Scientific article
UDC 159.9
https://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2023.3.2

Young People and the Internet: Subjective Factors in Choosing Online Behavior Strategies

Elena A. Suroedova[1], Maria A. Davydova[1*], Anastasia V. Grishina[1]

[1] Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation

[*] Corresponding author: 18121980dma@gmail.com

Abstract

Introduction. Technologies and digital communication play a crucial role in everyday life. With the increasing number of people spending a significant amount of time online, the study of subjective factors influencing online behavior strategies becomes highly relevant. The novelty of this research lies in identifying online behavior strategies among young individuals and examining the factor structures of young people with different online behavior strategies. This article presents the results of studying the personality traits of students with various online behavior strategies. **Methods.** Various methods were employed, including theoretical analysis and summarization of research findings on this issue; psychodiagnostic research methods; mathematical and statistical analysis (descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney U-test, cluster analysis, factor analysis). In the study, 177 students aged 17 to 21 participated. Two groups were distinguished in order to differentiate students based on their online behavior strategies: students with an entertainment-oriented Internet behavior (n = 124) and students with a productive-oriented Internet behavior (n = 53). **Results.** The following results were obtained: among contemporary youth who are active in the online environment, two strategies of online behavior are identified - entertainment-oriented online behavior strategy and productive-oriented strategy. The choice of behavior strategy is related to the respondents' personality traits. Significant differences were found between the groups of students with different online behavior strategies in terms of adaptability, self-acceptance, and autonomy. **Discussion.** The authors examine the personality traits of youth with different online behavior strategies. In conclusion, it is concluded that the factor structures of students with different online behavior strategies differ.

Keywords

online behavior strategies, youth behavior on the internet, online environment, adaptability, psychological well-being, meaning in life orientations, students

Funding

The article was carried out with the support of the RSF (Project 22-78-10107) titled "Transformations of Constructive and Destructive Strategies of Information Behavior of Youth in the Context of Increasing Geopolitical Risks: Psychological, Psychophysiological, and Psychogenetic Predictors."

For citation

Suroedova, E. A., Davydova, M. A., Grishina, A. V. (2023). Young People and the Internet: Subjective Factors in Choosing Online Behavior Strategies. *Russian Psychological Journal, 20*(3), 29–47. https://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2023.3.2

Introduction

The integration of the Internet, virtual space, digital technologies, and the network society into everyday life has marked a shift towards online activity, prompting sociologists and psychologists to contemplate the crisis of reality. In the early 21st century, virtual space was considered a separate dimension that users could enter and exit, as they were confined to desktop computers (Castells, 2004). However, with the development of mobile devices, the digital environment became ubiquitous (Kravchenko, 2019). The blurring of the boundaries between real and virtual spaces is reflected in the paradigms of "synchronization society" (Moiseev, 2014) and "augmented reality" (Diemer, Alpers, Peperkorn, Shiban & Mühlberger, 2015). The digital environment is a sphere of activity based on digital technologies, including software products, information systems, and devices. The digital environment is a component of innovative human work and a part of the social structure of society. Thanks to the unlimited possibilities of the media space, users can choose comfortable roles and online behavior strategies in the face of rapidly growing virtual reality opportunities. Activity on social networks can influence the status and prestige of young people.

The aim of the study is to investigate the subjective factors influencing the choice of online behavior strategies among students. It can be assumed that differences in personality traits will be identified among students employing different online behavior strategies. The research objectives include:

1) Conducting a comparative analysis of the personality traits of students employing different online behavior strategies in the Internet environment;

2) Determining the subjective factors influencing students' choices of online behavior strategies.

Methods

In the study, 177 students from the Don State Technical University participated. The average age of the respondents was 19 years (ranging from 17 to 24 years), and the gender distribution was 15% males and 85% females.

To identify online behavior strategies among college students, we conducted a questionnaire survey.

The following methods were used to assess personality traits:

- Rogers-Diamond Social Psychological Adaptation Diagnostic Method (Osnitsky, 2004);
- Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire (adapted by T. V. Kornilova) (Kornilova, 2013);
- Stress Appraisal and Coping Scale (SACS) by S. Hobfoll (Banshchikova, Sokolovsky, Morosanova, 2020);
- Assessment of Nervous-Mental Tension Method (T. A. Nemchin);
- Differential Reflection Type Questionnaire by D. A. Leontiev and E. N. Osin (Leontiev, Osin, 2014);
- Ryff Psychological Well-being Scale (PWB) (adapted by N. N. Lepeshinsky) (Lepeshinsky, 2007);
- Spielberger-Hanin Anxiety Scale (adapted by Batarshev, 2007)).

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods for data processing and interpretation, including: cluster analysis; factor analysis (principal component method, varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization); descriptive statistical methods; statistical criterion for detecting differences between groups (Mann-Whitney U-test method).

