

Научная статья | Original paper

The relationship and intercultural differences in tolerance and existential characteristics of student youth (on example of Russia and Armenia)

A.S. Berbaryan¹ , S.A. Tepanyan¹

¹ Russian-Armenian University, Yerevan, Republic of Armenia

 apsy@inbox.ru

Abstract

Context and relevance. The article offers an analysis of the levels of tolerance and existential characteristics of student youth, highlights the differences between the levels of tolerance and existential fullness in different ethnic groups, and studies the relationship between the level of tolerance and existential characteristics of Armenian and Russian student youth. **Objective.** The aim is to study the relationship between tolerance levels and existential characteristics of student youth in different sociocultural environments — the Republic of Armenia and the Russian Federation. **Hypothesis.** The hypotheses of our study were the following: 1) We assume that there exists a relationship between the levels of tolerance and certain existential characteristics; 2) We assume that the levels of tolerance and existential characteristics are different in Armenian and Russian student youth. **Methods and materials.** The study involved 100 participants (Armenian and Russian students). The subjects were divided into 2 groups (50% each): Armenian and Russian students ($M = 20,94$; 16% male, 84% female). We assessed the respondents' levels of tolerance and existential characteristics using the following assessment methods: the "Index of Tolerance" questionnaire by G.U. Soldatova, O.A. Kravtsova, and O.E. Khukhlaeva; and the Existence Scale (ES) by A. Langle, K. Orgler, and S.V. Krivtsova. **Results.** According to our first hypothesis, we observed statistically significant correlations between the general level of tolerance and certain existential characteristics. According to our second hypothesis, we identified statistically significant differences in the levels of tolerance and existential characteristics in Armenian and Russian student youth. **Conclusions.** The results showed medium and low statistically significant correlations between the general level of tolerance and existential characteristics in the Russian sample, while no statistically significant correlation was discovered in the general level of tolerance and the existential characteristics in the Armenian sample. The differences between the two samples can be attributed to the differences in the sociocultural situation in the Republic of Armenia and the Russian Federation.

Keywords: tolerance, existential characteristics, existential fullness, Armenian and Russian student youth, relationship

Funding. The research was supported by the Higher Education and Science Committee of MESCS RA (Research project № 10-2/24SSAH-5A039).

© Берберян А.С., Тепанян С.А., 2025



CC BY-NC

Supplemental data. Berberyan, A.S., Tepanyan, S.A. (2025). The relationship and intercultural differences in tolerance and existential characteristics of student youth (on example of Russia and Armenia) (data repository): Dataset. RusPsyData: Repository of psychological research and instruments. Moscow. <https://doi.org/10.48612/MSUPE/nemh-xd8u-tkmp>

For citation: Berberyan, A.S., Tepanyan, S.A. (2025). The relationship and intercultural differences in tolerance and existential characteristics of student youth (on example of Russia and Armenia). *Psychological Science and Education*, 30(6), 163–181. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2025300610>

Взаимосвязь и межкультурные различия толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристик студенческой молодежи (на примере России и Армении)

А.С. Берберян¹ , С.А. Тепанян¹

¹ Российско-Армянский университет, Ереван, Республика Армения

 aspsy@inbox.ru

Резюме

Контекст и актуальность. В статье представлен анализ уровней толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристик студенческой молодежи, выделены различия между уровнями толерантности и экзистенциальной наполненности в разных этнических группах, а также изучена взаимосвязь уровня толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристик армянской и российской студенческой молодежи. **Цель** — выявить взаимосвязь уровней толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристик студенческой молодежи в разных социокультурных средах — Республике Армения и Российской Федерации. **Гипотезами** нашего исследования были следующие: 1) мы предполагаем, что существует взаимосвязь между уровнем толерантности и некоторыми экзистенциальными характеристиками; 2) мы предполагаем, что уровни толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристик различаются у армянской и российской студенческой молодежи. **Методы и материалы.** В исследовании приняли участие 100 человек (армянские и российские студенты). Испытуемые представляли 2 группы (50%, 50%): армянские и российские студенты ($M = 20,94$, 16% мужчин, 84% женщин). Исследование уровня толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристик личности респондентов проводилось с использованием следующих методик: опросника «Индекс толерантности» Г.У. Солдатовой, О.А. Кравцовой, О.Е. Хухлаевой; шкалы экзистенциальности (ШЭ) А. Лэнгле, К. Орглера и С.В. Кривцовой.

Результаты. Согласно нашей первой гипотезе, мы выявили статистически значимые корреляционные связи между общим уровнем толерантности и некоторыми экзистенциальными характеристиками. Согласно нашей второй гипотезе, мы выявили статистически значимые различия в уровнях толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристиках личности у армянской и российской студенческой молодежи. **Выводы.** Результаты показали, что в российской выборке между общим уровнем толерант-

ности и экзистенциальными характеристиками личности наблюдаются статистически значимые умеренные и слабые корреляции, в то время как между общим уровнем толерантности и экзистенциальными характеристиками личности армянской выборки корреляции отсутствует. Различия между двумя выборками могут быть обусловлены различиями в социокультурной ситуации в Республике Армения и Российской Федерации.

Ключевые слова: толерантность, экзистенциальные характеристики, экзистенциальная наполненность, армянская и российская студенческая молодежь, взаимосвязь

Дополнительные данные. Берберян, А.С., Тепанян, С.А. (2025). Толерантность и экзистенциальные характеристики армянской и российской студенческой молодежи (репозиторий данных): Набор данных. RusPsyData: Репозиторий психологических исследований и инструментов. Москва. <https://doi.org/10.48612/MSUPE/nemh-xd8u-tkmp>

Финансирование. Исследование выполнено при поддержке Комитета высшего образования и науки МОНКС РА (научный проект № 10-2/24SSAH-5A039).

Для цитирования: Берберян, А.С., Тепанян, С.А. (2025). Взаимосвязь и межкультурные различия толерантности и экзистенциальных характеристик студенческой молодежи (на примере России и Армении). *Психологическая наука и образование*, 30(6), 163–181. (На русск.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2025300610>

Introduction

People in a world of cultural, religious, and ideological diversity confront situations where they do not always approve of the beliefs, values, or behavior of others. The processes of globalization stimulate this unconscious desire to differ from the uniform world. The criteria for otherness become more diverse and complex; they exit the framework of habitual racial and ethnic stereotypes, acquiring unique social, economic, sexual, gender, and other features.

