attacks accompanied by harm infliction upon the aggression target are capable of diminishing or entirely eliminating aggressive drive.

The researcher introduced substantial amendments to the "aggression-frustration" schema: frustration does not necessarily manifest in aggressive actions but rather stimulates a readiness for them; even in a state of readiness, aggression does not arise without appropriate conditions; exiting a frustrating situation through aggressive actions cultivates a habit of such actions in the individual [13].

In the process of its development, the frustration approach has undergone considerable changes and has diverged into two significant independent streams: representatives of the first stream remained adherents of the frustration-aggression hypothesis, they study the conditions under which a frustration situation leads to the emergence of aggressive actions; representatives of the second stream created their own concept of frustration, which is based on the analysis of frustration situations, classification, and typology of reactions to frustration.

In the interpretation of another cognitivist, D. Zillmann, cognition and arousal are closely interrelated; they significantly influence each other during the process of experiencing suffering and determine our behavior. Thus,

awareness of an event affects the degree of arousal, enhancing or weakening it. There is also a feedback loop between them: arousal plays a significant role in the cognitive mediation of behavior. Thus, during aggression, a person's impulsive action will be aggressive also because the disintegration of the cognitive process creates obstacles to the inhibition of aggression by consciousness. In cases of very high levels of arousal, a decrease in the ability to cognitive activity can lead to impulsive behavior [13].

Through the recognition of the role and significance of "cognitive components" (i.e., consciousness), psychology gradually came to recognize not only biological or energetic, but also social factors in the form of real factors of social learning.

The most famous researcher of the behavioral approach to aggression is Arnold Bass. He defines frustration as the blocking of the process of instrumental behavior and introduces the concept of attack – an act that supplies the body with hostile stimuli. At the same time, an attack causes a strong aggressive reaction, and frustration – a weak one [2].

The scientist noted a number of factors that determine the strength of aggressive habits. First, it is the frequency and intensity of cases in which the individual was attacked, frustrated, irritated. Individuals who received many angry stimuli will probably react more aggressively than those who received fewer such stimuli. Secondly, it is the frequent achievement of success through aggression, which, according to the researcher, leads to strong attacking habits. Success can be internal (sharp weakening of anger) and external (elimination of an obstacle or achievement of reward). The tendency that has developed to attack may make it impossible for the individual to distinguish between situations that provoke and do not provoke aggression. Thirdly, it is the cultural and subcultural norms that a person learns, and which can facilitate the development of aggressiveness in him [8].

A. Bass introduced the concepts of hostile and instrumental aggression. Hostile aggression is motivated by negative emotions with the intent to inflict harm. Instrumental aggression involves goals unrelated to causing harm, meaning aggression becomes a tool for personal gain or advancement.

The scientist defined aggression as any behavior that contains a threat or causes harm to others. It is equally important to consider aggression not only as behavior but also as a mental state that includes cognitive, emotional, and volitional components. The cognitive component involves orientation, which requires understanding the situation, seeing the object of attack, and identifying one's "offensive means." The emotional component

of the aggressive state manifests as anger. Often, a person at all stages of the aggressive state (preparation for aggression, the process of aggressive action, evaluation of the action's result) experiences a strong emotion of anger, sometimes taking the form of affect or rage. However, it should be noted that aggression is not always accompanied by anger, and the feeling of anger does not always lead to aggression. The volitional aspect of aggression is manifested in all formal qualities of will: purposefulness, perseverance, determination, and in some cases, initiative and courage.

A. Bass divided the concepts of aggressiveness and hostility and defined hostility as a reaction that develops negative feelings and negative evaluations of people and events. He attributed the following types of reactions to the concept of aggressiveness: physical aggression – the use of physical force against another person; irritation – readiness to express negative feelings at the slightest disturbance (irascibility, brutality); verbal aggression – the expression of negative feelings both through form (shouting, screaming) and through the content of verbal responses (curses, threats). He attributed the following types of reactions to the concept of hostility: resentment – envy and hatred of others for real and imagined actions; suspicion – ranging from distrust and caution towards people to the belief that others are planning and causing harm.