Results

The survey data underwent cluster analysis, during which groups of students with two distinct online behavior strategies were identified:

- a strategy characterized by entertainment-oriented behavior in the Internet environment;
- a strategy characterized by productive-oriented behavior in the Internet environment.

The first group (entertainment-oriented strategy) included the largest number of

respondents (124 individuals). During the survey, students noted that, in the context of changes in the media landscape due to restrictions imposed on companies providing services for some previously popular social networks within the territory of the Russian Federation, the amount of time spent in the online environment either increased or remained unchanged. Their consumption of media content remained practically unchanged. Respondents indicated that they had no interest in dating websites, live streaming on social networks, earning money through social media and the Internet, or engaging in business-related communication. This group of respondents can be referred to as "***media content consumers***."

The second group (productive-oriented strategy) consisted of 53 respondents. Students in this group have noted that recently, there has been a significant or moderate decrease in the amount of time spent in the online environment. They have significantly reduced their use of social networks for interpersonal and business communication, finding romantic partners, learning and development, gaming activities, publication activity, and online earnings. There has been an increase in information consumption, offline and messenger-based communication. It is worth noting that in the past and present, this group of students has been characterized by their activity in creating media content.

Thus, we have identified two groups of students with different behavior strategies in the online environment. The first group consists of students characterized by a high level of media content consumption but who are not active content creators. The amount of time they spend in the online environment has either remained unchanged or increased. The second group comprises respondents who are both consumers and active creators of media content. In the current circumstances, their time spent in the online environment has decreased, but there has been an increase in communication time through messengers and offline interactions.

During the study of personality traits in groups of students with different online behavior strategies in current conditions, the following differences were identified (Table 1).

Based on the results of the "Social-Psychological Adaptation" and "Psychological Well-being Scale" assessments, respondents with the first strategy (entertainment-oriented) are characterized by immaturity, neurotic deviations, and an inability to make decisions. They exhibit a low degree of social interaction and communication needs, along with emotional ambiguity towards the world and the people, events, objects, and phenomena in it (discomfort, apathy, depression, etc.).

On the other hand, students with the second strategy of online behavior (productive orientation) are characterized by independence, non-conformity, and the ability to resist societal pressures. They autonomously regulate their own behavior, evaluate themselves based on personal criteria, hold a positive self-image, acknowledge and accept various aspects of themselves, including both their positive and negative qualities, and have a positive outlook on their past.

Table 1

Results of a comparative analysis of the personality traits of respondents with different online behavior strategies

(Mann-Whitney U-test)							
	Rogers-Diamond's scales of the social-psychological adaptation diagnosis methodology					Well-being Scale (PWB)	
	Mal-adaptation	Non-acceptance of others	Integral indicator of emotional comfort	Emotional discomfort	Subjugation	Autonomy	Self-acceptance
	M (σ)	M (σ)	M (σ)	M (σ)	M (σ)	M (σ)	M (σ)
Group 1	82,61 (35,5)	18,09 (8,9)	56,90 (19,1)	20,00 (11,7)	18,03 (8,4)	46,39 (22,3)	45,73 (23,9)
Group 2	68,55 (35,5)	15,08 (7,3)	61,64 (19,1)	15,51 (9,6)	15,60 (7,1)	52,23 (21,0)	52,60 (22,7)
U-test	2520,5	2540,0	2627,5	2492,0	2648,5	2679,500	2643,500
p	,01	,01	,03	,01	,04	,05	,04

To explore the structure of personal characteristics in respondents with different online behavior strategies and examine the interrelationships between these traits, a factor analysis was conducted. During the factorization and rotation process, two distinct structures were identified, differing in quantitative and qualitative characteristics.

In a group of students with the first Internet behavior strategy, the factor structure can be characterized as unstable, inconsistent, and incomplete, as indicated by 4 variables (constituting 8.88%) that are excluded from the overall structure. Six variables (13.3%)

exhibit a negative orientation. The structure comprises seven factors, explaining 73.2% of the variance (factor extraction method - principal component analysis, with Varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization, convergence achieved after ten iterations) (see Table 2). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is 0.812. Commonality analysis revealed the highest values for the following indicators: "Environmental Management" (0.963), "Self-acceptance" (0.961), "Life Goals" (0.956), and "Personal Growth" (0.952).

The first and most informative factor combines indicators characterizing personal immaturity: "Maladjustment," "Integrated Emotional Discomfort Score" (negative orientation), "Integrated Adaptation Score" (negative orientation), "Personal Anxiety Scale," "Emotional Discomfort," "External Control," "Integrated Self-Acceptance Score" (negative orientation), "Self-Rejection," "Integrated Internality Score" (negative orientation), "Situational Anxiety Scale," "Avoidance," "Quasi-Reflection," "Integrated Dominance Aspiration Score" (negative orientation), " Subjugation," and "Integrated Acceptance of Others Score" (negative orientation). This factor can be labeled as "personal immaturity".

