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Multiculturalism is an increasingly common characteristic of contemporary societies. In culturally diverse social contexts, virtually every person experiences intercultural contact on a daily basis. It is essential to understand that there must be both cultural diversity and equity in social participation for true multiculturalism to exist in these settings. Beyond its core definition, it is clear that multiculturalism is a complex concept encompassing many dimensions and meanings. First, the term is understood to describe a demographic fact, indicating the existence of cultural diversity in a society. Second, multiculturalism refers to the policies and programs that are in place to manage intercultural relations and acculturation. Third, multiculturalism refers to psychological phenomena, including individual attitudes and ideologies that accept or reject the demographic, civic and policy features of multiculturalism. This chapter considers Canadian multiculturalism policy, examining how the multiple meanings of multiculturalism vary around the world. Within this framework, I highlight the psychological processes and outcomes of multiculturalism, particularly in connection with acculturation, adaptation and intercultural relations and consider whether these processes and outcomes differ for dominant and non-dominant groups. I suggest some ways in which to enhance the positive outcomes of intercultural contact and the resultant acculturation outcomes. Finally, this chapter sets the stage for the presentation of the other chapters in this volume. It elaborates three
hypotheses derived from Canadian multiculturalism policy: the multiculturalism, integration and contact hypotheses.
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**Introduction**

*What is multiculturalism?*

The concept of *multiculturalism* has acquired many meanings over the past 40 years that vary across societies. In the 1970s, Berry, Kalin and Taylor (1977) defined multiculturalism as having two equally important emphases: (i) the presence of ethnocultural diversity in a society and (ii) the presence of equitable participation by all cultural groups in that society. With respect to the first aspect, they made distinctions among the three different meanings of the ethnocultural diversity component of multiculturalism. First, multiculturalism is a demographic fact: most societies around the world are now culturally diverse. Second, multiculturalism is an ideology: individuals and groups hold views about their acceptance or rejection of this diversity. Third, some governments articulate public policies and develop programs addressing the acceptability of diversity as well as its promotion. These three features are closely related. If diversity is not present, there is no need to be concerned with what people think about it and no need for governmental action.

Although multiculturalism is sometimes thought to only refer to the presence of cultural diversity in a society, the second core element of multiculturalism (equitable participation) is equally important. A view of multiculturalism that considers only the existence of cultural diversity may lead to the emergence of separate cultural groups within a diverse society. Diversity without equal participation will lead to separation or segregation; equal participation without diversity will result in assimilation or the pursuit of the melting pot. In the absence of diversity and equity, marginalization and exclusion will likely occur, but when both diversity and equity are present, integration and multiculturalism are found.

**Multiculturalism as Demographic Diversity**

Ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic diversity are commonplace in most countries. Worldwide, Africa and Asia are home to the most diverse nations, whereas Japan and the Koreas are among the most ethnically homogenous. Parts of North and South America (e.g., Canada and Peru) are highly diverse, and there is a wide variation in the Middle East. Although diversity is increasing in the European Union, most European countries are relatively homogenous (Alseina et al., 2003). To illustrate the extent of this diversity, Figure 1 presents data from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. This figure is based on the probability that two randomly selected people in a society will belong to the same ethnic group; higher scores indicate greater diversity. This figure shows that Canada, Spain and Belgium are the most diverse societies, while Japan, (South) Korea and Iceland are the least.
Immigration enhances cultural diversity and has recently been a contentious issue in many countries (such as the United States of America, Europe and Australasia). In these countries, diversity has been linked to a range of negative social outcomes, including increased anti-immigrant sentiments, perceived threat, and hostile ethnic attitudes (Bloemraad & Wright, 2014; Dustmann, Fabbri, & Preston, 2011; Quillian, 1995; Schneider, 2008). Putnam’s (2007) controversial research in the United States concluded that immigration and ethnic diversity reduce social solidarity, reduce trust and altruism, and are associated with a decline in friendships; however, these claims have not been widely replicated in international research (e.g., Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010). In contrast, increasing diversity does not inevitably lead to conflict or reductions in social capital. For example, Kalin and Berry (1982) examined Canadian neighborhoods, showing that positive attitudes toward ethnic out-groups increased in proportion to the size of the group in the neighborhood. Similar trends have been found in New Zealand, where residents’ value of immigrants generally increases and immigrants’ perception of discrimination decrease in response to the growing density of immigrant populations (Ward, Masgoret, & Vauclair, 2011). In sum, multidisciplinary research converges on the conclusion that broader demographic, social and political factors shape the impact of cultural diversity on intercultural relations at both the national and neighborhood levels.
At the institutional level, cultural diversity brings both benefits and challenges. In educational settings, diversity can have negative and positive consequences for interpersonal and intergroup relations (Vervoort, Scholte, & Overbeek, 2010). For example, diversity has detrimental effects on academic achievement for both majority- and minority-group students (van Ewijk & Sleegers, 2010). Meanwhile, diversity is known to have positive consequences for ethnic minority students who feel less vulnerable and lonely and experience greater feelings of self-worth in more diverse classrooms (Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2006). Ultimately, the effects of cultural diversity on educational settings is very much affected by other aspects of the school environment, including having a broader approach to multicultural education, the strength of student-teacher relationships and the nature of peer norms (Thijs & Verkuyten, 2014).

In organizational settings, there can also be positive and negative consequences. For example, exposure to diversity can promote enhanced creativity and perspective-taking. Alternately, it can promote greater conflict, diminished cohesion and lower productivity. Culturally diverse groups generate more creative solutions, which can lead to competitive advantages for organizations; however, individuals frequently report greater conflict in culturally heterogeneous settings than in more homogenous ones (Stahl, Maznevski, Voigt, & Jonsen, 2010). Furthermore, research suggests that the link between diversity and job performance is unstable and ultimately depends on the context in which the work takes place (Kochan et al., 2003).

Ultimately, it is not cultural diversity per se that determines positive or negative consequences for nations, neighborhoods, schools or organizations. More important are the ways in which diversity and equitable inclusion are managed or accommodated, which leads us to examine multiculturalism policy.

**Multiculturalism as policy**

In some countries, legislatures create policies to address the management and accommodation of diversity. Aligned to these policies are programs supporting cultural diversity and facilitating equitable participation for heterogeneous ethnocultural groups. It is important to recognize, however, that the existence of policies and programs alone is not sufficient to achieve a truly multicultural society; it is imperative that the policies and programs be systematically implemented.

As in the case of demographic diversity, there is great variation in the adoption of multicultural policies and practices across countries. There is also much debate about their success and impact (e.g., Banting & Kymlicka, 2013; Colombo, 2015; Kymlicka, 2012; St. Jacques, 2014). At present, there are two important databases that describe and quantify the status of national multiculturalism policies: the Multicultural Policy Index (MPI; Banting & Kymlicka, 2006-2012) and the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX, 2010). Both indices consider policies relating to diversity and equity and are based on specific indicators of the degree to which a society pursues those two features of social organization. These are described more fully in the section on Multiculturalism Policy below.
**Multiculturalism as ideology**

Individuals’ evaluations of diversity and equity have been referred to as *multicultural ideologies*. Multicultural ideology is defined by Berry et al. (1977) as an appreciation for cultural diversity and a need for mutual accommodation that promotes equitable participation. In some societies, however, there is a common misconception that multiculturalism refers only to cultural diversity (i.e., the presence of many independent cultural communities). As noted above, cultural diversity without intercultural interaction and equitable participation in the larger society can become separation and segregation. Furthermore, as also noted above, in the absence of equity, diversity is typically seen as being socially divisive.

The view of multiculturalism as mere cultural diversity seems to have formed the basis of recent assertions that “multiculturalism has failed” in some European societies (e.g., in Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom). For example, the British Prime Minister (Number 10, 2011) argued that state multiculturalism in “Britain had encouraged different cultures to live separate lives”… and that “the UK needed a stronger national identity to prevent people turning to all kinds of extremism.” We argue that multiculturalism has not failed because it was never fully attempted in these societies. If multiculturalism is viewed as only tolerating the presence of different cultures in a society without the simultaneous promotion of inclusion through programs to reduce barriers to equitable participation,

![Figure 2. Multicultural ideology in various countries (Ward and Masgoret, 2008, p. 234).](image-url)
then such policies, practices and ideologies are more accurately described as being a form of segregation. Cameron seems to have recognized this view. However, the proposed solution to the problem of segregation has been more homogeneity rather than the pursuit of the double engagement option articulated in our vision of multiculturalism.

Multicultural ideologies vary markedly across countries. For example, Ward and Masgoret (2008) assembled scores on multicultural ideology for a number of countries (see Figure 2).

In this data set, New Zealand, Australia and Sweden were most accepting of this ideology, while Greece, Austria and Germany were the least accepting. Although not shown in this figure, 85% of Canadians support this statement. In a second study from a (Eurobarometer, 2007) public opinion poll given in 27 European countries, results indicated that agreement with the general premise that ethnic diversity enriches national culture (the diversity element) varies from 32% in Malta to 86% in Sweden. Simultaneously, the proposition that there should be more ethnic minority Members of Parliament (the intercultural element) receives a lower level of endorsement, ranging from 17% in Bulgaria and Cyprus to 66% in Sweden and France. This attitudinal pattern is in keeping with the “principle-implementation gap,” which suggests that individuals are more likely to support abstract principles than concrete policies that are designed to achieve goals. Similarly, there is strong evidence that multiculturalism receives greater support as an abstract principle, while more concrete constructions of multiculturalism are viewed as threatening to members of the dominant group (Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014).