Analysis of Arnold Bass's theory reveals aggression not only as destructive behavior but also as a potential tool for protection and overcoming frustration. According to his concept, frustration, defined as the blocking of the process of instrumental behavior, is directly related to the failure to achieve goals, which emphasizes the possibility of aggression arising as a reaction to obstacles. The introduction of the concept of "attack" demonstrates that aggression can serve as a means of protection against external threats, and a strong aggressive reaction to an attack confirms its effectiveness in self-defense. An important aspect is the definition of instrumental aggression as a means of achieving goals unrelated to causing harm, which indicates its constructive potential. Factors influencing aggressiveness, such as the frequency and intensity of aggressive stimuli and the success of aggressive actions, show that aggression can be learned behavior aimed at overcoming obstacles. The consideration of aggression as a mental state that includes cognitive, emotional, and volitional components emphasizes its complexity and at the same time shows that the volitional component, such as purposefulness and determination, can be used to achieve goals. Thus, Bass's theory shows that aggression can be not only a reaction to negative emotions but also a tool for protection, overcoming frustration, and forming useful habits.

Another well-known researcher of the behavioral approach is A. Bandura. He calls his approach socio-behavioral and contrasts it with previous representatives of learning theory on issues of prosocial and deviant behavior, i.e., behavior that deviates from social norms [1]. In his opinion, the social learning theories of Miller and Dollard, Skinner, Rotter suffer from being based on a limited set of principles established and supported mainly by studies of animal learning in single-person situations, and for an adequate consideration of social phenomena, these principles need to be expanded and modified, introducing new principles established and confirmed by studies of the acquisition and modification of human behavior in dyadic and group situations.¹ Thus, from the very beginning, A. Bandura opposed the arbitrary extrapolation of data from the animal world to the social world, which is very characteristic of behaviorism.

Social learning theory is the study of human behavior oriented towards a model. The model in this case is considered as a means of interpersonal influence, through which the formation (change) of relationships or ways of human action is possible. Unlike psychoanalysts and ethologists, proponents of the behavioral approach rely primarily on data from controlled laboratory experiments and usually speak of aggressive behavior as overt, externally expressed actions. These actions are very active, often initiative, and always cause some harm to the object (person, and in some cases, inanimate object), but the extent of this harm depends on both the aggressor and the resistance provided to him.

This theory explains the acquisition, provocation, and regulation of aggression. A. Bandura believes:

- 1) aggression arises through biological factors (hormones, nervous system), learning (direct experience, observation); aggression is provoked by the influence of patterns (disruption, attention), unacceptable treatment (attacks, frustration), incentive motives (money, admiration), instructions (orders), eccentric beliefs (paranoid ideas);
- 2) aggression is regulated by external rewards and punishments (material reward, unpleasant consequences), vicarious reinforcement (observation of how others are rewarded and punished), self-regulation mechanisms (pride, guilt) [1].

According to the theory, aggression is considered as social behavior, which includes actions behind which are complex skills that require comprehensive learning. To perform an aggressive action, one must know how to handle weapons, what movements during physical contact will be

dangerous for the victim, and also understand what words or actions cause suffering to the objects of aggression. And since this knowledge is not given at birth, people must learn to behave aggressively.

This theory emphasizes the role of learning through observation and direct experience in the acquisition of aggression, but does not deny the contribution of biological factors. The implementation of aggressive action depends on the basic neurophysiological mechanisms. The nervous system is involved in the implementation of any action, including aggressive ones. The influence of these basic structures and processes is limited. A. Bandura believes that people are endowed with neuropsychological mechanisms that enable aggression, but the activation of these mechanisms depends on appropriate stimulation, controlled by consciousness. Therefore, different forms of aggression, the frequency of their manifestations, the situations in which it unfolds, as well as the specific objects chosen for attack – all this is largely determined by factors of social learning.