For students following the first internet behavior strategy, personal immaturity and neurotic deviations are closely linked to both personal and situational anxiety. They exhibit a low inclination towards interacting with others, engaging in communication, and establishing connections with their surroundings. Furthermore, they express dissatisfaction with their character traits, coupled with a high level of suppression, lethargy, and apathy towards the world, ongoing events, and phenomena. The above-mentioned characteristics are associated with traits such as an inability to take responsibility for events happening around them and in their lives, a tendency to attribute their failures to external circumstances, and a predisposition to adapt to the real or perceived needs and interests of other people. These respondents' thoughts are directed not towards their current life situation but towards past or future potential events.

Six variables exhibit a negative orientation within the structure. Students following the first strategy experience negative emotional states, tend to avoid taking responsibility for events in their lives, and are not inclined to dominate over others.

The second factor encompasses indicators characterizing psychological well-being: "Personal Growth," "Life Goals," "Autonomy," "Environmental Management," "Psychological Well-being," "Self-Acceptance," and "Positive Relationships." These variables are related to the individual's life orientations and form the basis for comprehensive personal development and life functioning.

The third factor combines variables related to the behavioral characteristics of students: "Hyper-vigilance," "Procrastination," "Avoidance," "Cautious Actions," "Introspection," and "Seeking Social Support."

The fourth factor groups the following indicators: "Adaptability," "Systemic Reflection," "Internal Control," "Self-Acceptance," and "Acceptance of Others."

The fifth factor is represented by Manipulative, Aggressive, Antisocial, and Impulsive behaviors.

The sixth factor combines the scales of Dominance, Escapism, and Non-Acceptance of others.

The seventh factor includes the scale of Involvement in social contact, indicating the need of students with the first strategy for receiving support and attention from others.

From the factorial structure of interrelationships, certain indicators such as Emotional Comfort, Nervous-Mental Stress Scale, Assertive Actions, and Vigilance "dropped out". It can be assumed that these indicators are not related to the peculiarities of online behavior among students with the first strategy.

Thus, the factorial structure of the subjective characteristics of students with the first strategy of online behavior is incomplete, inconsistent, and contradictory (Table 2).

Table 2

Rotated matrix of subjective feature components in the group of respondents with the first online behavior strategy

Variables	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maladaptivity	0,946	-0,058	-0,025	-0,013	-0,007	-0,014	0,009
Integral Indicator of Emotional Comfort	-0,821	0,244	-0,045	0,070	-0,022	-0,199	-0,013
Integral indicator of adaptation	-0,820	0,147	-0,178	0,144	-0,036	0,282	0,069
Personality Anxiety Scale	0,816	-0,103	-0,230	-0,010	0,107	-0,035	-0,117
Emotional Discomfort	0,794	-0,098	0,373	-0,014	0,050	0,182	-0,086
External Control	0,774	-0,009	0,383	-0,089	-0,060	0,341	0,031
Integral Indicator of Self-Acceptance	-0,760	0,085	0,079	0,299	0,112	-0,238	-0,064
Self-Rejection	0,730	-0,046	0,301	-0,124	-0,029	0,087	0,009

Variables	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Integral Indicator of Internality	-0,700	0,173	-0,271	0,179	0,081	-0,326	-0,187
Situational Anxiety Scale	0,674	-0,151	0,037	0,007	0,247	0,089	-0,297
Avoidance	0,592	-0,019	0,266	-0,053	0,288	-0,015	0,381
Quasireflexivity	0,567	0,043	0,204	0,377	0,146	0,106	-0,104
Integral Indicator of Dominance Aspiration	-0,564	0,150	-0,166	0,244	0,229	0,234	-0,470
Subjugation	0,549	-0,016	-0,183	-0,139	-0,178	0,308	0,478
Integral Indicator of Acceptance of Others	-0,508	0,137	-0,147	0,328	-0,046	-0,468	0,349
Emotional Comfort	-0,435	0,031	0,409	0,399	0,048	0,207	0,153
Scale of Nervous-Mental Stress	0,379	-0,052	-0,111	-0,007	0,316	-0,086	-0,144
Assertive Actions	-0,327	0,077	-0,097	0,022	-0,084	0,127	-0,133
Personal Growth	-0,036	0,970	-0,012	0,091	-0,010	0,005	-0,020
Life Goals	-0,131	0,963	0,031	0,103	0,004	0,005	0,018
Autonomy	-0,099	0,956	-0,035	0,051	0,019	0,044	-0,070