Multiculturalism policies in culturally diverse societies

Multiculturalism policies internationally

As noted above, there are two important databases that describe and quantify national multicultural policies: the Multicultural Policy Index (MPI; Banting & Kymlicka, 2006–2012) and the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX, 2010). The MPI (see Figure 3) is “a scholarly research project that monitors the evolution of multiculturalism policies across Western democracies. The project is designed to provide information about multiculturalism policies in a standardized format that aids comparative research and contributes to the understanding of state-minority relations. There are three separate indices covering three types of minorities: one index relating to immigrant groups, one relating to historic national minorities, and one relating to indigenous peoples.” The index includes a set of nine criteria for assessing the promotion of multiculturalism (by policy and practice) in pluralistic societies. These include: government policies promoting multiculturalism, maintaining a multicultural ministry or secretariat, adopting multiculturalism in school curricula, representing ethnicities in the media, exempting cultural groups from codes that are rooted in the dominant society (e.g., Sunday closing), permitting dual citizenship, funding for cultural organizations, and funding for bilingual or heritage language instruction.

Related to the MPI Index are the reports of Bloemraad (2011; Wright & Bloemraad, 2012). Bloemraad (2011) examined multiculturalism policies and practices
in various countries and tracked changes over the years from 1980 to 2010 using the MPI. This index places Canada and Australia in first place, followed by Sweden, New Zealand, Belgium, and the United Kingdom. Toward the middle are Spain, Portugal and the USA. Lowest placed are France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland and Denmark. Of particular interest is the Netherlands, which was ranked rather high in 2000, but dropped to a low score in 2010. This earlier high position was the result of longstanding “pillarization” policies (Fleras, 2009), while the drop may reflect recent assertions that multiculturalism has failed in the Netherlands (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010).

A second index, the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), is based on indicators of migrant integration in a number of policy domains: labor mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality and anti-discrimination laws. Scores are currently provided for 37 countries, which can be seen in Table 1 (MIPEX, 2010).

Curiously, the rather low ranking of European societies (except for Sweden and Portugal) flies in the face of an EU (2005) directive promoting core elements of multiculturalism policy, the “Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU.” Among the 11 principles, one article asserts the right to cultural maintenance: “The practice of diverse cultures and religions is guaranteed under the Charter of Fundamental Rights and must be safeguarded, unless practices conflict with other inviolable European rights or with national law.” Another promotes
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**Figure 3. Multiculturalism Policy Index**

participation: “Frequent interaction between immigrants and Member States citizens is a fundamental mechanism for integration. Shared forums, intercultural dialogue, education about immigrants and immigrant cultures, and stimulating living conditions in urban environments enhance the interactions between immigrants and Member State citizens.” Further: “Access for immigrants to institutions, as well as to private goods and services, on a basis equal to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way is a critical foundation for better integration.” And a third notes the importance of learning the national language: “Basic knowledge of the host society’s language, history, and institutions is indispensable to integration; enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration.” With respect to the process, the directive identifies the integration of migrants and their cultural communities as “… a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States. Integration is a dynamic, long-term, and continuous two-way process of mutual accommodation… It demands the participation not only of immigrants and their descendants but of every resident” (p. 1).

What are the effects of multicultural policies? There is ample evidence that multiculturalism produces positive outcomes for non-dominant groups, although the precise effects vary by context and policy type. Anti-discrimination policies improve economic outcomes for immigrants (Aleksynska & Algan, 2010), and wage gaps between immigrants and residents are lower in countries with more favorable immigration policies, as defined by the Migrant Integration Policy Index (Nieto,
Matano, & Ramos, 2013). Immigrants who experience greater belonging in terms of citizenship acquisition, have higher levels of trust and report lower levels of discrimination in countries with more multicultural policies (Koopmans, Statham Giugni, & Passy, 2005; Wright & Bloemraad, 2012). More generally, Bloemraad and Wright (2014, p. 292) have concluded “that multicultural policies appear to have some modest positive effects on socio-political integration for first-generation immigrants and likely little direct effect, positive or negative, on those in the second generation.” These favorable outcomes are mirrored in organizational settings where “identity conscious” as opposed to “identity blind” policies result in higher employment status for people of color (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995).

Multiculturalism policies can also benefit dominant groups. Kesler and Bloemraad’s (2010) 19-country study showed that multicultural policies increase a sense of belonging, defined in terms of civic participation. However, despite these positive outcomes, multicultural policies have often been misunderstood as exclusionary and perceived as threatening by members of the dominant ethno-cultural group (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). Current debates in the United States focus on the merits of multicultural versus color-blind ideologies and policies. In contrast to the tenets of multiculturalism, which reflect a positive recognition and accommodation of diversity, color-blind ideologies and policies ignore or minimize group differences, consistent with the “melting pot” metaphor for managing diversity. Although the color-blind strategy is often portrayed by members of the dominant group as a mechanism for decreasing inequality, it instead functions as a justification for existing inequality. This strategy is associated with a stronger racial bias, bringing with it negative consequences in educational and organizational settings (Apfelbaum, Norton, & Sommers, 2012). In contrast, multicultural models of diversity are associated with greater inclusiveness, reduced racial bias, and more engagement from non-dominant groups (Plaut et al., 2011; Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009). Overall, multicultural approaches have been shown to promote “positive psychological, educational and organizational outcomes for minorities and organizations” (Plaut et al., 2011, p. 2).

**Multiculturalism policy in Canada**

As just discussed, many culturally diverse societies have sought to understand diversity and manage it through policy. The first multiculturalism policy was adopted in Canada in 1971. The basic goal of the policy was articulated as follows:

“A policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework... (is) the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of all Canadians. Such a policy should help to break down discriminatory attitudes and cultural jealousies. National unity, if it is to mean anything in the deeply personal sense, must be founded on the confidence on one's individual identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others, and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions.... The Government will support and encourage the various cultural and ethnic groups that give structure and vitality to our society. They will be encouraged to share their cultural expression and values with other Canadians and so contribute to a richer life for all”. Government of Canada, (1971).
An examination of this policy reveals three main components. The first is the goal, which is “to break down discriminatory attitudes and cultural jealousies.” This goal seeks to enhance mutual acceptance among all cultural groups. It is approached by two main program components. One is the cultural component, which is to be achieved by providing support and encouragement for cultural maintenance and development among all cultural groups. The other is the social or intercultural component, which promotes the sharing of cultural expressions by providing opportunities for intergroup contact and the removal of barriers to full and equitable participation in the daily life of the larger society. A third component acknowledges the importance of learning a common language(s) to permit intercultural participation among all groups.

Over the years, I have been involved in conceptual and empirical examinations of Canadian multiculturalism policy from a psychological perspective (Berry, 2013, 2014). I first evaluated the Canadian policy and its implementation after ten years (Berry, 1984) and again after twenty (Berry & Laponce, 1994). In this work, I examined its core elements (and linkages among elements). I proposed that these elements formed a coherent set of psychological concepts and principles and that they could serve as the basis for developing testable hypotheses.

Figure 4 demonstrates some of these core elements and linkages (from Berry, 1984). The fundamental goal of the policy is to enhance mutual acceptance among all etnocultural groups. The cultural component focuses on maintaining and developing cultural groups, while the social component promotes intergroup contact and participation. Learning a common language(s) is also emphasized as part of the cultural component. The intercultural component involves communicative competence and understanding, which are linked to mutual contact and participation. These elements are interrelated, forming a coherent set of psychological concepts and principles.
all ethnocultural groups (upper right). This goal is pursued by three program components. On the upper left is the cultural component, which is to be achieved by providing support for cultural maintenance and development among all ethnocultural groups. The second is the social (or intercultural) component (lower left), which seeks the sharing of cultural expressions by providing opportunities for intergroup contact and by removing barriers to full and equitable participation in the daily life of the larger society. The last feature is the intercultural communication component, shown in the lower right corner of Figure 4. This represents the bilingual reality of Canadian society, promoting the acquisition of one or both official languages (English and French) as a means for all ethnocultural groups to interact with each other and to participate in national life.

It is essential to note that the Canadian concept of multiculturalism, and of multiculturalism policy, has two main and equally important emphases: the maintenance of heritage cultures and identities (the cultural component) and the full and equitable participation of all ethnocultural groups in the life of the larger society (the social or intercultural component).

In addition to these four components, there are linkages among them. The first (top of Figure 4), termed the multiculturalism hypothesis, is expressed in the policy statement as the belief that confidence in one’s identity will lead to sharing, respect for others, and the reduction of discriminatory attitudes. Berry, et. al. (1977) identified this belief as an assumption with psychological roots that is amenable to empirical evaluation. A second link in Figure 4 (left side) is the hypothesis that when individuals and groups are “doubly engaged,” (that is, valuing and participating in both their heritage cultures and in the larger society) they will be more successful in their lives. This success will be evidenced by a higher level of wellbeing in both psychological and social domains. This is the integration hypothesis, in which involvement with, competence in and confidence in both cultural communities provides the social capital to succeed in intercultural living.

A third link portrayed in Figure 4 (diagonal) is the contact hypothesis, by which contact and sharing are believed to promote mutual acceptance under certain conditions, especially those of status equality and voluntary intercultural contact.

By balancing these components, it should be possible to achieve the core goal of the policy: the improvement of intercultural relations in Canada, where all groups and individuals have a place, within both their own heritage cultural environments and the larger society. In this sense, multiculturalism is for everyone, not only for non-dominant groups. This aspect emphasizes that all groups and individuals are engaged in a process of cultural and psychological change.