The accelerating processes of globalization, the growth of pluralistic societies worldwide, and the undeniable growth of migration have brought forth the issue of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is conceptualized in terms of positive intergroup relations and 'productive diversity', representing a rich and relevant national asset, as well as acting as a crucial condition for the development of intercultural competence and acquiring intercultural communication skills (Volkova, 2021; Johansson,

2024). Differences can be difficult to accept when they conflict with one's convictions and way of life because each person tends to believe in the legitimacy and validity of their values, beliefs, and practices. However, not all can receive confirmation, "affirmation" because of their "propositional content that implies a distinction between true and false, right and wrong, beautiful and ugly" (Joppke, 2004, p. 242). These notions foreground the problems of existential fullness — a way of life that is meaningful and purposeful, a concept of inner consent.

The relevance of our study is determined by the necessity of examining systemic intercultural differences among representatives of various ethnic and social groups in the era of multiculturalism and globalization. The relevance of the study is also determined by the significance of the problem of tolerance in a transitive world (Berry, Lepshokova, Grigoryev, 2022). In the scientific literature, the relationship be-

tween existential characteristics and tolerance has been underexplored.

The aim of this research was to identify the interconnections between the levels of tolerance and the existential characteristics of student youth in the Republic of Armenia and the Russian Federation.

The hypotheses of our study were the following:

1) a relationship exists between the level of tolerance and certain existential characteristics;

2) the levels of tolerance and existential characteristics differ in Armenian and Russian student youth.

Theoretical and methodological framework

Our research builds upon the works of key scholars, including I. Yalom, V. Frankl, A. Längle, G.W. Allport, M. Verkeuten, and G.U. Soldatova.

In researching existential characteristics, we rely on the ideas of Viktor Frankl, who emphasizes that the deepest motivation of a person is the search for meaning, oriented towards revealing the profound aspirations of human nature.

Logotherapy (Greek *logos*: “word”) strived to prevent the loss of meaning (Severina, Epishin, 2024; Maurits, Hatta, Suhana, 2023; Ivers, Johnson, Casares, et al., 2024; McLafferty, 2024). Frankl emphasizes the importance of freedom and responsibility of human beings — qualities that determine them as “personality”. A “personality” is, according to Frankl’s theoretical stance, more than a mere instinctual “psychic apparatus”, and that is what makes human beings capable of “Self-transcendence”. As a consequence, human beings as “personalities” are sensitive to values in the world and to potential meanings underlying their decisions and

actions. As such, people do not fundamentally pursue lust (Freud) or power (Adler), but according to Frankl (1987), the deepest human motivation is the search for meaning (Omelchenko, 2023).

The modern existential theory comes from the idea that human existence takes as its foundation the four fundamental realities, the cornerstones of existence, which were hitherto defined by Yalom (1980). According to Längle, they “highlight the common existential emphasis on the tragic dimensions of human existence: freedom (or “groundlessness”), death, isolation (especially loneliness), meaninglessness or absurdity” (Längle, 2003, p. 4).

According to A. Längle, a comparison of Frankl and Yalom reveals, “Groundlessness implies the world with its supporting structure, death means having a life with growth and temporality, loneliness arises from the uniqueness of each person, and meaning relates to a contextual understanding of one’s own existence and activities that are directed towards a worthwhile future” (Längle, 2003, p. 4). Each of these categories is vital to the achievement of inner consent to the subjective reality, posing a challenge to alter subjective reality until one can achieve inner consent — in other words, existential fullness. According to Frankl, existential vacuum (Frankl, 1987), exemplified by the absence of motivation and feelings of emptiness and meaninglessness, arises from following the drives of lust or power instead of the noetic search for meaning of life and values of it, truth, justice, and freedom — but in combination with responsibility (Frankl, 1987). There are four fundamental conditions for existential fullness determined by Längle as a result of his empirical and phenomenological work. These are the realities that human beings are confronted with: “The world in its fac-

tuality and potentiality, life with its network of relationships and its feelings, being oneself: existing as a unique, autonomous person, and the future that we shape" (Längle, 2003, p. 4).

In our opinion, discussions on inner consent to reality are incomplete without the exploration of the concept of tolerance. Inner consent to reality consists in accepting the world and the people around us as they are, without denial or distortion, while the essence of tolerance boils down to forbearance, respect for other people, understanding of others' opinions, beliefs, faiths, behaviors, and traditions — in a broad spectrum, "otherness" — based on the recognition of cultural diversity. These concepts are interconnected because achieving inner consent and the right to hold one's own convictions and views is, in effect, impossible without recognizing the right of others to be different.

Numerous theories and definitions have been proposed regarding the concept of tolerance. Throughout history, philosophers have advanced the idea of tolerance time and again, but it has always remained a contested concept, the practice and limitations of which have been subject to societal debate from the time of Aurelius to the present. In *The Meditations*, Marcus Aurelius expressed the idea of tolerance as follows: "All men are made for one another; either then teach them better, or bear with them" (Aurelius, in the translation of Casaubon, 1692, p. 169).

Voltaire, in his *Treatise on Tolerance*, speaks against religious intolerance, while Jean-Jacques Rousseau devoted some of his works to analyzing human rights and tolerance. John Locke, in his *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689), grounds the understanding of tolerance on social agree-

ment and the separation of personal and social lives.

Famous English philosopher Peter Nicholson states that any tolerant attitude requires conciliation with some form of otherness. In his paper "Tolerant as a Moral Ideal," Nicholson defines tolerance as a relationship based on six characteristics:

Deviation — that which is tolerated differs from what is seen as the norm;

Non-triviality — the subject of deviation is not trivial;

Disagreement — the tolerating subject disagrees with the deviation on moral grounds;

Power — the tolerating subject has the power necessary to attempt to suppress the object of tolerance (or, at least, to resist or impede it);

Non-repudiation — the tolerant subject does not use their power to suppress or denounce the deviation, thereby allowing it to exist;

Goodness — tolerance is genuine, and the tolerant subject is good. (Nicholson, 1985, p. 160).

When reconciliation is successful, one must be willing to accept certain concessions (e.g., the desire to offend, suppress, or displace someone), while remaining committed to one's own beliefs. The conflict between this commitment to one's own beliefs and the acceptance of others' stances and beliefs characterizes tolerance as a moral quality, making it more complex to understand and acquire.

Psychology considers tolerance as "acceptance of others whose actions, beliefs, physical capabilities, religion, customs, ethnicity, nationality, and so on differ from one's own" (APA Dictionary of Psychology, 2023), a fair and objective attitude toward points of view different from one's own,

mutual respect, freedom of choice, political correctness, tact, support, forbearance, forgiveness, liberalism, equality, dialogue, cooperation, and aspiration towards social integrity. Therefore, understanding tolerance requires a consideration of the aspect of dislike, disagreement, or disapproval. According to Sullivan, the term itself presupposes opposition or disagreement (Sullivan, Schmitt, 2022), in the lack of which we no longer speak of tolerance but of indifference or sympathy (Volkova, 2021).