Variables	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Environmental Management	-0,201	0,951	0,012	0,083	-0,099	0,019	0,022
Psychological Well-being	-0,048	0,947	-0,111	0,082	0,030	0,001	0,037
Self-Acceptance	-0,244	0,944	0,051	0,084	-0,026	0,025	0,007
Positive Relationships	-0,028	0,910	0,001	0,053	-0,140	-0,059	0,065
Hyper-Vigilance	0,242	-0,052	0,924	-0,061	0,017	0,067	-0,062
Procrastination	0,216	-0,060	0,913	-0,105	0,001	0,103	-0,054
Avoidance	0,245	-0,040	0,885	-0,182	-0,027	0,044	0,006
Cautious Actions	-0,098	-0,003	0,739	0,018	0,304	0,054	0,304
Introspection	0,613	-0,053	0,654	0,047	0,090	0,008	-0,119
Social Support Seeking	-0,073	0,132	0,537	0,002	0,184	-0,009	0,487
Vigilance	0,035	0,027	0,477	0,001	-0,016	-0,015	-0,038
Adaptability	-0,438	0,227	-0,314	0,704	0,088	-0,173	0,081
Systemic Reflection	0,063	0,096	-0,127	0,670	-0,041	0,152	-0,023
Internal Control	-0,050	0,225	-0,310	0,653	-0,002	-0,223	-0,305

Variables	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Self-Acceptance	-0,499	0,105	0,076	0,648	0,110	-0,138	0,041
Acceptance of Others	-0,116	0,079	0,199	0,546	-0,218	-0,209	0,381
Manipulative Actions	0,017	-0,131	0,127	0,063	0,735	0,225	0,143
Aggressive Actions	0,373	0,011	-0,062	0,064	0,719	-0,074	0,074
Antisocial Actions	-0,078	-0,072	0,368	-0,056	0,715	0,011	-0,059
Impulsive Actions	-0,020	0,021	-0,120	-0,127	0,621	0,131	0,465
Dominance	-0,126	0,050	0,255	0,030	0,270	0,805	0,067
Escapism (Avoidance of Problems)	0,469	0,068	-0,185	-0,077	0,016	0,699	0,082
Non-Acceptance of Others	0,528	-0,017	0,317	-0,131	-0,023	0,610	-0,221
Social Engagement	-0,089	0,012	-0,058	0,087	0,255	0,010	0,748
Dispersion (Load)	22,21	14,91	12,30	6,45	6,06	5,93	5,37

In a group of students **with the second behavior strategy on the Internet** under changed conditions, the factor structure can be characterized as incomplete, stable,

and consistent. It includes six factors that explain 79.527% of the variance (factor extraction method: principal component analysis, rotation method: varimax with Kaiser normalization, convergence reached after ten iterations) (Table 3). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sample adequacy is 0.585 (which is a good value for sample adequacy). Commonality analysis showed that the highest values were observed for the indicators of "Environmental Management" (0.957), "Personal Growth" (0.957), and "Integrated Adaptation Index" (0.921). This structure is incomplete, as evidenced by two variables (accounting for 4.44%) that are "outside" the overall structure (Table 3). Variables with negative direction in the structure were not identified.

The key factor includes scales such as "Scale of Personal Anxiety," "Maladaptation," "Introspection," "Emotional Discomfort," "Situation-specific Anxiety Scale," "Hyper-Vigilance," "Self-Rejection," "Rejection of Others," "Avoidance," "External Locus of Control," "Quasi-Reflection," and "Subjugation". The results indicate that the choice of a productive online behavior strategy by young people is associated with increased anxiety, personal immaturity, decision-making difficulties, negative feelings about the current situation, excessive self-criticism, and reflection on the past or future, reluctance to engage with others, dissatisfaction with one's qualities and abilities, external locus of control, and anticipation of adversity and threats. This factor characterizes personal immaturity, the inability to take responsibility for life events, and the inability to adapt flexibly to changing conditions.

The **second factor** includes scales such as "Adaptability," "Integrated Adaptation Index," "Self-Acceptance," "Integrated Self-Acceptance Index," "Integrated Other-Acceptance Index," "Acceptance of Others," "Integrated Emotional Comfort Index," "Integrated Internality Index," "Internal Locus of Control," "Systemic Reflection," "Vigilance," and "Integrated Dominance Orientation Index." The nature of this constellation suggests a connection between the second online behavior strategy and the respondents' ability to adapt to societal demands in line with their needs and goals; adequate self-assessment; a willingness to engage and communicate with others; positive emotional experiences towards their surrounding reality; high internality, meaning the ability to take responsibility for their life; intolerance of uncertainty; rationality; reflexivity; and a drive for leadership.

The third factor includes scales reflecting psychological well-being: "Positive Relationships," "Personal Growth," "Environmental Management," "Life Goals," "Autonomy," "Psychological Well-being," and "Self-Acceptance."