Other countries have advanced multiculturalism policies. The MPI and MIPEX analyses described above (Section 1.2) provide evidence of large variations in how societies address the issues of diversity and equity. Perhaps closest to the situation in Russia is a proposal by the European Union, which adopted a set of “Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration” in 2005. The first of these principles is:

“Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States. Integration is a dynamic, long-term, and con-
tinuous two-way process of mutual accommodation, not a static outcome. It demands the participation not only of immigrants and their descendants but of every resident. The integration process involves adaptation by immigrants, both men and women, who all have rights and responsibilities in relation to their new country of residence. It also involves the receiving society, which should create the opportunities for the immigrants’ full economic, social, cultural, and political participation. Accordingly, Member States are encouraged to consider and involve both immigrants and national citizens in integration policy, and to communicate clearly their mutual rights and responsibilities."

In this EU statement, we find the three cornerstones of multiculturalism: the right of all peoples to maintain their cultures, the right to participate fully in the life of the larger society, and the obligation for all groups (both dominant and non-dominant) to engage in a process of mutual change. Research on the acceptance of this policy in Europe has only just begun.

However, there is some indication (e.g., van de Vijver, Breugelmans & Schalk-Soekar, 2008) that Europeans make a clear distinction between the right of immigrants to maintain their cultures in private (i.e., in their families and communities) and the right to expect changes to the public culture of the society of settlement. Much of this research found that it is considered to be acceptable to express one’s heritage culture in the family and in the community, but that it should not be expressed in public domains, such as educational or work settings. This view is opposed to the basic principles outlined by the European Union, which identify the process as one of mutual accommodation.

There is also a common misunderstanding that multiculturalism means only the presence of many non-dominant cultural communities (“minorities”) in a society (i.e., acknowledging the cultural maintenance component), without their equitable participation and incorporation into the larger society (i.e., not accepting the intercultural component). Because of this, many see multiculturalism as leading to social division and separation. It is this incomplete view that has led some in Europe to declare that “multiculturalism has failed.” However, in my view, it has not failed because it has never been tried; those societies have given little regard to the intercultural component.

Adaptation to living in culturally diverse societies
The integration hypothesis proposes that adaptation will be more successful in culturally diverse societies when individuals engage with both their heritage culture and the larger society. There are three types of adaptation: psychological, sociocultural, and intercultural. The first two were identified by Ward (1996), who distinguished between psychological adaptation and sociocultural adaptation. The first refers to adaptations that are primarily internal or psychological (e.g., a sense of well-being or self-esteem, sometimes called “feeling well”). The second adaptation (sociocultural) is sometimes called “doing well.” This form of adaptation manifests as competence in carrying out the activities of daily intercultural living. A third form of adaptation has recently been introduced: intercultural adaptation (Berry,
This concept refers to how well individuals relate to each other in a culturally diverse society. It includes both affect (liking or disliking) and behaviors (acting on these preferences) and is assessed using constructs such as ethnic attitudes, tolerance, discrimination and prejudice.

Evidence supporting the integration hypothesis is widespread. Berry (1997) reviewed a number of studies and concluded that this relationship formed a general pattern. More recent research supported his contention with respect not only to psychological and sociocultural adaptation (e.g., Ward & Rana Deuba, 1999; Berry et al. 2006) but also in domain-specific areas of adaptation, such as better cognitive performance in academic settings (van de Vijver, Helms-Lorenz, & Felzer, 1999) and fewer instances of health-risk behaviors (Chédebois et al., 2009). More recently, the meta-analysis by Nguyen and Benet-Martínez (2013) concluded that integration is associated with better adaptation. Specifically, they found that integration (“biculturalism” in their term) has a significant and positive relationship not only with psychological and sociocultural adaptation but also with domain-specific outcomes, such as academic achievement and career success. A possible explanation for the relationship between integration and these positive outcomes is that those who are “doubly engaged” with both cultures receive support and resources from both and are competent in dealing with both as well. The social capital afforded by these multiple social and cultural engagements may well offer the route to success in pluralistic societies.

It is important to note that Berry (2005) has argued that integration can only be achieved in multicultural societies characterized by mutual accommodation, positive perceptions of diversity and the adoption of policies to support cultural maintenance and equitable participation. His comparative research demonstrated that the link between integration and adaptation is weaker in France, where there is more perceived discrimination and fewer multicultural policies, than in Canada (Berry & Sabatier, 2010). Indeed, Verkuyten (2007) has argued that in contrast to settler societies, most European countries have a long history of established majority groups, and as immigration has not played a significant role in the national self-image, it is more difficult for immigrants to be included and find a sense of belonging.

**Improving intercultural relations in culturally diverse societies**

As noted throughout this paper, the multicultural vision is defined as meeting two requirements: maintaining diverse heritage cultures and promoting equitable participation for all ethno-cultural groups. Some multiculturalism policies advance these features and legislate for these outcomes; however, others only promote diversity without equitable inclusion. The multicultural vision asserts that diversity should be valued as a public good, that it should be accommodated and that it should have positive consequences for individuals and groups. However, how can we ensure positive outcomes from sustained intercultural contact?

First, multicultural policy and practice must focus not only on diversity but must also place equal emphasis on inclusive participation. It is the absence of this equity component that has led the people and leaders of some countries to assert
that “multiculturalism has failed.” However, as argued above, it has not failed because it has not been attempted. The most important element in this lack of equitable inclusion is discrimination, which takes place at three levels: systemic (in the society), group (excluding groups of people because of their membership), and personal (diminishing an individual’s opportunity to participate as a member of a cultural community). In much of the research reviewed in this paper, discrimination was found to be the single most important contributor to mutual hostility (that is, reciprocal negative affect) as well as to poor psychological and sociocultural adaptation. Public legislation promoting inclusion and limiting expressions of exclusion (both in words and in action) are required to minimize such negative outcomes.

Second, public education regarding the dual nature of multiculturalism (cultural diversity and equitable inclusion) needs to be prioritized, enabling all members of the society to understand and appreciate this complex vision. The advantages of diversity and equity (as outlined in this chapter; see also Berry, 1998) need to be exemplified in all domains of life: education, health, justice, media and political life. The costs can also be identified, but then challenged by studies showing, for example, that immigration and diversity may have initial economic costs but make significant economic and cultural contributions in the longer term. For instance, public advertising in Canada, based on the slogan “Multiculturalism Works,” promotes the idea that a society in which members know many languages, sets of customs and values enjoys advantages when engaging the world in trade and diplomacy. Additionally, having cultural activities, such as cinema, theatres, music and literature, from diverse parts of the world is widely acknowledged to enrich people’s lives.

Third, the contact hypothesis has been repeatedly assessed and found to be largely valid (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2011). Under most conditions (especially that of equal status contact), more contact is associated with more positive intercultural encounters and outcomes. Intercultural contact, of course, is a prerequisite for the inclusion component of multiculturalism, and positive intercultural attitudes and practices are usually prerequisites for equitable inclusion. Policies and programs that encourage intercultural encounters and dialogue, such as shared endeavors in arts, sport, and politics, may yield positive relations.

Fourth, implicit in the multicultural vision at the country-level is the notion that national identity can and should incorporate diversity. We have seen that in some societies (“settler societies”), holding both a positive ethnic identity and a positive national identity are compatible ways to think of oneself. However, in some other societies (those new to the experience of immigration and diversity), these two identities are negatively correlated. We have also seen that this “double” way of living (using the integration/multicultural strategy) is usually associated with greater levels of personal wellbeing. One way to achieve these positive outcomes is to promote a common in-group identity (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kafati, 2000), a superordinate inclusive identity that accommodates both national and ethnic attachments (see Kunst, Thomsen, & Sam, 2014). For example, research has shown that the values of diversity and inclusion lie at the core of Canadian pride, which underpins Canadian national identity (Cameron & Berry, 2011).
Finally, there is evidence that support for multiculturalism depends on the meaning attributed to the concept and associated policy. The distinction between multiculturalism in principle and multiculturalism in practice has been examined by Yogeeswaran and Dasgupta (2014), who found that construing multiculturalism in abstract terms and in relation to broad goals reduced the extent to which diversity was viewed as threatening by members of dominant groups; conversely, highlighting the concrete ways in which multiculturalism can be achieved increased perceptions of threat. Similarly, in Berry et al.’s (1977) Canadian national survey, support for the ideology of multiculturalism was high, but diminished when it was made more concrete by referring to the practical consequences and was even lower when the costs (e.g., possible tax implications) were identified. This presents challenges for the accommodation of diversity and places a greater onus on governments to balance the benefits of multiculturalism with its costs. Despite these challenges, we believe that the multiculturalism policy and programs rooted in the research reviewed in this chapter will provide a solid basis for the improvement of the experience of acculturation and for making intercultural relations more positive for all.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have noted that multiculturalism is a widespread and increasingly important characteristic of all contemporary societies. These culturally diverse settings provide a social context for intercultural contact, in which acculturation becomes a daily experience for almost everyone. We have emphasized that in these settings, multiculturalism requires the presence of both cultural diversity and equity in social participation. It is clear that the concept of multiculturalism is complex, with many dimensions and meanings. I commenced the examination of this complexity by distinguishing some of the core elements of multiculturalism. First, the term is understood as referring to the demographic fact of cultural diversity in a society. Second, multiculturalism refers to the policies and programs that are in place to manage intercultural relations and acculturation. Third, multiculturalism refers to psychological phenomena, including individual attitudes and ideologies that accept or reject these demographic, civic and policy features of multiculturalism. I have elaborated how these multiple meanings of multiculturalism vary around the world and discussed their positive and negative consequences. Specifically, I have considered the effects of multiculturalism for national societies at one end of the spectrum and for individuals at the other end, with an intermediate level of analysis considering institutions, organizations, neighborhoods, communities and other groups. Within this framework, I have highlighted the psychological processes and outcomes of multiculturalism, particularly in connection with acculturation, adaptation and intercultural relations, and have considered whether these processes and outcomes are the same or different for dominant and non-dominant groups. Finally, I have suggested some ways in which to enhance positive outcomes of intercultural contact and the resultant acculturation outcomes.
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This article examines intercultural relations in the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania (RNO-A). The research is based on the theory of acculturation of J. Berry and uses the hypotheses and measures developed in the Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies project. The RNO-A is the most favorable place for Russians living in the North Caucasus because attitudes toward the Russian minority in the RNO-A are not discriminatory. Our goal was to test three hypotheses in the RNO-A: the multiculturalism hypothesis, the integration hypothesis, and the contact hypothesis. We conducted a sociopsychological survey. The sample included members of the ethnic majority, the Ossetians (N= 318), and members of the ethnic minority, the Russians (N= 327). Data processing was carried out using structural equation modeling (SEM) separately for the ethnic minority and for the ethnic majority, and the models were compared with each other. The results show that perceived security among the Russians (the ethnic minority) as well as among the Ossetians (the ethnic majority) promoted support for a multicultural ideology, tolerance, and mutual integration. The number and frequency of friendly intercultural contacts had a positive and significant impact on a preference for integration among both the Ossetians and the Russians. An integration strategy and the expectation of integration promoted life satisfaction in both groups. Because the results of the study confirmed all three hypotheses, we conclude that interethnic relations between the Russians and the Ossetians in the RNO-A are based on the principles of multiculturalism.