The 'paradoxical' nature of tolerance is further highlighted when tolerance is approached as an attitude, in the social psychological meaning of the word (Sullivan, Schmitt, Goad, 2022; Schmitt, Calloway, Sullivan, Clausen, Tucker, Rayman, et al., 2021). Tolerance can be defined as the respect, acceptance, and appreciation of the rich diversity of human beings, the world's cultures, and forms of expression. Tolerance is an integral positive moral quality of a person embedded in the system of values, where forbearance of opinions, beliefs, and behavioural norms, as well as recognition of the equality and value of other people, are integral. Tolerance is characterised by interest toward others, freedom from bigotry, readiness to cooperate and coexist, and polite, laid-back speech. Tolerance determines a person's ability to act in problematic or critical situations by communicating with their environment to restore their own mental and psychological wellness, adapt, avoid confrontation, and develop positive relations within themselves and with the outer world. Tolerance results from many aspects (temperament, family dynamics, upbringing, experience, and social and cultural factors) working together to form the attitude of a human towards different (Liu, 2021). Contemporary scholars, following

Allport's approach, advocate for "a warmer degree of tolerance" (Allport, 1954, p. 425); in contrast to 'cold' tolerance, a value-based form of tolerance is articulated, which predicates not on patience (endurance) but on acceptance, respect, and recognition of all people (Verkuyten, 2022).

From the perspective of the existential-humanistic concept of personality development, tolerance in its mature manifestation is viewed as a category characterizing a conscious, meaningful, and responsible personality. This understanding of tolerance, which is not reduced to simple stereotypical actions, allows this category to be presented as a value, a life position of the individual in search of specific existential meanings of responsible decisions. From these positions, tolerance is understood as a free and responsible choice of a person, a "value-based tolerant attitude toward life" (Asmolov, 2002; Asmolov, 2011).

The central questions — in the name of what and for the sake of what an individual acts in a tolerant manner, which values they uphold, and what meaning such actions hold for them — do not pertain to identifying the causes underlying manifestations of tolerance (Pervova, 2022). The genuine essence of human behavior depends on the answers to these posed existential questions, and from this point of view, meaningless tolerance is pseudotolerance, and in some cases, intolerance disguised as socially approved behavior. Thus, tolerance in its full extent is not reduced to knowledge, abilities, skills, to individual psychological qualities, or to the conditions of the social environment. In the existential-humanistic interpretation, a person is given the possibility, the potential for realizing a healthy and constructive beginning, which is actualized through their

choice of meaning, free, and responsible self-determination in every specific life situation.

In order to understand tolerance, it is important to proceed from the thesis that it constitutes a special and meaningful orientation toward the world and toward others. The well-known psychologist D.A. Leontiev paid special attention to identifying the relationship between tolerance for uncertainty and the semantic sphere, with personal choice when modeling the 'existential dilemma' (Leontiev, Mandrikova, 2005; Belov, Danilov, Rotman, 2023).

It should be highlighted that maintaining plural societies depends on people's willingness to allow others to live the life that they want. As summarized by M. Verkuyten, "as a key approach to achieving this, intergroup tolerance in its classical sense implies that people put up with outgroup beliefs and lifestyles that they disapprove of because these are meaningfully different, and sometimes even antithetical and incompatible with ingroup convictions and worldviews" (Verkeuten, 2022, p. 1). Of particular importance is the fact that tolerance is not the opposite of prejudice (Pervova, 2022; Verkuyten, Yogeeshwaran, Adelman, 2022), and it is not the same as appreciating diversity since people tolerate what they disapprove of or object to. Tolerance reconciles critical judgement with the protection and permitting of dissenting outgroup beliefs and practices (Verkuyten, Yogeeshwaran, Adelman, 2022).

Therefore, it makes tolerance a key ingredient for a diverse, equal, and open society: tolerance is "indispensable for any decent society — or at least for societies encompassing deeply divergent ways of life" (Oberdiek, 2001, p. 23). Thus, tolerance is a distinctive orientation that com-

bines disapproval of outgroup beliefs and practices with a behavioral intention to nevertheless accept — in the sense of not interfering with — these beliefs and practices (Verkuyten, Yogeeshwaran, Adelman, 2022). Research on the relationship between tolerance and existential characteristics of personality has been gaining relevance recently, but there is insufficient work on this topic.

Thus, two approaches have emerged: researchers suggest that tolerance for uncertainty is a characteristic that determines a high level of meaning in life and psychological well-being, and the degree of success in a person's self-realization. According to the second approach, a high level of meaning in life represents a reflection of existential resources that allow an individual to find meaning in overcoming challenging situations (Lerner, 2023).

In our opinion, the link between tolerance and existential characteristics or resources is ambiguous and multifaceted and warrants a comprehensive examination: tolerance can be conceptualized as a factor in the development of personal existential characteristics and a stimulus for the formation and development of a meaningful, existentially rich life.

The psychological features of youth develop under the influence of the socio-cultural environment in which they exist and operate. Sociocultural factors influencing the formation of youth's worldview and value orientations include family, the cultural sphere of societal life, the education system, the accepted ideology in the country, mass media, religion, and others. The perfection of socialization institutions and the maintenance of a dynamic equilibrium of the sociocultural environment in which the younger generation functions

are of particular importance in achieving a coordinated and productive influence on the process of youth development (Sakharchuk, Bagramyan, Kiseleva, Sakharchuk, 2022). Since the description of the socio-cultural environment involves a systemic analysis of basic social factors, we focus on the types of tolerance and their relationship with existential characteristics.

Armenia's monoethnic environment includes features of the worldview and outlook of people with a shared Soviet past, but there is a certain specificity: the predominance of a monoethnic population composition (ethnic minorities constitute less than 2% of Armenia's population) and intense dynamic migration processes, which result in Armenians living outside of Armenia and the presence of powerful Armenian diasporas (Armenia-Diaspora Unity, 2023; Berberyan, Berberyan, Gevorkyan, 2025; Berberyan, Bultseva, Berrios Callejas, 2024). The development of Armenian youth proceeds under conditions of entrenched ethnic and cultural unity and a close connection with traditions, family values, historical narratives, and the high significance of language and community.

Russian youth develop within a complex and multilayered sociocultural environment, characterized by historically established ethnocultural diversity, which conditions a multiethnic environment. Furthermore, the multiethnic environment combines traditional values of the past and the growing influence of globalization processes. In the context of the intersection of cultures and the dual pressure of traditional society and global discourse, the issues of tolerance and internal agreement become especially relevant.