The scientist interprets the role of reinforcement in learning differently. He considers reinforcement as a factor that promotes learning, not causes it. In his opinion, firstly, the observer can learn new reactions by observing the behavior of the model; secondly, it is not necessary to put the reaction of the model and the reaction of the observer in the conditions of reinforcement. Numerous studies by the scientist and his colleagues have shown that reinforcing consequences can serve to activate behavior acquired in conditions of non-reinforced observation. Emphasizing that reinforcement does not play a dominant role in the acquisition of new reactions, the scientist assigns it a central role in strengthening and maintaining (preserving) various behavioral tendencies. Behavioral patterns can be acquired, according to the author, through direct personal experience, as well as through observation of the behavior of others and its consequences for them, that is, through the influence of an example.

A. Bandura distinguishes the following directions of the model's influence on the observer:

- through observation of the model's behavior, new reactions can be acquired;
- through observation of the consequences of the model's behavior (its reward or punishment), the restraint of behavior previously learned by the observer can be strengthened or weakened, that is, the existing behavior of the observer is modified by observing the model;

- observation of the behavior of another (model) can facilitate the implementation of reactions previously acquired by the observer.

The researcher tried to implement the principles of learning he formulated, in particular, in the study of aggressive behavior. He put forward three points of analysis of aggressive behavior: the way of acquiring such actions; factors that provoke their behavior; conditions under which they are fixed [1].

The scientist posits that the frustration-aggression theory is insufficient for explaining aggressive behavior. He proposes an alternative approach: the acquisition of behavior with destructive potential through learning, on the one hand, and on the other, the issue of factors determining whether an individual will implement what they have learned.

From the scientist's perspective, frustration is merely one, and not necessarily the most significant, factor influencing aggressive behavior. He argues that frustration is most likely to provoke aggression in individuals who have learned to respond to aversive treatment with aggressive attitudes and actions. He notes that aggression is generally better explained by its rewarding consequences than by frustrating conditions and the punishments it incurs.

This theory offers numerous opportunities for controlling human aggression. This is due to two factors: social learning implies the manifestation of aggression by people only in certain social conditions, and the fact that aggressive behavior is an acquired model of social behavior, therefore, it can be weakened by eliminating the conditions for its manifestation. According to A. Bandura, aggression is also a reaction to provoking factors, serving as a means of protection or restoration of justice, and is regulated by reinforcement, which makes it a tool for achieving desired outcomes.

Investigating frustration, T. Shibutani focused on human behavior in difficult life situations and emphasized the close connection of this phenomenon with compensatory reactions of the individual. During frustration, a person uses "typical techniques." T. Shibutani characterized them as substitutes for satisfaction when the first impulse cannot be satisfied. According to the author, two main reactions to frustration arise: aggression and retreat [7, pp. 74–75]. Frustration seeks discharge and often finds it in the form of aggression, the trigger for which is anger. Often the object of attack can be a person who has no relation to the event that caused the frustration. A relevant example is the illustration of Bidstrup's caricature, in which the boss scolds his subordinate. He, in turn, vents his anger on

the boy postman. The boy pushes the dog. The angry dog, when the boss leaves the office, bites him. Thus, catharsis occurred, everyone vented their irritation [8].

T. Shibutani agrees with Berkowitz's view that aggressive reaction is only one of the forms of frustration manifestation [7]. The second typical reaction to frustration, according to T. Shibutani, is retreat. Retreat can be physical, for example, before a stronger opponent, or psychological, such as a person's admission that they were wrong. If the retreat is conscious, it is called restraint. Restraint is not always a constructive way out of the situation; it can later make itself felt. The author also cites an example of another reaction to frustration – fantasy, which uses images as a means of satisfying needs. Fantasy enables a person to effectively complete actions that would otherwise be almost impossible to perform. Despite the fact that fantasy is often condemned, it becomes pathological only when a person ceases to distinguish between dreams and reality.