Keywords: intercultural relations, acculturation, ethnic majority, ethnic minority, multiculturalism, intercultural contact, integration

Introduction

A major challenge confronting Russian society in the 21st century is finding effective strategies for managing cultural diversity. Researchers have discerned some basic principles that underpin the processes and outcomes of intercultural relations in plural societies. In our survey we used three hypotheses of intercultural relations
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offered by Berry (2013): the multiculturalism hypothesis, the contact hypothesis, and the integration hypothesis.

The basic notion of the multiculturalism hypothesis is that only when people are secure in their identities they will be in a position to accept those who differ from them. Conversely, when people feel threatened, they will develop prejudice and engage in discrimination. The multiculturalism hypothesis is confirmed in many studies. For example, in two national surveys in Canada (reviewed by Berry & Kalin, 2000), measures of cultural security/threat and economic security/threat were created with respect to extant diversity and the continuing flow of immigration. These two security scores were correlated with each other and with various intercultural attitudes. Cultural security was negatively correlated with ethnocentrism and positively correlated with multicultural ideology and with the perceived consequences of multiculturalism. Economic security had a similar pattern of correlations with these variables.

Ward and Masgoret (2008) found that more frequent intercultural contact led to decreased intergroup anxiety, which, in turn, predicted lower perceptions of threat and more positive attitudes toward immigrants in New Zealand. A study of Estonian Russians showed that the high perception among Estonians that Russia presents a threat is an obstacle to the adaptation of Russians in Estonia (Kruusvall, Vetik, & Berry, 2009).

Rohmann, Florack, and Piontkowski (2006) examined acculturation preferences and desired intergroup contact in connection with the Integrated Threat Theory. They found that the same threats — culture discordance and contact discordance — predicted both negative attitudes toward minority groups (Italians and Turks) among German hosts and negative attitudes toward the majority group (Germans) among immigrants. Moreover, the effects were stronger among and toward Turks than among and toward Italians. A study in the Netherlands (Van Oudenhoven, Groenewoud, & Hewstone, 1996) showed that a secure attachment style was related to a preference for integration in both immigrants and the Dutch. In Russia, Lebedeva and Tatarko (2013) studied intercultural relations between migrants from the Caucasus and Muscovites. They found that cultural security predicted tolerance, a preference for integration, and social equality in both groups, but to a lesser extent among the Muscovites.

The contact hypothesis suggests that negative attitudes held by one group toward another are caused by a lack of knowledge about that group. When individuals of two groups come into positive, personal, and cooperative contact with each other, they will get to know each other, and doing so leads to the elimination or reduction of prejudice. However, there are two important conditions: there must be (1) equal status of individuals or groups in contact and (2) support for intercultural contact by the society. Under these conditions mutual attitudes and interactions will become increasingly positive — for instance, through a growing recognition of similarities (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1997).

A good deal of research has been carried out to test this hypothesis (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp 2011; Van Oudenhoven et al., 1996). An example of the application of the contact hypothesis to the migration context can be found in Voci and Hewstone (2003) in an Italian study and by Van Oudenhoven and colleagues (1996) in Dutch
research; both studies demonstrated that intercultural contact significantly improved attitudes toward immigrants.

In addition, an analysis of the research showed that cross-ethnic friendships are positively related to social competence and life satisfaction (e.g., Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009; Hui, Chen, Leung, & Berry, 2015; Hunter & Elias, 1999; Lease & Blake, 2005; Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). Research with young adults suggests that cross-ethnic friendships are related to psychological well-being (Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008). For children living in multiethnic contexts cross-ethnic friendships have a protective role in psychological well-being (Bagci, Rutland, Kumashiro, Smith, & Blumberg, 2014).

The integration hypothesis posits that when individuals are engaged in both cultures (their own heritage culture and that of the larger society), they will achieve a higher level of adaptation and well-being than when they engage in only one or neither culture. The evidence for integration being associated with better adaptation has been reviewed by Berry (1997, 2011). More recently, Nguyen and Benet-Martínez (2013) carried out a meta-analysis across 83 studies with over 20,000 participants. They found that integration had a significant and positive relationship with both psychological adaptation (e.g., life satisfaction, positive affect, self-esteem) and sociocultural adaptation (e.g., academic achievement, career success, social skills, lack of behavioral problems).

Ward and Kennedy (1994) reported that, compared with assimilated sojourners, integrated sojourners experienced less psychological distress. Studies also showed that the integration expectation predicted both success in coping with stressful situations and emotional intelligence in dominant group members (Schmitz & Berry, 2009). Verkuyten (2009) argued that acceptance and recognition of cultural diversity are important for self-feelings and showed that endorsement of multiculturalism is positively associated with self-esteem for individuals in both dominant and nondominant groups.

However, in some studies the importance of the strategy of assimilation in the adaptation of migrants and ethnic minorities has been demonstrated (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk, & Kinunen, 2011; Kus-Harbord & Ward, 2015; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). For example, a study in Nepal showed that support for assimilation promotes better sociocultural adjustment, while support for integration promotes better psychological well-being (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999).

The context of interethnic relations in the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania

One of the important issues in the RNO-A is interethnic relations and the strategies of mutual acculturation of the dominant ethnic group (Ossetians) and Russians as an ethnic minority. The role of Russians in the economic and social-cultural development of the RNO-A is significant. Russians had a dominant position in the political, economic, cultural, and educational fields through the 1980s. In the 1990s Russians were forced out of their positions and replaced by members of the dominant ethnic group. Analysis of the dynamics of the ethnic composition of the population of the RNO-A suggests an intensive outflow of the Russian population
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(Riots . . . 2002, 2004; Itogi . . . 2010, 2012; Vsesoyuznaya, 2015). Russians constituted around 50% of the population of Ossetia in the 1940s to the 1970s, about 30% in the 1970s to the 1990s, and 20% in 2010. Because of such changes the identity of Russians living in the RNO-A is being transformed; they have started to recognize themselves as an ethnic minority (Belozero, 2001; Soldatova, 1998; Vorobyov, 2001), although they are still the majority in Russia as a whole.

Nevertheless, the literature shows (Migratsiya russikikh, 2013) that attitudes toward the Russian minority in the RNO-A are not discriminatory and that the Republic is the most favorable place for Russians in the North Caucasus. Studies have found that some factors contribute to sociopolitical stability and intergroup peace in the RNO-A: positive historical memories, the long experience of living together in the area, the use of the Russian language in interethnic communication, and the fact that Ossetians and Russians belong to the same Orthodox Church in the RNO-A (Balikoev, 2011).

However, because of the hierarchical structure of Ossetian society, the incorporation of Russians into the regional political and business elites is difficult. Social stratification contributes to the formation of various sectors of society along ethnic lines. Thus, ethnic Ossetians dominate in the parliament (Dzadziev, 2008). Research on strategies of intercultural interaction (Gutsunarova, 2010) have shown that the majority of Ossetians and Russians living in the RNO-A choose a strategy of equal-status interaction and that these ethnic groups are oriented toward mutual integration (Kobakhidze, 2005). However, Russians prefer equal status in interpersonal communication more than Ossetians do (Gutsunarova, 2010). This preference is especially evident in business (Kobakhidze, 2005): Russians, more than Ossetians, are open to joint activities (Gurieva, 1997, 2010).

Ossetians have a high degree of emotional acceptance of Russians (Gurieva, 1997, 2010), and, in general, they have positive stereotypes of Russians. However, Ossetians more frequently demonstrate isolationist attitudes, they have a dominant orientation toward monoethnic marriages, and they are less ready to accept a person from another ethnic group as a supervisor (Kobakhidze, 2005).

The literature and the descriptions of social context allow us to define the purpose of our study and to formulate research hypotheses.

**The research hypotheses**

The objective of our research was to test in the RNO-A three hypotheses of intercultural relations: the multiculturalism hypothesis, the contact hypothesis, and the integration hypothesis.

1. The multiculturalism hypothesis: The higher one’s sense of security, the higher is one’s willingness to accept those who are culturally different. Specifically:
   1a. The higher the perceived security, the higher are support for multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance for both the Russian minority and the majority group.
   1b. The higher the perceived security, the higher is support for the integration strategy/expectation and the lower is support for the assimilation strategy/expectation for both the Russian minority and the majority group.
2. The contact hypothesis: Intercultural contact promotes mutual acceptance (under certain conditions, especially that of equality). Specifically:

2a. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts with the majority group members among the Russian minority group members, the higher are their level of tolerance and their preference for integration and assimilation expectations.