The fourth factor comprises the following scales: "Seeking Social Support," "Engagement in Social Contacts," "Cautious," "Manipulative," "Antisocial," "Assertive," and "Aggressive Actions."

The fifth factor encompasses "Dominance," "Emotional Comfort," and "Escapism."

The sixth factor, contributing to 5.639% of the total variance, includes coping behavior strategies such as "Avoidance" and "Impulsive Actions."

Table 3

Rotated matrix of subjective feature components in the group of respondents with the second online behavior strategy

Variables	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Personality Anxiety Scale	**0,920**	0,119	0,014	-0,110	-0,027	0,079
Maladaptation	**0,887**	-0,138	-0,104	0,135	0,035	0,210
Introspection	**0,840**	0,009	0,091	0,147	-0,005	0,080
Emotional Discomfort	**0,820**	-0,239	-0,231	0,045	0,320	-0,011
Situational Anxiety Scale	**0,799**	-0,021	0,030	-0,015	-0,080	0,064
Hyper-Vigilance	**0,751**	-0,182	-0,102	-0,070	-0,050	0,176
Self-Rejection	**0,723**	-0,278	-0,102	0,254	0,263	0,038
Rejection of Others	**0,697**	-0,313	-0,304	0,233	-0,069	-0,050
Avoidance	**0,663**	-0,005	0,003	0,144	0,036	0,569
External Control	**0,662**	-0,214	-0,024	0,074	0,600	0,230
Quasi-Reflection	**0,652**	0,247	-0,010	-0,044	0,277	0,295
Subjugation	**0,601**	-0,111	-0,016	-0,141	0,366	0,497
Procrastination	0,493	-0,077	0,088	0,065	0,166	0,455
Nervous-Psychic Strain Scale	0,469	-0,013	0,032	-0,047	-0,052	-0,084
Adaptability	-0,009	**0,888**	0,203	0,113	0,046	-0,002
Integrated Adaptation Index	-0,290	**0,855**	0,301	0,120	0,012	-0,043

Variables	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Self-Acceptance	-0,149	**0,835**	0,282	0,160	-0,012	0,061
Integrated Self-Acceptance Index	-0,294	**0,833**	0,304	-0,006	-0,041	0,045
Integrated Other-Acceptance Index	-0,198	**0,833**	0,382	-0,067	0,088	0,139
Acceptance of Others	-0,057	**0,787**	0,250	-0,117	0,116	0,242
Integrated Emotional Comfort Index	-0,422	**0,764**	0,342	0,079	0,042	0,113
Integrated Internality Index	-0,200	**0,754**	0,279	0,130	0,013	-0,258
Internal Control	0,278	**0,733**	0,151	0,244	0,320	-0,238
Systemic Reflection	0,325	**0,715**	0,113	0,301	0,047	0,096
Vigilance	0,240	**0,643**	0,138	0,200	-0,295	-0,169
Integrated Dominance Orientation Index	-0,204	**0,612**	0,214	0,365	0,193	-0,369
Positive Relationships	-0,012	0,258	**0,928**	-0,107	-0,044	0,061
Personal Growth	0,004	0,296	**0,916**	0,164	0,011	0,065
Environmental Management	-0,159	0,292	**0,915**	0,086	-0,003	-0,033
Life Goals	-0,028	0,306	**0,892**	0,135	0,029	-0,011

Variables	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Autonomy	0,056	0,219	**0,887**	0,181	-0,089	-0,159
Psychological Well-being	0,017	0,235	**0,882**	0,096	-0,045	0,007
Self-Acceptance	-0,114	0,327	**0,873**	-0,140	0,026	0,051
Seeking Social Support	-0,115	0,134	0,061	**0,905**	-0,013	0,203
Cautious Actions	0,139	0,095	0,168	**0,862**	0,034	0,142
Manipulative Actions	-0,045	0,034	-0,052	**0,855**	0,020	-0,193
Antisocial Actions	0,182	-0,024	-0,032	**0,828**	0,212	-0,020
Engagement in Social Contacts	0,098	0,293	0,084	**0,821**	0,000	0,293
Assertive Actions	-0,150	0,206	0,211	**0,799**	-0,252	0,047
Aggressive Actions	0,496	0,152	-0,036	**0,637**	0,173	-0,189
Dominance	-0,061	0,138	0,004	0,093	**0,904**	-0,111
Emotional Comfort	-0,070	0,369	0,007	0,027	**0,838**	0,144
Escapism (Avoidance of Problems)	0,393	-0,125	-0,093	-0,007	**0,828**	0,140
Avoidance	0,549	-0,200	-0,039	0,032	-0,047	**0,644**
Impulsive Actions	0,145	0,169	0,005	0,193	0,074	**0,628**
Dispersion (Load)	19,907	19,110	15,032	12,259	7,579	5,639

Discussion

The concept of the "digital turn" (Kravchenko, 2019) emphasizes the impact of digitization on people's leisure time and behavior in the online environment. Most spheres, such as work, education, and leisure, are becoming digital, drawing more and more people

into the online space. The development of smartphone applications, social networks, online games, and live sports event streaming shape digital culture and online behavior. Online behavior of users is generally understood as the consumption of information on the Internet and content production on various new media platforms (Garbuznyak, 2022).