According to B. Kreychi [3], it is important to distinguish between "adequate" or "adaptive" aggression and "inadequate" or "maladaptive" aggression. Adaptive aggression is a behavioral manifestation of internal mechanisms (biological, psychological, cognitive, emotional) that perform their natural function. Adaptive aggression helps in competitive struggle to satisfy one's needs, but it does not have serious negative consequences in the sense that exists in a particular society.

Maladaptive aggression meets two criteria. Firstly, it does not perform the function of helping in individual or group rivalry or providing protection in the context of the rules of a particular society; secondly, maladaptive aggression is a manifestation of a damaged internal mechanism, i.e., a neuropsychiatric disease. The first, socio-value criterion may change as society changes. The second, factual, must remain stable. Like mental disorders in general, maladaptive aggression lies on the border between the artificial (human-created) social world and the natural world. Thus, aggression is not necessarily considered a mental disorder or a manifestation of psychopathology, but primarily as a forced reaction to conditions created by society [3].

In particular, M. Levitov distinguished cognitive, emotional, and volitional components in aggressive behavior [4]. The cognitive component manifests in orientation, which requires understanding the situation and identifying objects of attack within it. Special attention is needed to study the influence of threat on aggression.

Not every threat elicits an aggressive state, and conversely, not every aggressive state is provoked by a threat. It is important to correctly understand the threat, analyze, and evaluate it. The state of aggression, its form, and strength depend on this. Overestimation of the threat can lead to awareness of one's powerlessness and even to the abandonment of aggression. Underestimation of the threat, on the contrary, may indicate an overestimation of one's own forces and cause a state of frustration, and sometimes even lead to defeat.

The emotional component is expressed primarily in anger, but it does not always transition into aggression. Moreover, anger does not always provoke it. For example, "powerless" anger – a reaction to frustration – does not lead to aggressive behavior. "Noble" anger – indignation about a bad deed – also does not imply aggression as behavior. In addition to anger, other emotions and feelings are also observed that are part of the emotional component of the aggressive state: ill will, malice, vindictiveness, and sometimes sadism.

According to M. Levitov, the volitional component includes purposefulness, determination, perseverance, and in some cases, initiative and courage. Often, an aggressive state arises and develops in a struggle that requires volitional qualities. But "if from the formal side the aggressive state is a volitional act, then it would be completely wrong to attribute it to manifestations of willpower. Willpower, not in the formal but in the true, meaningful sense of the term, is determined by the social value of the goal, perseverance conditioned by certain goals; it is manifested not in aggression, but in its content and opposition, that is, only in such a struggle that has social and moral positive significance" [4, pp. 53–55].

Fritz Perls, a representative of the humanistic approach in psychology, viewed aggression as an integral component of the process of interaction between the individual and the environment, necessary for adaptation and functional development. He conceptualized aggression as a set of diverse functions of the organism's contact with the environment, emphasizing the differentiation of the concepts of "destruction" and "demolition." Unlike destructive "destruction," which disrupts the contact process, "demolition" is interpreted as a constructive act aimed at deconstructing previous forms to assimilated elements. This process is necessary for the integration of new experience, whether it is the assimilation of food, processing lecture material, perception of parental instructions, or adaptation to partner habits. The absence of such "demolition" leads to the formation of introjects – internalized external elements that hinder full contact of the organism

with the environment, and which may subsequently become the object of destructive "destruction." Thus, Perls emphasized the important role of aggression as a tool that ensures dynamic adaptation and integration of experience, contributing to the development of personality [11].

4. Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research

The conducted theoretical analysis of scientific approaches to the study of aggressive behavior provides grounds for drawing the following conclusions: aggression is a multifaceted phenomenon that can act not only as destructive behavior but also as an adaptive mechanism aimed at protection, overcoming obstacles, and achieving goals. Frustration, defined as the blocking of the process of instrumental behavior, acts as a powerful stimulus for aggressive reaction. Aggressive behavior can be learned through observation and reinforcement, and also used as a tool to achieve specific goals unrelated to causing harm. Fritz Perls's concept of "constructive demolition" demonstrates that aggression can be used to "demolish" outdated forms of behavior and integrate new experience.