2b. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts with the Russian minority-group members among the majority group members, the higher are their level of tolerance and their preference for integration and assimilation strategies.

2c. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts with the majority group members among the Russian minority group members, the higher are the level of life satisfaction, self-esteem, and sociocultural adaptation of the members of the Russian minority group and the higher are the level of life satisfaction and self-esteem of the members of the majority group.

3. The integration hypothesis: Those who prefer the integration strategy have greater psychological and sociocultural adaptation. Specifically:

3a. The higher the preference for the acculturation strategy of integration among members of the Russian minority group, the higher is their level of life satisfaction and self-esteem; the higher their preference for the acculturation strategy of assimilation, the better is their sociocultural adaptation.

3b. The higher the acculturation expectations of integration among members of the majority group, the higher are their level of life satisfaction and their self-esteem.

Method

Participants

The study was conducted in the RNO-A in 2014. The sample included members of the ethnic majority, the Ossetians (N=318), and of the ethnic minority, the Russians (N=327). Table 1 provides the basic characteristics of these samples.

Table 1. Gender and age characteristics of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gender characteristics</th>
<th>Age characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N, %)</td>
<td>Female (N, %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>99 (30%)</td>
<td>228 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossetians</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>97 (31%)</td>
<td>221 (69%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

The study used scales from the Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies questionnaire (http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/mirips), translated into
Russian and adapted for use in Russia (Lebedeva, 2009). The following scales (except for the Contact scale) were tested using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). Indicators of all models meet recommended characteristics (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

**Contact.** Two items: “How many close Ossetian [Russian] friends do you have?” “How often do you meet with close Ossetian [Russian] friends?” (for Russians, α = .77; for Ossetians, α = .72).

**Perceived security.** Three items: for example, “There is room for a variety of languages and cultures in Ossetia.”

**Multicultural ideology.** Five items: for example, “We should recognize that cultural diversity is a fundamental characteristic of Ossetian society.”

**Tolerance.** Three items: for example, “We should promote equality among all groups, regardless of racial or ethnic origin.”

**Acculturation strategies** (for the Russian minority). **Integration:** Three items: for example, “It is important to me to be fluent in both Ossetian and Russian.” **Assimilation:** Four items: for example, “I prefer social activities that involve Ossetians only.”

**Acculturation expectations** (for the Ossetian majority). **Integration:** Three items: for example, “Russians should be fluent in both Ossetian and Russian.” **Assimilation:** Four items: for example, “Russians should prefer social activities that involve only Ossetians.”

**Self-esteem.** Four items: for example, “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.”

**Life satisfaction.** Four items: for example, “In most ways my life is close to my ideal.”

**Sociocultural adaptation** (for the Russian minority). Seven items: for example, “Living in Ossetia, how much difficulty do you experience in relating to members of the opposite sex?”

**Sociodemographic data.** We asked our participants about their personal characteristics (gender, age, education, and ethnicity).

**Procedure**

We used the snowball technique for sampling. We asked Ossetian and Russian university and high school students to fill out questionnaires by themselves as well as to distribute them among their parents and grandparents. Respondents were not remunerated.

**Data processing**

We used the following methods of data processing: descriptive statistics, Cronbach’s α, confirmatory factor analyses, structural equation modeling (SEM) with SPSS 22.0 and AMOS 22.0.

**Results**

Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, and t-tests of all the measures obtained from the samples of Ossetians and Russians in the RNO-A. Perceived security, multicultural ideology, tolerance, the acculturation strategy of integration,
and self-esteem were significantly higher among the Russians, while the Ossetians’ scores were higher on intensity of friendly contacts with the Russians, the acculturation expectation of assimilation, and life satisfaction. There were significant differences on all measures except perceived security and integration, which were approximately equal in both the groups. The Ossetians’ preference for assimilation of the Russians was expressed by their higher score on the expectation of assimilation of Russians, who preferred assimilation to a lesser extent. The comparisons of acculturation expectations and strategies need to be treated with caution because of the different phrasing of the questions.

Figure 1 presents the results of the testing of the three hypotheses of intercultural relations among the Ossetians.

Consistent with the multiculturalism hypothesis, the levels of support for multicultural ideology and tolerance among the Ossetians could be predicted by their perceived security (.44 and .32 respectively). In addition, perceived security among the Ossetians positively and significantly affected their acculturation expectation of integration (.49) but had a negative and significant effect on their acculturation expectation of assimilation (–.33). In other words, the multiculturalism hypothesis was fully supported in the sample of Ossetians.

The contact hypothesis was partially supported within the majority group. Among the Ossetians their friendly contacts with Russians positively and significantly affected their acculturation expectation of integration (.17) but not their preference for assimilation (.05) and ethnic tolerance (.02). In addition, the relationship between their contacts with Russian friends and perceived security was not significant (–.01).

Complementing the contact hypothesis, our proposal was that intense intercultural contacts as well as the acculturation expectation of integration would promote more life satisfaction and higher self-esteem. However, the results did not confirm our prediction: the Ossetians’ friendly contacts with Russians did not promote
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Figure 1. Results of SEM for the three hypotheses of intercultural relations for the Ossetians. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, n.s. — not significant. Indicators of the model: χ² = 682.2; df = 292; p = .000; χ²/df = 2.3; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .065; SRMR = .066; PCLOSE = .013.

their life satisfaction and self-esteem (.06 and .06), which, however, were positively associated each with other (.34).

Consistent with the integration hypothesis, a preference for the integration expectation among the Ossetians had a positive impact on their life satisfaction (.34); however, the relationship with self-esteem, while positive, was not significant (.14). Their acculturation expectation of assimilation had an insignificant relationship with life satisfaction (.02) but had a significant and positive impact on their self-esteem (.41).

We revealed additional relationships in this model: the level of tolerance among the Ossetians was positively and significantly related to their level of support for multicultural ideology (.57) and to their acculturation expectation of integration (.48), but there was no such significant relationship for the acculturation expecta-
tion of assimilation (−.13). Support for multicultural ideology was significantly and positively correlated with the expectation of integration (0.44); however, this support was not significant for the expectation of assimilation (−0.09).

Figure 2 presents the results of the testing of the three hypotheses of intercultural relations among Russians in the RNO-A.

For the Russians, the multiculturalism hypothesis was also fully supported: perceived security predicted tolerance (0.25) and multicultural ideology (0.78). In addition, perceived security among the Russians, as well as among the Ossetians,

---

**Figure 2.** Results of SEM for the three hypotheses of intercultural relations for Russians. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, n.s. — not significant. Indicators of the model: χ² = 1014.6; df = 497; p = .000; χ²/df = 2.0; CFI = .91; RMSEA = .057; SRMR = .062; PCLOSE = .016.
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positively and significantly affected their acculturation expectation of integration (.51) but had a negative and significant effect on their acculturation expectation of assimilation (–.48).

The contact hypothesis was partially supported within the Russian minority: their friendly contacts with Ossetians positively and significantly affected the acculturation strategy of integration (.20) but not their preference for assimilation (.00) or ethnic tolerance (.01). However, the Russians’ friendly contacts with Ossetians had a significant and positive association with their perceived security (.58), in contrast to the Ossetians’ experiences.

In addition, the Russians’ friendly contacts with Ossetians promoted higher life satisfaction (.24) and self-esteem (.26), in contrast to the Ossetians’ experiences. However, intercultural friendships did not affect the sociocultural adaptation of the Russians (.06).

Consistent with the integration hypothesis, a preference for the integration strategy among the Russians had a significant positive impact on their life satisfaction (.31). The relationship between the acculturation strategy of integration and self-esteem, while positive, was not significant (.16). The impact of integration on sociocultural adaptation was negative but not significant (–.15). Among the Russians, their acculturation strategy of assimilation had a significant and positive impact on their sociocultural adaptation (.32) and a significant negative impact on their self-esteem (–.25). However, assimilation had no significant effect on their life satisfaction (.07).

The level of tolerance among the Russians was positively and significantly related to their level of support for multicultural ideology (.54) and to the acculturation strategy of integration (.24), but there was a negative and significant relationship with the acculturation strategy of assimilation (–.23). Support for multicultural ideology had a positive but insignificant correlation with the strategy of integration (.15), but there was a negative and significant relationship with the acculturation strategy of assimilation (–.18).

As with the Ossetians, the Russians’ self-esteem was positively associated with their life satisfaction (.27). The relationship of life satisfaction and self-esteem with sociocultural adaptation was insignificant and negative (–.15 and –.13, respectively).

Overall, the three hypotheses showed the same pattern of relationships in both the Russian and the Ossetian cultural groups: intercultural contacts promoted a preference for the integration strategy and expectation; perceived security predicted tolerance and multicultural ideology. Intercultural contacts also promoted a preference for the acculturation strategy and the expectation of integration, which in its turn promoted better life satisfaction.

However, we also found differences in the relationships in the models for the Russians and the Ossetians. For the Russians, the acculturation strategy of assimilation affected their self-esteem negatively, but for the Ossetians this influence was positive. For the Russians, their friendly contacts with Ossetians promoted higher life satisfaction and self-esteem, but this relationship was insignificant for the Ossetians. In addition, the results demonstrated that, among the Russians, intercultural friendly contacts had a positive and significant relationship with their perceived security, but this relationship was insignificant for the Ossetians.
Overall, the findings of this study are generally consistent with the three hypotheses. The multiculturalism hypothesis received full support among the Ossetians (the ethnic majority) and the Russians (the ethnic minority). Perceived security predicted multicultural ideology and tolerance in both samples. These results are consistent with data obtained in other countries (e.g., Berry, 2006): measures of security correlated positively with positive intercultural attitudes and multicultural ideology.