The nature of the environment is of great importance in integration processes: societies with a more inclusive sociocultural en-

vironment strive to integrate migrants and ethnocultural minorities and are capable of effectively utilizing the benefits of cultural diversity. By contrast, an exclusive environment, which marginalizes migrants and ethnocultural minorities from social life, is more likely to contribute to the emergence and escalation of conflicts and associated social, economic, and political problems (Bultseva et al., 2021). As researchers assert, support for multicultural ideology and viewing cultural diversity as a resource for solving societal problems contribute to the inclusion of ethnocultural minorities, particularly for Armenians in Russia. Many factors with the potential to influence the inclusiveness of the sociocultural environment still need to be investigated in the future (Poole, 2021; Ospanov, Kalyuzhnova, Khlystova, Crowley-Vigneau, 2025; Bivand, Mathilde, Mjelva, 2025; Moghadam, 2024).

Materials and methods

Sample. Data collection was carried out using an online platform; participants were recruited using the “snowball” sampling method. A total of 100 people took part in the study: the respondents were divided into two groups — Armenian (monoethnic environment) and Russian (polyethnic environment) students. The sample consisted of university students from the Russian Federation and the Republic of Armenia (RAU, RUDN University, Samara branch of Moscow City University), with Russian as their main language of academic and daily communication. Data collection in both samples was conducted in Russian. Respondents provided information about their age, gender, ethnicity, country of residence, level, and field of education. Descriptive statistics of the samples are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Sociodemographic characteristics

Respondents	N
Sex:	
Male	16
Female	84
Age:	
Average age	20,94
Country of residence:	
Republic of Armenia	50
Russian Federation	50
Total	100

Methods. We conducted the assessment of the respondents' level of tolerance and existential characteristics by employing the following assessment methods:

1. The "Index of Tolerance" questionnaire by G.U. Soldatova, O.A. Kravtsova, O.E. Khukhlaeva: this questionnaire is aimed at determining the general level (low, medium, or high) and aspects of tolerance. The questionnaire consists of three subscales, which correspond to three types of tolerance: Ethnic tolerance, Social tolerance, and Tolerance as a personality trait. The questionnaire consists of 22 statements that detect tolerant and intolerant attitudes towards certain ethnic and social groups, as well as intergroup communication.

2. The Existence Scale (ES) by A. Längle, K. Orgler, and S.V. Kravtsova. ES is a self-rating questionnaire aimed at estimating the levels of Existential fullness of the person with their existence. The test includes 4 main subscales: Self-distance, Self-transcendence, Freedom and Responsibility, as well as two additional subscales: Person and Existentiality. The questionnaire includes 46 statements.

Results

The analysis of the level of tolerance in the Armenian sample according to the "Index of Tolerance" questionnaire (G.U. Soldatova, O.A. Kravtsova, O.E. Khukhlaeva) (see Table 2) revealed a medium general level of tolerance ($M = 87,96$, $SD = 8,14$). Based on the acquired data, we can conclude that the respondents manifest a combination of both tolerant and intolerant traits and are likely to behave in a tolerant manner in some social situations while exhibiting intolerance in others. The scores for each subscale validate the medium results: ethnic tolerance ($M = 29,16$, $SD = 4,49$), Social tolerance ($M = 29,02$, $SD = 3,79$) and Tolerance as a personality trait ($M = 29,78$, $SD = 3,38$). Thus, the Armenian respondents showcase medium levels of tolerance toward representatives of other ethnic and social groups and minorities, as well as generally favorable attitudes and beliefs towards the world and current social processes.

The analysis of the level of tolerance in the Russian sample (see Table 2) also revealed a medium general level of tolerance ($M = 94,8$, $SD = 11,26$). As previously stated, the medium general results are shown by respondents who are characterized by

a combination of both tolerant and intolerant traits, depending on the circumstances. These results are confirmed by the scores of the subscales. Medium mean scores are observed for the Social tolerance subscale ($M = 31,44$, $SD = 5,06$) and Tolerance as a personality trait ($M = 31,2$, $SD = 4,07$), while the subscale for ethnic tolerance ($M = 32,16$, $SD = 5,68$) revealed a high level of interethnic tolerance among Russian respondents, which indicates a positive perception of other ethnic groups and openness of attitudes toward them. This may correspond to the polyethnic environment, which provides for more frequent and already familiar interethnic contacts.

The analysis of the results of the Existence Scale (A. Längle, K. Orgler, S.V. Krivtsova) showed that in the Armenian sample (see Table 3), the level of Existential fullness ($M = 180,2$, $SD = 28,80$) is at a medium level, yet relatively low. Relatively low medium levels of general existential fullness observed in the Armenian sample may indicate an unfulfilled existence, as well as an emotional inability to engage in dialogue with life and a lack of responsible involvement in it. A thorough understanding of this result requires consideration of the Person and Existentiality subscales. Based on the combination $P > E$, which is

observed in the Armenian sample, it can be theorized that a person is relatively successful in dealing with themselves but rather constrained in the implementation of their life. The medium results are further validated by the results of the subscales: low medium levels in the Armenian sample for the subscales Self-distance ($M = 27,8$, $SD = 6,08$), Self-transcendence ($M = 64$, $SD = 9,86$) and Freedom ($M = 42,22$, $SD = 9,05$), while the level of Responsibility ($M = 46,18$, $SD = 10,34$) is medium. These results indicate difficulties in decision-making and responding to external challenges, emotional isolation, which may manifest as apathy or indifference toward life, as well as insecurity and social dependence. Nevertheless, the result on the subscale Responsibility points to the potential to take responsibility for one's own life. These data may reflect the characteristics of a monoethnic environment, particularly the traditional family structure and social dependence, but at the same time, a striving for inner integrity.

The analysis of the results of the Existence Scale for the Russian sample (see Table 3) revealed that the level of Existential fullness ($M = 196,06$, $SD = 31,96$) is — although higher than the mean of the Armenian sample — also at a medium level.