Prospects for further research in this area lie in the study of the neurobiological mechanisms of aggression, which will allow for a better understanding of its nature and the development of effective correction methods. It is necessary to study the influence of the social context, including cultural and social factors, on the manifestation of aggression, especially in conditions of conflict and instability. An important direction is the development of practical methods for the constructive use of aggression to overcome frustration and protection, as well as the creation of training programs for self-regulation and emotional competence skills. The study of the ethical aspects of using aggression as a tool, to prevent abuse and destructive consequences, is extremely relevant. Also promising is the further study of the positive functions of aggression, such as motivation, perseverance, and determination. Further research in this direction will help reveal the potential of aggression as a constructive force that contributes to personal growth and social adaptation.

References:

1. Bandura A., Walters R. Adolescent Aggression. A Study of the Influence of Upbringing and Family Relations. M.: April Press, EKSMO Press, 2000. P. 512.
2. Bass, A.G. Psychology of Aggression. Kyiv: Publishing Union "Andrum", 2005. - P. 60-67.

3. Kreychi B. Social Psychology of Aggression. SPb.: Prime Euroznak, 2003. 213 p.
4. Levitov N. D. Frustration as one of the types of psychological states. Questions of Psychology. 1967. No. 6. P. 38–58.
5. Petechel O. Yu. Theoretical analysis of the problem of aggression / O. Yu. Petechel // Actual problems of improving the current legislation of Ukraine. - 2017. - Issue. 44. - P. 88-102.
6. Freud S.A. General introduction to psychoanalysis. N.Y.: Garden City Publishing Co, 1943.
7. Shibutani, T. Social psychology. M.: Progress, 1967.
8. Buss A. Some determinants of rigidity in discriminationreversion leaning. J. Exp. Psycho. 1952. vol. 44. – P. 222–227.
9. Berkowitz L. Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation // Psychological Bulletin. 1989. Vol. 106, № 1. P. 59-63.
10. Dollard J., Miller N.E., Doob L.M. et al. Frustration and aggression. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1939.
11. Perlz F. Teoriya geshtal't-terapii. M.: Institut Obshchegumanitarnykh issledovaniy, 2008. 320 c.
12. Rogers C.R. Toward a science of the person. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964. 109–140.
13. Zillmann D. Cognition-excitation dependencies in the escalation of anger and angry aggression // The dynamics of aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., 1994. P. 45-71.

Transliteration of References:

1. Bandura A., Walters R. Adolescent Aggression. A Study of the Influence of Upbringing and Family Relations. M.: April Press, EKSMO Press, 2000. P. 512.
2. Bass, A.G. Psychology of Aggression. Kyiv: Publishing Union "Andrum", 2005. - P. 60-67.
3. Kreychi B. Social Psychology of Aggression. SPb.: Prime Euroznak, 2003. 213 p.
4. Levitov N. D. Frustration as one of the types of psychological states. Questions of Psychology. 1967. No. 6. P. 38–58.
5. Petechel O. Yu. Theoretical analysis of the problem of aggression / O. Yu. Petechel // Actual problems of improving the current legislation of Ukraine. - 2017. - Issue. 44. - P. 88-102.
6. Freud S.A. General introduction to psychoanalysis. N.Y.: Garden City Publishing Co, 1943.
7. Shibutani, T. Social psychology. M.: Progress, 1967.
8. Buss A. Some determinants of rigidity in discriminationreversion leaning. J. Exp. Psycho. 1952. vol. 44. – P. 222–227.
9. Berkowitz L. Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation // Psychological Bulletin. 1989. Vol. 106, № 1. P. 59-63.

10. Dollard J., Miller N.E., Doob L.M. et al. Frustration and aggression. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1939.
11. Perlz F. Teoriya geshtal't-terapii. M.: Institut Obshchegumanitarnykh issledovaniy, 2008. 320 c.
12. Rogers C.R. Toward a science of the person. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964. 109–140.
13. Zillmann D. Cognition-excitation dependencies in the escalation of anger and angry aggression // The dynamics of aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., 1994. P. 45-71.