Perceived security played an important role in the preference for integration and assimilation. For the ethnic majority and minority members in the RNO-A, perceived security promoted a preference for the acculturation strategy and the expectation of integration but did not promote the acculturation strategy and the expectation of assimilation. In other words, the Ossetians and the Russians, who had a strong mutual perceived security, preferred the integration but not the assimilation strategy or expectation.

The contact hypothesis received partial confirmation in both samples. The results of our study demonstrated that intercultural friendly contacts predicted a preference for integration but did not predict a preference for assimilation or tolerance. The Ossetians were willing to accept Russians on their own cultural terms and did not require them to give up their cultural heritage in order to be accepted in the larger society. Having friends among Ossetians and frequency of contacts with them promoted the orientation of the Russians to the integration strategy. These data partly confirm the results obtained earlier in the RNO-A by Gutsunarova (2010), who notes that intercultural contacts significantly and positively correlated with positive attitudes toward integration.

In addition to orientation to the integration hypothesis, intercultural friendly contacts of ethnic minority group members in the RNO-A promoted both their life satisfaction and their self-esteem; however, for ethnic majority group members, this effect was not significant. Similar evidence, obtained in several other studies, has shown that among children and young adults, cross-ethnic friendships are related to psychological well-being (e.g., Bagci et al., 2014; Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008). In general, for the Russians, both the preference for the integration strategy and intercultural friendly contacts played an important role in obtaining life satisfaction, whereas for the Ossetians only the integration expectation promoted their life satisfaction.

We also found that, for the Russians, intercultural friendships were significantly and positively related to their perceived security, whereas for the Ossetians, this relationship was insignificant. Our data differ from the results of some other studies. For example, Lebedeva and Tatarko (2013) showed that, for migrants, perceived security and contacts were not related to each other. In other words, to have friendly intercultural contacts, a person need not always feel secure.

Consistent with the integration hypothesis, support for the integration strategy among the Russians and the integration expectation among the Ossetians predicted only their life satisfaction. In part, our results are consistent with other research (Ward & Kennedy, 1994) reporting that, compared with assimilated sojourners, integrated sojourners experienced less psychological distress. Previous studies have also shown that the integration expectation predicts both successful
coping in stressful situations and emotional intelligence in dominant group members (Schmitz & Berry, 2009). Jasinskaja-Lahti and colleagues (2011) found in Finland that the integration attitude positively predicted the psychological adaptation of immigrants from Russia and the former Soviet Union. Hui and colleagues (2015) showed that, for dominant-group members in Hong Kong, the integration expectation predicted their psychological adaptation. However, the impact of integration on self-esteem was not revealed in our research data, which were different from data obtained by Verkuyten (2009), who showed that endorsement of multiculturalism is positively associated with self-esteem for individuals of both dominant and nondominant groups.

For ethnic majority-group members in the RNO-A, the assimilation expectation positively predicted their self-esteem, while for ethnic minority-group members, the assimilation strategy negatively predicted their self-esteem. The reason may be that, among Russians, refusing to maintain one's own cultural heritage is not relevant to feelings of self-esteem in a multicultural society like the RNO-A. Our results are consistent with data obtained by Kus-Harbord and Ward (2015) in a study of ethnic Russians in Estonia. Other researchers (Kolosov & O’Loughlin, 2008) have found that assimilation is associated with higher well-being under conditions of low perceived group devaluation but with poorer well-being when group devaluation is perceived as high. Our results may imply that the Russians had a higher perceived group devaluation; therefore, support for the strategy of assimilation negatively correlated with self-esteem. In contrast, the Ossetians may have had a lower perceived group devaluation, and thus support for the strategy of assimilation positively correlated with self-esteem.

In contrast to studies that report that the strategy of integration is most conducive to the sociocultural adaptation of nondominant groups (Berry, 1997; Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2013; Sam & Berry, 2006), we found that among the Russians only the assimilation strategy positively predicted sociocultural adaptation. These data are consistent with the results of Ward and Kennedy (1994), who noted that integrated and assimilated sojourners encountered less social difficulty, and with the results of Ward and Rana-Deuba (1999), who noted that integration promoted better psychological well-being, while assimilation promoted better sociocultural adjustment.

For both samples we found that tolerance significantly and positively correlated with multicultural ideology and a preference for integration. The Russians and the Ossetians who recognized intergroup differences and respected equal rights and who held a positive attitude toward multiculturalism preferred the integration strategy/expectation. Similar results have been found in studies of dominant and nondominant groups in Hong Kong (Hui et al., 2015) and in a study of Dutch majority-group members (Schalk-Soekar & Van de Vijver, 2008).

In addition, for the Ossetians multicultural ideology was significantly and positively related to the acculturation expectation of integration. However, for the Russians this relationship was not significant. For the Russians multicultural ideology and tolerance were significantly and negatively related to the acculturation strategy of assimilation (for ethnic majority-group members these relationships were not significant).
Our study showed that in both samples self-esteem was significantly and positively correlated with life satisfaction. For the Russians self-esteem and life satisfaction had negative relationships with sociocultural adaptation, but these relationships were not significant.

**Conclusion**

We have shown that a sense of security is important in achieving mutual acceptance and integration among ethnic minority and majority groups in the RNO-A: in both samples, security was strongly related to multicultural ideology and tolerance. Therefore, the multiculturalism hypothesis received full support with both the Ossetians and the Russians. In addition, we found that perceived security predicted positively the integration strategy/expectation and predicted negatively the assimilation strategy/expectation.

The present study proved that the quantity of interethnic friends and the frequency of meeting with them promoted the integration strategy/expectation but not the assimilation strategy/expectation and tolerance in both samples. In addition, we found that for the ethnic minority group in the RNO-A intercultural contacts can be antecedents of higher life satisfaction and self-esteem. Thus, the contact hypothesis was partially supported in our study. In addition, intercultural contacts correlated significantly and positively with perceived security in the ethnic minority group.

The integration hypothesis was also partially supported: the Russians’ preference for the integration strategy promoted their life satisfaction but not their self-esteem and better sociocultural adaptation. The Ossetians’ preference for the integration expectation also promoted their life satisfaction but not their self-esteem. In addition, we found that support for the acculturation strategy of assimilation significantly and negatively predicted self-esteem and significantly and positively predicted better sociocultural adaptation in the ethnic minority group. For the ethnic majority group, support for the acculturation expectation of assimilation significantly and positively predicted their self-esteem.

Therefore, our testing of the multiculturalism hypothesis, the integration hypothesis, and the contact hypothesis in the RNO-A showed that, in general, mutual intercultural attitudes are positive and correspond to the ideology of multiculturalism in the RNO-A. This identified pattern of relations demonstrates that intergroup interaction in a multicultural society between two ethnic groups that are both oriented toward mutual integration and close intercultural contacts promotes the psychological well-being of both groups.

**Limitations**

The main limitation of this study is that it was conducted in a specific region. This study did not measure variables that may be important for studies of acculturation and intercultural relations in other regions — for example, cultural distance. In the RNO-A the cultural distance between Russians and Ossetians tends to be rather small because Ossetians and Russians are both Orthodox Christians, in contrast
to the situation in other regions of the North Caucasus. The cultural specificity of this region might have an impact on the positive nature of intercultural relations in it. In future research, it will be important to test these hypotheses in regions with a greater cultural distance between the majority and minority groups.
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The project Mutual Intercultural Research in Plural Societies was designed to examine three hypotheses of intercultural relations: the multiculturalism hypothesis, the integration hypothesis, and the contact hypothesis. These hypotheses were derived from the Canadian multiculturalism policy (Berry, 1984), and their validity has been assessed in a number of countries. Our goal was to evaluate these hypotheses in Russia (Moscow) and Latvia (Riga). We used sociopsychological surveys of two dominant groups (Russian Muscovites and Latvians in Riga) and two nondominant groups (migrants from the Caucasus in Moscow and the Russian minority in Riga) employing structural equation modeling. A sense of perceived security promoted tolerance toward other cultural groups in three of the samples. Perceived security was related significantly to multicultural ideology in Riga, but there was no significant relationship to multicultural ideology in the Moscow samples. A preference for the integration strategy among the migrants in Moscow as well as among the Russians in Latvia promoted their better sociocultural adaptation and had a significant impact on the life satisfaction of the Muscovites but had no impact on the Latvian sample in Riga. Our results provided some support for the effect of intercultural contact on the acceptance of others in three of the groups: the migrants in Moscow, the Russian minority in Riga, and the dominant group in Moscow. However, among the Russians in Riga, the relationship between contacts and perceived security was negative. The multiculturalism hypothesis was confirmed with the dominant group in Riga and was partly confirmed with both the dominant and the nondominant groups in Moscow and with the Russian minority in Riga. The contact hypothesis received partial support with both groups in Moscow and the Russian minority in Riga but was not confirmed with the Latvians in Riga. There was partial support for the role of the integration strategy in promoting sociocultural adaptation and well-being among the migrants in Moscow and the Muscovites. These findings require additional analysis of the sociopolitical and historical context in Latvia in order to understand the psychological outcomes of acculturation among the Russian minority there.
Keywords: integration, multiculturalism, acculturation strategies/expectations, intercultural contact, intercultural relations, multicultural ideology, life satisfaction, perceived security, tolerance

Introduction
After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Russia and the other former Soviet republics faced new challenges in achieving mutual acceptance among members of the larger society and members of other ethnic groups. We present here an empirical examination of the three hypotheses of intercultural relations (multiculturalism, integration, and contact) in the Russian and Latvian contexts.