Table 2
The general level and subscales of tolerance of the participants ($N = 100$)
according to the “Index of Tolerance” questionnaire by G.U. Soldatova,
O.A. Kravtsova, O.E. Khukhlaeva, mean

Scales	Armenian respondents $N = 50$			Russian respondents $N = 50$		
	Mean	SD	SEM	Mean	SD	SEM
Ethnic tolerance	29,16	4,49	0,64	32,16	5,68	0,80
Social tolerance	29,02	3,79	0,54	31,44	5,06	0,72
Tolerance as a personality trait	29,78	3,38	0,48	31,2	4,07	0,58
General level of tolerance	87,96	8,14	1,15	94,8	11,26	1,59

The given result of general Existential fullness observed in the Russian respondents indicates growing inner openness and the ability to face the demands of the outside world, which is confirmed by the analysis of the parity of the subscales Person and Existentiality. These results receive further confirmation through the scores of the subscales. In the Russian sample, medium levels are observed for all of the subscales: Self-distance ($M = 30,28$, $SD = 7,01$), Self-transcendence ($M = 67,78$, $SD = 10,71$), Freedom ($M = 45,86$, $SD = 9,48$), and Responsibility ($M = 52,14$, $SD = 12,79$). The obtained results allow us to assume that the respondents are capable of perceiving life situations with greater clarity, and their attention transfers outward, while the ability to distance themselves from themselves develops, which allows them to assess the situation objectively. The average level on the subscale Self-transcendence indicates emotional openness and a more inclusive method of being. The result on the subscale Freedom reflects the ability to make decisions with greater ease and confidence in their correctness, and internal autonomy. The average level on the subscale Responsibility indicates an increased personal in-

volve ment in the process of constructing one's own life and accepting responsibility for the choices made. These results can be linked to the characteristics of the polyethnic environment and social autonomy.

Statistical analysis. A correlation analysis of the obtained results was conducted to reveal a possible connection between the levels of tolerance and certain existential characteristics. We performed correlation analyses using the Pearson correlation coefficient to assess the associations between variables

In accordance with our first hypothesis, we identified statistically significant moderate and weak correlation links (see Table 4) between the general level of tolerance and the existential characteristics Existential fullness ($r = 0,259$, $p < 0,01$), Self-transcendence ($r = 0,341$, $p < 0,01$), Person ($r = 0,353$, $p < 0,01$), and Self-Distance ($r = 0,226$, $p < 0,05$). In addition to this, significant correlations were found between the subscale of Ethnic tolerance and the existential indicators Self-transcendence ($r = 0,343$, $p < 0,01$), Person ($r = 0,338$, $p < 0,01$), Existential fullness ($r = 0,235$, $p < 0,01$), and Freedom ($r = 0,197$, $p < 0,05$), as well as between the subscale

Table 3
Existential characteristics of the participants ($N = 100$) according to the Existence scale (Existenzskala) by A. Längle, K. Orgler, and S.V. Krivtsova

Scales	Armenian respondents $N = 50$			Russian respondents $N = 50$		
	Mean	SD	SEM	Mean	SD	SEM
Self-distance (SD)	27,8	6,08	0,86	30,28	7,01	0,99
Self-transcendence (ST)	64	9,86	1,39	67,78	10,71	1,51
Freedom (F)	42,22	9,05	1,28	45,86	9,48	1,34
Responsibility (V)	46,18	10,34	1,46	52,14	12,79	1,81
Person (P)	91,8	13,41	1,90	98,06	14,65	2,07
Existentiality (E)	88,4	17,44	2,47	98	20,76	2,94
Existential fullness (G)	180,2	28,80	4,07	196,06	31,96	4,52

Tolerance as a personality trait and the indicators Person ($r = 0,369$, $p < 0,01$), Self-transcendence ($r = 0,365$, $p < 0,01$), Existential fullness ($r = 0,279$, $p < 0,01$), and Self-distance ($r = 0,222$, $p < 0,05$).

For a deeper understanding of this connection, a correlation analysis was performed for each of the samples. The results of the correlation analysis (see Table 5) showed that in the Russian sample, there are statistically significant moderate and notable correlations between the general level of tolerance and the existential characteristics of Person ($r = 0,382$, $p < 0,01$) and Self-transcendence ($r = 0,400$, $p < 0,01$). In addition to this, our analysis revealed significant correlation links between the subscale Ethnic tolerance and the existential indicators of Self-transcendence ($r = 0,421$, $p < 0,01$) and Person ($r = 0,355$, $p < 0,05$), as well as between the subscale Tolerance as a personality trait and the existential indicators of Self-transcendence ($r = 0,578$, $p < 0,01$), Existential fullness ($r = 0,407$, $p < 0,01$), Person ($r = 0,600$, $p < 0,01$), and Self-distance ($r = 0,370$, $p < 0,01$).

The supposed link between the general level of tolerance and the existential characteristics of personality in the Armenian sample was not confirmed (see Table 6); revealing no statistically significant correlations. The first hypothesis of the study, therefore, received a partial confirmation.

According to our second hypothesis, we revealed statistically significant differences in the levels of tolerance and existential characteristics between Armenian and Russian student youth (see Table 7). We employed Student's t-test to identify statistically significant differences; the effect size was calculated using Cohen's d coefficient. Our analysis identified highly significant statistical differences between the levels of Ethnic tolerance ($t = 2,93$, $p < 0,01$), Social tolerance ($t = 2,71$, $p < 0,01$), and the General level of tolerance ($t = 3,48$, $p < 0,01$) in the Armenian and Russian samples.

Statistically significant differences were also found between some existential characteristics of Armenian and Russian student youth: Responsibility ($t = 2,56$, $p < 0,05$), General level of Existential full-

Results of the Pearson correlation analysis between tolerance indicators and existential characteristics across all respondents (N = 100)

Scales	Self-distance (SD)	Self-transcendence (ST)	Freedom (F)	Responsibility (V)	Person (P)	Existentiality (E)	Existential fullness (G)
Ethnic tolerance	0,191	0,343**	0,197*	0,056	0,338**	0,128	0,235*
Social tolerance	0,105	0,070	0,037	0,066	0,099	0,058	0,082
Tolerance as a personality trait	0,222*	0,365**	0,124	0,192	0,369**	0,176	0,279**
General level of tolerance	0,226*	0,341**	0,163	0,129	0,353**	0,156	0,259**

Table 5

Results of the Pearson correlation analysis between tolerance indicators and existential characteristics across the Russian respondents (N = 50)

Scales	Self-distance (SD)	Self-transcendence (ST)	Freedom (F)	Responsibility (V)	Person (P)	Existentiality (E)	Existential fullness (G)
Ethnic tolerance	0,099	0,421**	0,180	-0,051	0,355*	0,051	0,195
Social tolerance	0,005	-0,047	-0,036	-0,049	-0,032	-0,047	-0,045
Tolerance as a personality trait	0,370**	0,578**	0,144	0,223	0,600**	0,203	0,407**
General level of tolerance	0,186	0,400**	0,127	0,032	0,382**	0,078	0,225

Table 6

Results of the Pearson correlation analysis between tolerance indicators and existential characteristics across the Armenian respondents (N = 50)