A survey of students revealed that the majority of them are active consumers of media content, and some actively create content. Students are spending more and more time online, primarily playing games and engaging in social networks. However, they are less interested in communicating through messengers, earning money through social networks, or forming romantic relationships online. Using cluster analysis, two groups of students were identified: the first group prefers online communication and content consumption, while the second group tends to create their own content and earn money online. Lately, they have started to engage more in real-life communication and messaging platforms.

The results of the comparative analysis indicate that girls and boys with the first behavioral strategy in the online environment are less adaptive. They experience negative emotions and distress more frequently, exhibit less inclination to engage in direct communication with others, establish fewer interpersonal contacts, tend to perceive others as hostile, and demonstrate compliance and conformity. Students with the second strategy, on the other hand, exhibit a higher degree of self-esteem and self-acceptance, independence, and autonomy.

When comparing the factorial structures, it can be observed that they differ in qualitative characteristics, the number of identified factors, their sequence, completeness, and consistency. The first factor, which we labeled as "Personality Immaturity" in both groups, is consistent; however, the composition varies slightly. In the general factor of the first group, there are significantly more variables, and additionally, there are scales with a negative orientation. In the second factor within the group of students with the first behavioral strategy, a cluster of scales from the "Psychological Well-being Scale" methodology emerged, whereas in the group of students with the second strategy, a cluster was formed demonstrating connections to adaptability, self-acceptance, acceptance of others, internality, reflectiveness, vigilance, and a tendency towards leadership. Differences in the composition of clusters are noted in the fourth factor. Thus, students with the first strategy tend to exhibit non-constructive coping behaviors, while respondents with the second strategy display a complex mix of constructive and destructive coping mechanisms in challenging situations.

According to T. Scholz, there are two main trends in the transformation from analog behavior culture to digital: deterritorialization of space and time and disintermediation (Scholz, Routledge, 2013). K. Spracklen, an expert in internet behavior, believes that the distinctions between reality and simulation are disappearing, giving rise to virtual spaces for work, education, and entertainment. Online activities are interactive, and

social networks contribute to a sense of belonging (Spracklen, 2015). Research results on problematic internet technology usage by individuals indicate the development of maladaptation (Churchill, Clark, Prochaska-Cue, Creswell, 2007). Various types of online behavior have been identified, such as shopping, pornography, surfing, and excessive use of chat and social networks. It has been found that men are more likely to engage in online gaming, while women tend to have problematic online shopping behavior (Ioannidis et al., 2018). People who frequently use the internet may experience depression, anxiety, depersonalization, as well as a desire to cope with negative emotions and a lack of social support (Dolzhenkova, Bortnikova, 2021).

Research in the field of problematic internet usage and its relationship with individual characteristics is increasingly conducted. These studies encompass research on the personality of internet-dependent users, the identification of predictors for the development of internet-dependent behavior (Mehroof, Griffiths, 2010; Dmitriev, 2013; Kolmogortseva, 2017; Hawi, Samaha, 2019), clinical variants of problematic internet use (Petrov, Chernyak, 2020), preferences of internet-dependent respondents (Zykova, 2020), the connection between personality traits and the regulation of online activity among students (Panshina, Sungurova, Karabushchenko, 2021), the association between problematic internet use and mental well-being (Kholmagorova, Gerasimova, 2019), and the psychological characteristics of individuals with problematic and adaptive internet use (Orestova, Filippova, 2022), cultural and historical phenomena on the Internet (Zhuravlev, Zinchenko, Kitova, 2022), cultural mediation of digital generation identity (Shaigerova, Shilko, Vakhantseva, 2022).

In recent years, Russian researchers have shown interest in several aspects of the role of the Internet in shaping the identity and value orientations of young people (Kopteva, 2017; Mayatskaya, 2017; Shumskikh, Gladskikh, Budanova, 2017; Temina, 2017), the spiritual and moral development of youth (Grandova, 2017; Emelyanenko, 2017), and socialization in the online environment (Orlov, Orlova, 2018). All of these studies help to form an understanding of the current changes in the processes of socialization among contemporary youth, which are occurring under the influence of digitization. There is also a concept of cyber-socialization as a new socio-psychological phenomenon (Pleshakov, 2011; Marcinkovskaya, 2012; Martsinkovskaya, 2019).