Context of intercultural relations in Russia
According to United Nations estimates for 2013, the Russian Federation is the world’s second-leading country in the number of immigrants (11.2 million), after the United States (with 45.8 million immigrants). The states of the former Soviet Union account for most of the inflow into Russia (in 2009, their overall share was 74%), with the relative contribution of Central Asian countries continuously on the rise. Russia now faces a different kind of immigration compared with that of the early 2000s, when most immigrants were ethnic Russians from the former Soviet states. These newer immigrants have lower educational levels and less professional training than previous migrants. Their knowledge of the Russian language is also lower than that of earlier migrants (Vishnevskiy, 2011).

From the early 1990s onward, this immigration was generally viewed by Russian officials as a transient phenomenon, and immigrant workers were regarded as nonpermanent residents. However, it is now clear that Russia has become an immigrant-receiving country, and immigration has become an enduring phenomenon. Immigrant workers are especially in demand in the country’s larger cities. Moscow is the most popular destination for migrants. Its 10.38 million inhabitants include people from every ethnic group now living in the Russian Federation, as well as from a wide range of foreign countries. Although 85% of the city’s permanent residents are ethnic Russians, they have experienced deterioration of living standards and social status. This change has raised fears among “native” Muscovites that they could be forced out of their established socioeconomic positions and could have their living standards lowered. Intercultural arguments, including references to differences in religion or education levels, are often used to explain the growing social instability and expanding crime rates in Moscow.

Thus, the problems of the mutual adaptation of these culturally distant immigrants and the Russian population are sharp and have resulted in the growth of xenophobia and of ethnic and religious intolerance (Lebedeva & Tatarko, 2013). Previously, in the Soviet Union, an ideology of “internationalism” and the promotion of an overall identity as “Soviet people” helped to avoid serious problems with intercultural interactions. Soviet people perceived themselves as equal to each other, irrespective of their ethnic origin. At present, with increasing migration and the rise of specific ethnic and religious identities, serious issues challenge intercultural relations in Russian society. As a result, the government is faced with the need to develop policies on migration and intercultural relations.
Context of intercultural relations in Latvia

Latvia also cannot be called an ethnically homogeneous country. Relations between the dominant ethnic group (the Latvians) and other ethnic groups play an important role in Latvia’s domestic policy (Apine, 2010). Other ethnic groups therefore constitute a significant force in the shared experience of Latvian society. Ethnic Russians form the second largest ethnic group by size (26.0%) after Latvians themselves (61.4%) (The population of Latvia…, 2014) Russians are indeed in a unique position owing to a change in their status. Before the Soviet Union broke up, Russians in Latvia were the ethnic majority, but, after the fall, they immediately became the ethnic minority.

Modern European standards of democracy require Latvia to provide equal rights for both the dominant ethnic group and ethnic minorities when it comes to political participation. So what is Latvia’s official policy toward Russians? Latvia’s official policy toward national minorities is defined as “integration while preserving cultural and ethnic identity” (Permanent Mission of the Republic of Latvia to the United Nations, 2016). In Latvia, national minorities are officially defined as Latvian citizens who differ from ethnic Latvians by their culture, religion, or language and who have traditionally been living in Latvia for a long time and consider themselves a part of the Latvian state and society. People who are not citizens of Latvia are not considered members of a national minority, but they still enjoy the same rights as national minorities unless the law places restrictions on them. However, this definition presents a problem for national minorities, in particular for noncitizens residing in Latvia for an extended period of time (typically since the end of the Soviet Union). As of July 1, 2014, there were 276,797 noncitizens residing in Latvia (12.77% of Latvia’s total population) (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia, 2015). In comparison, citizens of the former Soviet Union who were residing in Russia after the fall received Russian citizenship automatically.

Noncitizens of Latvia are not refugees; they are guaranteed almost the same rights as Latvian citizens (they have the right to reside permanently in Latvia and also have the same social guarantees as citizens). The main difference in rights is that noncitizens cannot vote or be elected and cannot hold public office or positions related to national security. On July 22, 1994, policymakers adopted an official citizenship law that described the naturalization procedure that began in 1995. Naturalization is the process by which an applicant for citizenship is awarded Latvian citizenship after passing exams on the Latvian language and on the history of Latvia and after swearing an oath to the Latvian Republic. But, in reality, this process better represents assimilation than integration because the purpose of naturalization is the gradual removal of the Russian language from daily communication. Language is, after all, one of the strongest ties people have with their culture. The second step in carrying out the assimilation policy toward the Russian minority in Latvia has its roots in education. In 1998, a new education law (in effect since June 10, 1999) had a significant impact on the education of ethnic minorities in Latvia (Republic of Latvia, 1998). Before 1999, there were both “Latvian” schools and schools for ethnic minorities in Latvia. Teaching in schools for ethnic minorities was carried out in their native language (for example, in Russian schools children were taught in Russian), and the state language (Latvian) was taught also as a special discipline.
The 1998 law introduced a new term: “schools using national minority educational programs.” In this way, the Russian language started to gradually become less relevant in education. Therefore, we can conclude that through its declared integration policy, Latvia is actually implementing a gradual assimilation policy for ethnic minorities.

**Theoretical background of the hypotheses of the research**

We have derived our research hypotheses from the three theoretical propositions on interethnic relations in plural societies (Berry, 2013). The first, termed the **multiculturalism hypothesis**, links cultural maintenance with positive intercultural relations. This hypothesis proposes that when people are secure in their own identity (when there is no threat to their culture and identity), they will be in a position to accept those who differ from them. This hypothesis is derived from a statement in the Canadian multiculturalism policy to the effect that when individuals are confident in their cultural and personal identities, intercultural relations will become more positive (including willingness to engage in intercultural contact, respect for others, and reduction in discrimination). Conversely, when people feel threatened, they will develop prejudice and engage in discrimination (Stephan, Renfro, Esses, Stephan, & Martin, 2005). Substantial empirical evidence now supports this hypothesis in various countries (Berry & Kalin, 2000; Berry, Kalin, & Taylor, 1977; Kruusvall, Vetik, & Berry, 2009; Ward & Masgoret, 2008). In our previous research, we studied mutual attitudes of Muscovites and migrants from the North Caucasus to Moscow, and we found that cultural security predicted tolerance, a preference for integration, and social equality in both groups, but to a lesser extent in Muscovites (Lebedeva & Tatarko, 2009).

A second theoretical proposition is the **contact hypothesis**. This hypothesis posits that intercultural contact and sharing promote mutual acceptance under certain conditions, especially that of equality (Allport, 1954). In national surveys in Canada, Kalin and Berry (1982) found substantial support for this relationship, especially when status was controlled. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006, 2008) carried out meta-analyses of numerous studies of the contact hypothesis from many countries and in many diverse settings (schools, workplaces, and experiments). Their findings provide general support for the contact hypothesis: intergroup contact does generally relate negatively to prejudice in both dominant and nondominant samples.

A third proposition is the **integration hypothesis**. This hypothesis proposes that when individuals and groups are “doubly engaged” (in both their heritage cultures and in the larger society) they will be more successful in their lives, including having a sense of personal well-being and sociocultural competence. In much research on intercultural relations and acculturation, the integration strategy has often been found to lead to better adaptation than other strategies (Berry, 1997). A possible explanation is that those who are doubly engaged with both cultures receive support and resources from both and are competent in dealing with both. The social capital afforded by these multiple social and cultural engagements may well offer the route to success in plural societies. The evidence for integration being associated
with better adaptation has been reviewed, and the integration hypothesis is well supported in comparative research (Berry & Sabatier, 2010). Nguyen and Benet-Martínez (2013) carried out a meta-analysis of 83 studies involving over 20,000 participants and found that integration (“biculturalism”) has a significant and positive relationship with both psychological adaptation (life satisfaction, positive affect, self-esteem) and sociocultural adaptation (academic achievement, career success, possession of social skills, lack of behavioral problems).

By using these components together and in a balanced way, it should be possible to achieve the core goal of the policy of multiculturalism: the improvement of intercultural relations in multicultural societies. The main goal of our research was testing and evaluating the relevance of these three hypotheses in the Russian and Latvian contexts.

**The research hypotheses**

1. **The multiculturalism hypothesis**: The higher one’s sense of security, the higher is one’s willingness to accept those who are culturally different. Specifically: the higher the perceived security, the higher are support of multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance (for both the minority group and the members of the larger society).

2. **The contact hypothesis**: Intercultural contact and sharing promote mutual acceptance (under certain conditions, especially that of equality). Specifically:
   2a. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts with the larger society among minority members, the higher are their preference for integration or assimilation strategies and their ethnic tolerance.
   2b. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts with immigrants among members of the larger society, the higher are their preference for integration and assimilation, their acculturation expectations, and their ethnic tolerance.

3. **The integration hypothesis**: Those who prefer the integration strategy have greater psychological and sociocultural adaptation. Specifically:
   3a. The higher the preference for the acculturation strategy of integration among minority group members, the higher is their level of life satisfaction and sociocultural adaptation.
   3b. The higher the acculturation expectations of integration among members of the larger society, the higher is their level of life satisfaction.

**Method**

**Participants**

The sample in Russia (Moscow) included 1,029 adult respondents: 651 were Russian Muscovites and 378 were migrants from the North Caucasus and South Caucasus states (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia). The sample in Latvia (Riga) included Latvians (N=363) and ethnic Russians (N=336). See Table 1 for age and gender statistics.
Table 1. Sample composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Gender Male</th>
<th>Gender Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians (Moscow)</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic migrants (Moscow)</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvians (Riga)</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Russians (Riga)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

The study used some scales and items from the project Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies (http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/mirips). The items were translated into Russian and adapted for use in Russia (Lebedeva & Tatarko, 2009, 2013) and were translated into Latvian and adopted for use in Latvia by our colleague I. Plotka. For this research, we used a 5-point scale: 1 — totally disagree; 2 — disagree; 3 — not sure/neutral; 4 — somewhat agree; 5 — totally agree.