Scales	Self-distance (SD)	Self-transcendence (ST)	Freedom (F)	Responsibility (V)	Person (P)	Existentiality (E)	Existential fullness (G)
Ethnic tolerance	0,217	0,157	0,114	0,040	0,214	0,083	0,150
Social tolerance	0,142	0,123	0,013	0,082	0,155	0,055	0,106
Tolerance as a personality trait	-0,051	0,036	0,024	0,048	0,004	0,041	0,026
General level of tolerance	0,165	0,159	0,079	0,080	0,192	0,088	0,143

ness ($t = 2,61, p < 0,05$), as well as two sums of factors — Person ($t = 2,23, p < 0,05$) and Existentiality ($t = 2,50, p < 0,05$). These data confirm the hypothesis of the presence of stable significant differences in the levels of tolerance and some existential characteristics between Armenian and Russian student youth. These differences may indicate the influence of the type of sociocultural environment not only on the

perception of others but also on internal agreement with the world.

Discussion

The obtained results confirm that the level of tolerance and existential characteristics of personality vary depending on the sociocultural environment. The evidence indicates that the Russian sample shows an average level of tolerance toward repre-

Statistical differences in the levels of tolerance and existential characteristics between the Armenian and Russian samples (N = 100)

Parameter	t	df	sig. (p value)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence interval		Standard error	Effect (Cohen's d)
					Lower	Higher		
Ethnic tolerance	2,93	98	0,0042**	-3,00	-5,03	-0,97	1,024	0,585973
Social tolerance	2,71	98	0,0080**	-2,42	-4,19	-0,65	0,894	0,541347
Tolerance as a personality trait	1,90	98	0,0608	-1,42	-2,91	0,07	0,748	0,379583
General level of tolerance	3,48	98	0,0007**	-6,84	-10,74	-2,94	1,965	0,696209
Self-distance (SD)	1,89	98	0,0618	-2,48	-5,09	0,13	1,313	0,377962
Self-transcendence (ST)	1,84	98	0,0693	-3,78	-7,86	0,30	2,058	0,367212
Freedom (F)	1,96	98	0,0523	-3,64	-7,32	0,04	1,853	0,392771
Responsibility (V)	2,56	98	0,0119*	-5,96	-10,58	-1,34	2,326	0,512481
Person (P)	2,23	98	0,0281*	-6,26	-11,83	-0,69	2,809	0,445752
Existentiality (E)	2,50	98	0,0139*	-9,60	-17,21	-1,99	3,833	0,50073
Existential fullness (G)	2,61	98	0,0106*	-15,86	-27,93	-3,79	6,084	0,521349

sentatives of other social groups, including minorities, as well as generally favorable attitudes and beliefs toward the world and people as a whole. The high level of Ethnic tolerance among Russian respondents likely stems from the characteristics of the environment: the polyethnic environment necessitates and stimulates the manifestations of tolerance in Russian youth. The homogeneity of the monoethnic environment in the Armenian sample appears to account for a more cautious and reserved approach toward other groups.

Analysis of the results from the Existence Scale showed higher scores on existential characteristics in the Russian sample compared to Armenian respondents. This may indicate greater openness, autonomy, and emotional involvement in life, which corresponds to the polyethnic context and more diverse social experience. In contrast, the Armenian sample shows a predominance

of Person over Existentiality, which may indicate developed self-understanding but less expressed external realization. This reflects the characteristics of a monoethnic culture with an emphasis on traditional and family values, which forms restrained attitudes toward “otherness”.

The subscale Self-distance measures a person's ability to distance themselves from their own desires, ideas, feelings, and intentions to objectively view a situation. The results show that Russian respondents perceive situations in a clearer manner, their attention concentrates on the outward, and the distance in relation to themselves is greater. Lower results in the Armenian sample indicate a weaker manifestation of this ability due to some form of internal confusion or fixations, such as conflicts, post-traumatic states, chronic deficits, or unsatisfied needs. The subscale Self-transcendence measures free emo-

tionality, which manifests in the ability to feel closeness, compassion, and to feel values and a deep connection. The level of Self-transcendence in Russian respondents implies average emotionality and a more involved way of existence. Thereby, the lower score on the Self-transcendence scale for Armenian respondents indicates emotional isolation and a lesser existential significance of life.

The subscale Freedom measures the ability to find real possibilities for action, build their hierarchy in accordance with their value, and thus make decisions grounded from a subjective standpoint. The low average level of Freedom in Armenian respondents indicates a weakened ability to make decisions and a level of uncertainty in those decisions, while in Russian respondents, it indicates the ability to make decisions easier and be confident in their correctness. The subscale Responsibility determines the ability to follow decisions made based on personal values, the average level indicating the potential to take responsibility and involve oneself in life processes.

The statistical data analysis revealed statistically significant differences and correlation links between the levels of tolerance and the existential characteristics of the surveyed student youth. The results of the correlation analysis confirmed the first hypothesis in part. Thus, within the overall sample, we revealed statistically significant moderate and weak correlation links between the general level and subscales of tolerance and such existential indicators as Self-transcendence, Person, Existential fullness, and Self-distance. Considering the data for individual samples confirmed our assumption about the presence of correlation links for Russian youth and refuted

it for the Armenian sample, where we discovered no significant links.

The comparative analysis of the average scores of the two samples allowed us to confirm the second hypothesis of the study. We found statistically significant differences between the indicators of tolerance and existential characteristics of Armenian and Russian student youth. The obtained data may indicate the influence of the mono- and polyethnic environment on the manifestations and interrelations of the phenomena under consideration.

The research results are consistent with data from other studies. For example, researchers point out: "Experiencing a true existential level of life helps a person to be aware of their needs and stay in touch with their feelings" (Solobutina, Miassarova, 2019). While basic awareness of emotions and desires is available to many, only an existentially mature person is capable of integrating this awareness into the broader context of their own being and values. Accounting for existential characteristics is important for the education system: researchers emphasize that they are witnesses that ignoring crucial existential questions in education contributes to spiritual emptiness in the lives of youth and reduces educational thinking only to instrumental, pragmatic problems: formal qualification standards and the transfer of communication skills (Vindeker, Berdnikova, 2022).