Conclusion

The behavior of students in the online environment in current conditions is influenced by various subjective factors and has an impact on the future direction of young people's life activities. Studying the characteristics of youth behavior in virtual space in relation to their individual traits allows for the prediction of adaptive capabilities, meaning of life, and behavioral orientations of young people. Analysis of the results allows us to conclude that young people with the second behavioral strategy demonstrate significantly more pronounced adaptive potential and psychological well-being in the current online environment. Moreover, these respondents in the current online environment tend to

satisfy their communication and social interaction needs in face-to-face communication and employ a variety of coping strategies in difficult situations.

The identification of the structural features of students' subjective factors has shown that the factor structures in groups of respondents with different online behavior strategies differ in terms of completeness, consistency, and integration. There is a tendency towards a higher level of formation of factor structures depending on behavior in the online environment under current conditions. The obtained results will enable the implementation of corrective measures with young people aimed at changing their online behavior, developing adaptive potential, fostering adequate behavioral responses, and enhancing their personal characteristics.

References

Banshchikova, T. N., Sokolovskiy, M. L., Morosanova, V. I. (2020). Coping Strategies for Stressful Situations: Psychometric Characteristics of the Russian Version of the Instrument. *Siberian Psychological Journal*, 76, 55–77. https://doi.org/10.17223/17267080/76/4

Batarshev, A. V. (2005). *Basic Psychological Properties and Self-Determination of Personality: Practical Guide to Psychological Assessment*. Rech.

Garbuznyak, A. Y. (2022). Analysis of Online Behavior of Russian New Media Users During Periods of Political Tension in 2020-2021. *Journal of Political Research*, 4, 31–43. https://doi.org/10.12737/2587-6295-2022-6-4-31-43

Grandova, S. I. (2017). The Impact of the Internet on the Spiritual and Moral Development of Schoolchildren and Students. *ASOU Conference: Collection of Scientific Papers and Materials of Scientific and Practical Conferences, 1*, 1094–1098.

Dmitriev, K. G. (2013). *Psychological Determinants of Internet Addiction in Adolescence.* Moscow Pedagogical State University.

Dolzhenkova, M. I., Bortnikova, T. G. (2021). Issues of Organizing Digital Leisure in Foreign Research Practice. *Bulletin of Tambov University. Series: Humanities,* 26(195), 210–222.

Emelyanenko, V. D. (2017). The Internet and the Human Spiritual World: a Values and Worldview Approach. *Bulletin of Minin University*, 4(21).

Zykova, E. I. (2020). Features of the Relationship between Psychological Boundaries and Internet Addiction Tendency. *National Health*, 2, 63–68.

Castells, M. (2004). *The Internet Galaxy*. Yekaterinburg.

Kolmogortseva, A. A. (2017). Predictive Model of the Structure of Personal Traits in Individuals with Internet Addiction. *World of Science*, 5(3), 1–9.

Kopteva, V. K. (2017). The Impact of Internet Communities on Personality Formation. Kommunikologiya: Electronic Scientific Journal, 2(3), 67–74.

Kornilova, T. V. (2013). Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire: Russian Adaptation. *Psychological Research,* 6(31), 4. https://doi.org/10.54359/ps.v6i31.671

Kravchenko, S. A. (2019). Sociology in Motion: The Relevance of the Humanistic Digital Turn. *Bulletin of the Russian University of Friendship of Peoples. Series: Sociology*, 19(3), 397–405. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2019-19-3-397-405

Leontiev, D. A., Osin, E. N. (2014). "Good" and "Bad" Reflection: From an Explanatory Model to Differential Diagnosis. Psychology. *Journal of the Higher School of Economics,* 11(4), 110–135.

Lepeshinsky, N. N. (2007). Adaptation of the "Psychological Well-being Scale" by K. Riff. *Psychological Journal*, 3, 24–37.

Marczinkovskaya, T. D. (2012). Informational Socialization in the Changing Information Space. *Psychological Research: Electronic Scientific Journal,* 5(26), 7.

Mayatskaya, O. B. (2017). The Influence of the Internet on the Values of the Young Generation of Russians. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 12(25), 354–358.

Moiseev, V. N. (2014). The Society of Synchronization: The Individual and Their Digital Profile. *Observatory of Culture*, 5, 109–113. https://doi.org/10.25281/2072-3156-2014-0-5-107-111

Orestova, V. R., Philippova, O. S. (2022). Differences in Psychological Characteristics of People with Problematic and Adaptive Internet Use. *RGGU Bulletin. Series "Psychology. Pedagogy. Education,"* 1, 119–133. https://doi.org/10.28995/2073-6398-2022-1- 119-133

Orlov, A. A., Orlova, L. A. (2018). Characteristics of the "Network Personality" as an Innovation in the Content Structure of Pedagogical Education. *Pedagogy*, 7, 12–22.