The Author

Oksana HERASYMCHUK
*PhD student, Specialty 053 Psychology,
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University,
Kyiv, Ukraine*
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5061-3675>
E-mail: oksana.gera.psy@gmail.com

Abstracts

ОКСАНА ГЕРАСИМЧУК. Агресія як адаптивний механізм. У статті представлено теоретичний аналіз наукових підходів до вивчення агресивної поведінки, зокрема, розглядаються концепції фрустрації-агресії, соціального научіння та гуманістичної психології. Автор досліджує агресію як багатогранний феномен, що може виступати не лише як деструктивна сила, але й як адаптивний механізм для захисту та подолання фрустрації.

Проаналізовано еволюцію теорії фрустрації-агресії, починаючи з класичних робіт Дж. Долларда та Л. Берковіца, до її сучасних модифікацій. Розглянуто внесок А. Басса у вивчення інструментальної та ворожої агресії, а також соціобіхевіоральний підхід А. Бандури до агресії як соціально навченої поведінки.

Особливу увагу приділено гуманістичній перспективі Ф. Перлза, який розглядав агресію як необхідний компонент адаптації та особистісного зростання. Визначено, що агресія може бути використана для "конструктивного руйнування" застарілих форм поведінки та інтеграції нового досвіду.

На основі аналізу наукових джерел зроблено висновок про потенціал агресії як адаптивного механізму, що сприяє захисту, подоланню

фрустрації та досягненню цілей. Визначено перспективи подальших досліджень, що включають вивчення нейробіологічних механізмів агресії, впливу соціального контексту, розробку практичних методів конструктивного використання агресії, а також дослідження єдиних аспектів та позитивних функцій агресії.

Стаття сприяє глибшому розумінню агресії як складного соціального явища та її ролі в адаптації та розвитку особистості.

Ключові слова: агресія, фрустрація, теорія агресії, агресивна поведінка.

OKSANA HERASYMCZUK. **Agresja jako mechanizm adaptacyjny.** Artykuł przedstawia teoretyczną analizę naukowych podejść do badania zachowań agresywnych, w szczególności omawia koncepcje frustracji-agresji, uczenia się społecznego oraz psychologii humanistycznej. Autorka bada agresję jako wielowymiarowe zjawisko, które może występować nie tylko jako siła destrukcyjna, ale także jako mechanizm adaptacyjny służący ochronie i przewyżczeniu frustracji.

Przeanalizowano ewolucję teorii frustracji-agresji, począwszy od klasycznych prac J. Dollarda i L. Berkowitza, po jej współczesne modyfikacje. Rozważono wkład A. Bassa w badanie agresji instrumentalnej i wrogiej, a także socj behawioralne podejście A. Bandury do agresji jako zachowania wyuczonego społecznie.

Szczególną uwagę zwrócono na humanistyczną perspektywę F. Perlsa, który postrzegał agresję jako niezbędny element adaptacji i rozwoju osobistego. Stwierdzono, że agresja może być wykorzystana do "konstruktywnej destrukcji" przestarzałych form zachowania i integracji nowych doświadczeń.

Na podstawie analizy źródeł naukowych wyciągnięto wniosek o potencjale agresji jako mechanizmu adaptacyjnego, który sprzyja ochronie, przewyżczeniu frustracji i osiąganiu celów. Określono perspektywę dalszych badań, które obejmują badanie neurobiologicznych mechanizmów agresji, wpływu kontekstu społecznego, opracowanie praktycznych metod konstruktywnego wykorzystania agresji, a także badanie etycznych aspektów i pozytywnych funkcji agresji.

Artykuł przyczynia się do głębszego zrozumienia agresji jako złożonego zjawiska społecznego oraz jej roli w adaptacji i rozwoju osobowości.

Słowa kluczowe: agresja, frustracja, teoria agresji, zachowanie agresywne.