Conclusions

The study's findings permit to draw a conclusion about the partial confirmation of our hypotheses; their analysis allowed:

1) to diagnose the levels of tolerance and existential characteristics of personality in Armenian and Russian student

youth, considering the sociocultural environment. Analysis of the general level and aspects of tolerance revealed that a medium level of tolerance dominates among both samples. However, a higher level of tolerance was found in the Russian sample, especially in Ethnic tolerance, which reflects the polyethnic context and the frequency of interethnic contacts. In contrast, Armenian respondents exhibit a combination of tolerant and intolerant traits, which is explained by the monoethnic composition of the society. The results from the "Existence Scale" indicate a higher level of existential characteristics in Russian respondents compared to the Armenian sample. Russian youth exhibit greater Existential fullness, involvement, autonomy, and emotional openness, while Armenian youth showcase a greater focus on self-understanding;

2) to confirm the presence of statistically significant moderate and weak correlation links between some aspects of tolerance and existential characteristics of personality in Russian respondents. We discovered no such associations within the findings derived from the Armenian sample. Comparative analysis of the data obtained allowed us to identify significant

differences in the levels and aspects of tolerance and existential characteristics between the two samples — Armenian and Russian student youth. The differences between the two samples may be due to the differences in the sociocultural situation in the Republic of Armenia and the Russian Federation;

3) to confirm the relevance of the problem under study; to ensure that research on the relationship between levels and aspects of tolerance and existential characteristics in different sociocultural environments is notably sparse, but it is in demand and necessary for resolving issues arising in the context of multicultural societies. Support for multicultural ideology and viewing cultural diversity as a resource for solving social problems contribute to the inclusion of ethnocultural minorities, e.g. Armenians in Russia, when compared with the higher characteristics of tolerance and existential features found in Russian youth. Many factors that may influence the inclusiveness of the sociocultural context still need further exploration in the future (Poole, 2021; Ospanov, Kalyuzhnova, Khlystova, Crowley-Vigneau, 2025; Bivand, Mathilde, Mjelva, 2025; Moghaddam, 2024).

Список источников / References

1. Асмолов, А.Г. (2002). Толерантность как культура XX века. *Толерантность: объединяя усилия* (с. 150–181). Летний сад.
- Asmolov, A.G. (2002). Tolerance as the Culture of the 20th Century. In *Tolerance: Bringing Efforts Together* (pp. 150–181). Letniy Sad.
2. Асмолов, А.Г. (2011). Идеология толерантности: школа жизни с непохожими людьми. *Горизонты современного образования*, (9), 1–3.
- Asmolov, A.G. (2011). Ideology of tolerance: a school of life with dissimilar people. *Horizonty sovremenennogo obrazovaniya* (9), 1–3.
3. Берберян, А.С., Берберян, Э.С., Геворкян, С.Р. (2025). Этническая идентичность и субъективное восприятие времени личности (на примере армянской молодежи). *Культурно-историческая психология*, 21(1), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2025210107> ISSN: 1816-5435 / 2224-8935
4. Берберян, А.С., Берберян, Г.С., Геворкян, С.Р. (2025). Ethnic identity and personality's subjective perception of time (on example of Armenian youth). *Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 21(1), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2025210107>. ISSN: 1816-5435 / 2224-8935
4. Бульцева, М.А., Бушина, Е.В., Берберян, А.С., Коджа, Е.А. (2021). Роль советской идентичности во взаимосвязи мультикультурализма и проницаемости социальных границ для русских в Армении. *Культурно-историческая психология*,

17(4), 56–64. <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2021170406>

Bultseva, M.A., Bushina, E.V., Berberyan, A.S., Kodja, E.A. (2021). The Role of Soviet Identity in the Relationship of Multiculturalism and Boundaries Permeability for Russians in Armenia. *Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 17(4), 56–64. <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2021170406>

5. Виндекер, О.С., Бердникова, Д.В. (2022). Экзистенциальный подход к проблеме образовательной успешности студентов. *Известия УрФУ. Серия 1. Проблемы образования, науки и культуры*. 28(3). <https://doi.org/10.15826/izv1.2022.28.3.059>

Vindeker, O.S., Berdnikova, D.V. (2022). The Existential Approach to Students' Educational Success. *Izvestia of Ural Federal University. Series 1. Problems of Education, Science and Culture*, 28(3). <https://doi.org/10.15826/izv1.2022.28.3.059>

6. Волкова, Н.А. (2021). Проблематика вопроса мультикультурализма и социально-психологической толерантности в условиях глобализации и всеобщей интеграции. *Познание*, (8). <http://www.nauteh-journal.ru/files/d5ab45cd-57e1-4693-a6d4-c70b6742a85a>

Volkova, N.A. (2021). Problems of the issue of multiculturalism and socio-psychological tolerance in the context of globalization and universal integration. *Poznание*, (8). <http://www.nauteh-journal.ru/files/d5ab45cd-57e1-4693-a6d4-c70b6742a85a>

7. Единство Армении и диаспоры. (2023, март 10–12). Ассамблея. Future Armenian. https://futurearmenian.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Armenia-Diaspora_unity-rus.pdf

Armenia-Diaspora Unity. (2023, March 10–12). Convention of the Future Armenian. https://futurearmenian.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Armenia-Diaspora_unity-rus.pdf

8. Леонтьев, Д.А., Мандрикова, Е.Ю. (2005). Моделирование «экзистенциальной дилеммы»: эмпирическое исследование личностного выбора. *Вестник Московского государственного университета. Серия 14. Психология*, (4), 37–42.

Leontiev, D.A., Mandrikova, E.Yu. (2005). Modeling the “existential dilemma”: an empirical study of personal choice. *Bulletin of Moscow State University. Series 14. Psychology*, (4), 37–42.

9. Лerner, С.А. (2023). Толерантность к неопределенности и экзистенциальные ресурсы лиц среднего возраста. *Научные Труды Московского Гуманитарного университета*, (6), 49–56. <https://www.doi.org/10.17805/trudy.2023.6.7>

Lerner, S.A. (2023). Tolerance of ambiguity and existential resources of middle-aged persons.

10. Омельченко, Н.В. (2023). Смысл жизни как глобальная проблема. Философия и общество, 1(106). <https://doi.org/10.30884/jfo/2023.01.0>

Omelchenko, N.V. (2023). The meaning of life as a global problem. *Philosophy and Society*, (1(106)). <https://doi.org/10.30884/jfo/2023.01.0>

11. Первова, И.Л. (Ред.). (2022). Толерантность и интолерантность в современном обществе: Новые реалии. Материалы научно-практической конференции, 15–16 ноября 2022 года. Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет.

Pervova, I.L. (Ed.). (2022). Tolerance and Intolerance in the Modern Society: New Realities. *Proceedings of the International scientific and practical conference*, November 15–16, 2022. Saint Petersburg State University.