Osnitsky, A. K. (2004). Determining the Characteristics of Social Adaptation. *Psychology and School*, 1, 43–56.

Panshina, S. E., Sungurova, N. L., Karabushchenko, N. B. (2021). Personality Traits of Students in Regulating Internet Activity. *Education and Science*, 23(3), 101–130.

Petrov, A. A., Chernyak, N. B. (2020). Contemporary Trends in Adverse Clinical and Social Dynamics of Personality Disorders in Problematic Internet Use. *Siberian Journal of Psychiatry and Narcology*, 3(108), 83–91.

Pleshakov, V. A. (2011). *Theory of Human Cybersocialization*. Homo Cyberus.

Temina, S. Y. (2017). Main Directions and Leading Trends in the Influence of Information Technologies on the Development and Upbringing of Emerging Personalities. *World of Education - Education in the World, 1*(65), 206–210.

Khomogorova, A. B., Gerasimova, A. A. (2019). Psychological Factors of Problematic Internet Use among Adolescent Girls. *Consultative Psychology and Psychotherapy,* 27(3), 138–155.

Shumskikh, T. Y., Gladskikh, N. A., Budanova, M. V. (2017). The Influence of the Internet on the Processes of Social Adaptation of Schoolchildren and Students. *Central Scientific Bulletin*, 2(9), 3–6.

Churchill, S. L., Clark, V. L. P., Prochaska-Cue, K., Creswell, J. W. (2007). How rural low-income families have fun: a grounded theory study. *Journal of Leisure Research, 39*(2), 271–294.

Diemer, J., Alpers, G. W., Peperkorn, H. M., Shiban, Y., Mühlberger, A. (2015). The impact of perception and presence on emotional reactions: A review of research in virtual reality. *Frontiers in psychology, 6*, 26.

Scholz, T. (2013). *Digital labor: the internet as playground and factory*. Routledge.

Hawi, N., Samaha, M. (2019). Identifying commonalities and differences in personality characteristics of Internet and social media addiction profiles: traits, self-esteem, and self-construal. *Behaviour & Information Technology, 38*(2), 110–119.

Ioannidis, K., Treder, M. S., Chamberlain, S. R. et al. (2018). Problematic internet use as an age-related multifaceted problem: Evidence from a two-site survey. *Addictive Behaviors, 81*, 157–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.02.017

Martsinkovskaya, T. D. (2019). The Person in Transitive and Virtual Space: New Challenges of Modality. *Psychology in Russia: State of the art, 12*(2), 165–176.

Mehroof, M., Griffiths, M.D. (2010). Online Gaming Addiction: The Role of Sensation Seeking, Self-Control, Neuroticism, Aggression, State Anxiety, and Trait Anxiety. *Cyberpsychology, behavior, and social networking, 13*(3), 313–316.

Shaigerova, L.A., Shilko, R.S., Vakhantseva, O.V. (2022) Cultural Mediation of the Identity of the Digital Generation: Perspectives on the Analysis of Internet Activity and Social Media. Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Seriya 14. Psikhologiya [Moscow University Psychology Bulletin], 2, 73–107. https://doi.org/10.11621/vsp.2022.02.04

Spracklen, K. (2015). *Digital Leisure, the Internet and Popular Culture. Communities and Identities in a Digital Age*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137405876

Zhuravlev, A.L., Zinchenko, Y.P., Kitova, D.A. (2022). Trends in the Study of Cultural-Historical Phenomena on the Internet (based on a study of Russians' attitudes towards money). *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art, 15*(1), 103–119. https://doi.org/10.11621/pir.2022.0107

Received: February 14, 2023
Revision received: April 04, 2023
Accepted: June 06, 2023

Author Contribution

Elena Alexandrovna Suroedova – research planning and execution, analysis, and interpretation of results.

Maria Anatolyevna Davydova – working with sources, writing the review section of the article.

Anastasia Vasilievna Grishina – research planning and execution, analysis, and interpretation of results.

Author Details

Maria Anatolyevna Davydova – Cand.Sci. (Sociology), Associate Professor, Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9101-1885; e-mail: 18121980dma@gmail.com

Elena Alexandrovna Suroedova – Cand. Sci. (Psychology), Associate Professor, Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation; SPIN-code RSCI: 1460-0988, RSCI AuthorID: 758849; Web of Science ResearcherID: V-9677-2017; Scopus Author ID: 57193068821; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9784-0142; e-mail: suroedova@mail.ru

Anastasia Vasilievna Grishina – Cand. Sci. (Psychology), Associate Professor, Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation; SPIN-code RSCI: 3773-3150, RSCI AuthorID: 756187; Web of Science ResearcherID: AAE-1641-2020; Scopus Author ID: 57218092586; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4005-8744; e-mail: avgrishina.donstu@gmail.com

Conflict of Interest Information

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.