12. Северина, Ю.В., Епишин, В.Е. (2024). Логотерапия и ее возможности в процессе психологической реабилитации. *Реабилитология*, 2(4), 385–394. <https://doi.org/10.17749/2949-5873/rehabil.2024.34>

Severina, Yu.V., Epishin, V.E. (2024). Logotherapy and its potential for psychological rehabilitation. *Journal of Medical Rehabilitation*, 2(4), 385–394. <https://doi.org/10.17749/2949-5873/rehabil.2024.34>

13. Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Perseus Books.

14. American Psychological Association. (2023). APA Dictionary of Psychology. <https://dictionary.apa.org/tolerance>

15. Aurelius, M. (ca. 180 CE/1692). *The meditations of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus: The Roman emperor, concerning himself* (M. Casaubon, Trans.). Churchill. (Original work written ca. 180 CE)

16. Belov, A.A., Danilov, A.N., Rotman, D. (2023). Homo tolerant in the value system “essentialism — existentialism.” *RUDN Journal of Sociology*, 23(4), 740–753. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2023-23-4-740-753>

17. Berberyan, A.S., Bultseva, M.A., Berrios Callejas, S.A. (2024). The permeability of social boundaries for Russians in the post-Soviet space: The role of social identities and perceived security. *RUDN Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1683-2024-21-2-408-426>

18. Berry, J.W., Lepshokova, Z., Grigoryev, D. (2022). How shall we all live together? Meta-analytical review of the mutual intercultural relations in plural societies project. *Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 1014–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12332>

19. Bivand, M., Mathilde, E., Mjelva, B., Forø, A.T. (2025). Conceptualizing and measuring conflict-related determinants of migration. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2025.2499816>
20. Johansson, T.R. (2024). In defence of multiculturalism — theoretical challenges. *International Review of Sociology*, 34(1), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2022.2045141>
21. Frankl, V.E. (1987). *Logotherapy und Existenzanalyse: Texte aus fünf Jahrzehnten* [Logotherapy and existential analysis: Texts from five decades]. Piper.
22. Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and policy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2004.00017.x>
23. Längle, A. (2003). The search for meaning in life and the fundamental existential motivations. *Psychotherapy in Australia*, 10(1), 22–27.
24. Längle, A., Orgler, C., Kundt, M. (2021). The Existence Scale: A new approach to assess the ability to find personal meaning in life and to reach existential fulfillment. *European Psychotherapy*, 4(1), 135–151.
25. Locke, J. (1689). *A letter concerning toleration* (W. Popple, Trans.).
26. Liu, M. (2021). Factors influencing tolerance of ambiguity and its implications for second language learning. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Education: Current Issues and Digital Technologies (ICECIDT 2021). <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210527.081>
27. Maurits, R.H., Hatta, M.I., Suhana, S. (2023). The application of logotherapy to improve the meaning of life in emerging adults with self-injury. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan*, 11(2), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jipt.v1i2.22875>
28. McLafferty, C.L., Jr. (2024). *Logotherapy and existential analysis: Theory and practice*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-48921-1>
29. Nicholson, P. (1985). Toleration as a moral ideal. In J. Horton, S. Mendus (Eds.), *Aspects of toleration* (pp. 1–25). Methuen.
30. Oberdiek, H. (2001). *Tolerance: Between forbearance and acceptance*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
31. Ospanov, M., Kalyuzhnova, Y., Khlystova, O., Crowley-Vigneau, A. (2025). The impact of armed conflicts and forced migration on labour markets: Systematic literature review and future research agenda. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10242694.2025.2513072>
32. Poole, A. (2021). Migration as conflict risk-management: Testing the new economics of labour migration as a framework for understanding refugee decision-making. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47(17), 3725–3742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2021.1984217>
33. Sakharchuk, E.S., Bagramyan, E.R., Kiseleva, I.A., Sakharchuk, A.L. (2022). Social focus of the educational activity of the university: Declaration of goals and practice. *The Education and Science Journal*, 24(3), 11–40. <https://doi.org/10.17853/1994-5639-2022-3-11-40>
34. Schmitt, H.J., Calloway, E., Sullivan, D., Clausen, W., Tucker, P.G., Rayman, J., et al. (2021). Chronic environmental contamination: A systematic review of psychosocial health consequences. *Science of the Total Environment*, 772. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145025>
35. Solobutina, M., Miyassarova, L. (2019). Dynamics of existential personality fulfillment in the course of psychotherapy. *Behavioral Sciences*, 10(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs10010021>
36. Sullivan, D., Schmitt, H.J., Goad, A.N. (2022). The socio-material force theory of identity. *Theory & Psychology*, 32, 353–374.
37. Verkuyten, M. (2022). *The Social Psychology of Tolerance*. Oxfordshire, UK: Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003335030>
38. Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., Adelman, L. (2022). The social psychology of intergroup tolerance and intolerance. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 34(1), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2022.2091326>
39. Yalom, I.D. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. Basic Books.

Information about the authors

Asya S. Berberyan, Grand PhD in Psychology, Professor, Head of the Psychology Chair, Russian-Armenian University , Yerevan, Republic of Armenia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0321-0161>, e-mail: aspsy@inbox.ru

Satenik A. Tepanyan, Postgraduate Student in Psychology, Russian-Armenian University, Yerevan, Republic of Armenia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0706-4412>, e-mail: satenik_tepanyan@mail.ru

Информация об авторах

Ася Суреновна **Берберян**, доктор психологических наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой психологии, Российско-Армянский университет, Ереван, Республика Армения, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0321-0161>, e-mail: aspsy@inbox.ru

Сатеник Авагавна **Тепанян**, аспирант направления «Психология», Российско-Армянский университет, Ереван, Республика Армения, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0706-4412>, e-mail: satenik_tepanyan@mail.ru

Contribution of the authors

Asya S. Berberyan — conceptualization; formal analysis; investigation; methodology; supervision; project administration; funding acquisition; drafting; reviewing, and editing.

Satenik A. Tepanyan — data collection; formal analysis; reviewing, and editing.

Вклад авторов

Ася С. Берберян — концептуализация; формальный анализ; исследование; методология; руководство; администрирование проекта; привлечение финансирования; написание — черновик; написание — рецензирование и редактирование.

Сатеник А. Тепанян — сбор данных; формальный анализ; написание — рецензирование и редактирование.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Конфликт интересов

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Ethics statement

Written informed consent for participation in this study was obtained from the participants.

Декларация об этике

Участники дали информированное согласие, прежде чем принять участие в исследовании.

Поступила в редакцию 05.08.2025

Received 2025.08.05

Поступила после рецензирования 22.10.2025

Revised 2025.10.22

Принята к публикации 01.12.2025

Accepted 2025.12.01

Опубликована 24.12.2025

Published 2025.12.24