**Perceived cultural security.** This construct assessed the perceived cultural security of the ethnic majority and minorities. The scale included three items (for example, “Learning other languages makes us forget our own cultural traditions”).

**Intercultural contacts.** Intercultural contacts were measured by parallel questions for minority and majority groups. We asked respondents about the number of their close friends and the frequency of their contacts with them. Muscovites were asked about their friends among migrants, and migrants were asked about their friends among Muscovites. This combination of the number and frequency of intercultural contacts is termed “intensity of contacts.” We asked only about close friendly contacts because friendly contacts implicitly involve equality, one of the conditions stipulated in the contact hypothesis.

**Multicultural ideology.** This construct assesses support for multiculturalism as a public policy and practice. It was measured by three items (for example, “A society that has a variety of ethnic and cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur”).

**Intercultural strategies of the nondominant population.** For the purposes of this research, we used intercultural attitudes only toward integration and assimilation, which are the two strategies that involve a willingness to engage with the larger society. The integration strategy was measured using three items (for example, “It is important to me to be fluent both in [national language] and in [ethnic language]”). The assimilation strategy was measured using three items (for example, “I prefer social activities which involve [ethnic group] only”). These items were used with the migrants and Russians in Riga.
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Intercultural expectations of the dominant population. Paralleling the strategies scale used with the nondominant populations, we used only the intercultural expectations of integration and assimilation with the host populations. These are the two expectations that involve a willingness to accept others into the larger society. The integration expectation was measured using three items (for example, “I feel that immigrants should maintain their own cultural traditions but also adopt those of Russians”). The assimilation expectation was measured using 3 items (for example, “It is more important for immigrants to be fluent in Russian (Latvian) than in their own language”). These items were used with the host populations only (Russians in Moscow and Latvians in Riga).

Ethnic tolerance. This scale had four items (for example, “It is good to have people from different ethnic and racial groups living in the same country”). This scale was applied to all four samples.

Sociocultural adaptation. This scale assesses competence in daily intercultural living among nondominant populations (Ward, 1996). Migrants in Moscow (and Russians in Riga) indicated how much difficulty they experienced while living in Moscow in each of 20 areas of daily life. Items were recoded positively.

Life satisfaction. This scale included four items (for example, “In most ways my life is close to my ideal”) and was used with all samples.

Demographic variables. In addition to the psychological constructs used for measuring the observed variables, questions asking about respondents’ backgrounds, such as gender, age, level of education, were included in the questionnaire. We used these questions with all samples.

Procedure
We used a “snowball” sampling strategy, asking our friends, acquaintances, and colleagues who were members of various migrant communities to interview their friends and relatives. Then, we asked them to distribute the questionnaire to other friends and acquaintances. The migrant sample contained people who came to study or work in Moscow, their friends, and their parents. The sample of Russians included ethnic Russians who were permanent Moscow residents. The same snowball strategy was used for this sample. Students made up about 66% of the whole sample. The questionnaire took approximately 40 minutes to complete. Because most of the respondents had a relatively high level of education, had lived in Russia for years, and had a good command of the Russian language, the survey was conducted in Russian.

In Riga the snowball technique was used by our Latvian colleagues. They interviewed Latvian and Russian university students first and then asked them to interview their ethnic Latvian and ethnic Russian friends, acquaintances, colleagues, and relatives. For Russians, the survey was conducted in Russian; for Latvians it was conducted in Latvian.
**Data processing**

For the testing of our three hypotheses, we used structural equation modeling (SEM) with AMOS version 20. We also used path analysis with AMOS version 19 (Arbuckle, 2010). This instrument allows the evaluation of a series of simultaneous hypotheses, taking measurement errors into account (see Bollen & Pearl, 2013). During the data processing, separate models were constructed for the each of four samples.

**Results**

We tested all three hypotheses of intercultural relations in the combined models with all four samples using structural equation modeling. The results for the migrants from the Caucasus in Moscow are presented in Figure 1. Assessment of model fit indicates that all the goodness-of-fit indices are exceptionally good ($\chi^2 = 683; p < .001; \chi^2/df = 1.8; \text{CFI} = .91; \text{AGFI} = .87; \text{RMSEA} = .05; \text{PCLOSE} = .84$).

![Figure 1. Results of structural equation modeling for all three hypotheses combined for the migrants in Moscow. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.](image-url)
Following our hypotheses we can see that perceived security was a significant positive predictor of ethnic tolerance ($\beta = 0.79, p < .001$). Ethnic contacts significantly and positively predicted both assimilation ($\beta = 0.17, p < .05$) and integration ($\beta = 0.26, p < .001$) strategies. The integration strategy in its turn significantly positively predicted the sociocultural adaptation ($\beta = 0.15, p < .05$) but not the life satisfaction of the migrants.

Figure 2 shows results of structural equation modeling for all three hypotheses combined for the Russians in Moscow. Assessment of model fit indicates that all the goodness-of-fit indices are satisfactory ($\chi^2 = 554; p < .001; \chi^2/df = 2.3, \text{CFI} = .91; \text{AGFI} = .91; \text{RMSEA} = .05; \text{PCLOSE} = .87$).

Perceived security was a significant positive predictor of ethnic tolerance ($\beta = 0.50, p < .001$) as with the migrants’ sample. Ethnic contacts significantly and positively predicted ethnic tolerance ($\beta = 0.10, p < .05$) and integration expectation ($\beta = 0.10, p < .05$) but did not predict assimilation. Finally, the integration strategy significantly and positively predicted the life satisfaction of the Russians in Moscow ($\beta = 0.10, p < .05$).

![Figure 2](image_url)

**Figure 2.** Results of structural equation modeling for all three hypotheses combined for the Russians in Moscow. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. 
For the Latvian case, Figure 3 shows the results of structural equation modeling for all three hypotheses combined for the Russian minority in Riga. The model fit indicates that all the goodness-of-fit indices are satisfactory ($\chi^2 = 554; p < .001; \chi^2 / df = 2.3; CFI = .91; AGFI = .91; RMSEA = .05; PCLOSE = .87$). Perceived security had no significant effect on either ethnic tolerance or multicultural ideology. Ethnic contacts significantly and positively predicted both the assimilation ($\beta = 0.26, p < .05$) and integration ($\beta = 0.31, p < .001$) strategies. The integration strategy had no statistically significant impact on either the sociocultural adaptation or the life satisfaction of the Russians in Riga.

Figure 4 shows the results of structural equation modeling for all three hypotheses combined for the Latvians in Riga. Assessment of model fit indicates that all the goodness-of-fit indices are exceptionally good ($\chi^2 = 472.3; p < .001; \chi^2 / df = 1.8; CFI = .87; AGFI = .88; RMSEA = .05; PCLOSE = .58$). Perceived security was a significant positive predictor of both ethnic tolerance ($\beta = 0.37, p < .01$)
Figure 4. Results of structural equation modeling for all three hypotheses combined for the Latvians in Riga. * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \), *** \( p < .001 \).

and multicultural ideology (\( \beta = 0.60, p < .001 \)). Ethnic contacts significantly and positively predicted ethnic tolerance (\( \beta = 0.21, p < .05 \)) but did not predict either the integration or the assimilation acculturation expectations. Integration in its turn had no significant impact on life satisfaction, as in the sample of the Russians in Riga.

**Discussion**

In our study, we tested mutual intercultural attitudes of the migrants/ethnic minority and the dominant population in Russia and Latvia, using the three hypotheses of intercultural relations: multiculturalism, contact, and integration.

According to the first hypothesis (multiculturalism) the higher the perceived security, the higher are the support of multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance (for both the minority group and the members of the larger society). For
both samples in Moscow we found that higher perceived security predicted higher levels of ethnic tolerance. For the two samples in Riga, we see the same pattern for both the dominant and the Russian minority groups, but the coefficients are significant only for the dominant group. However, only in the sample of Latvians does perceived security have a significant impact on support for multicultural ideology. Thus the results of the study fully support the multiculturalism hypothesis for the Latvians in Riga and partially support it for the migrants and the dominant group in Moscow and do not support it for the Russian minority in Riga.

The contact hypothesis posits the positive impact of friendly intercultural contacts on acceptance of “cultural others.” For the migrants from the Caucasus, having frequent friendly contacts among the Moscow population positively and significantly affected their acculturation strategies of integration and assimilation, just as they did for the Russians in Riga. For the Russian Muscovites, having friends among migrants and a high frequency of contact with them positively and significantly affected their acculturation expectation of integration. With respect to tolerance, for the migrants in Moscow, the impact of their contacts with Muscovites on their ethnic tolerance was negative and not significant. However, for the Russian Muscovites and for the Latvians in Riga, their intercultural contacts positively and significantly predicted their level of ethnic tolerance. So the contact hypothesis is partially confirmed with all four groups. We have two different patterns in these relationships: in the nondominant groups intercultural contacts positively predicted their integration and assimilation, but not their ethnic tolerance; however, in the dominant groups of Russian Muscovites and Latvians in Riga intercultural contacts contributed primarily to their level of ethnic tolerance.

According to the integration hypothesis, preference for the integration strategy promotes better psychological and sociocultural adaptation. Consistent with the hypothesis, a preference for the integration strategy among the migrants in Moscow had a positive impact on their sociocultural adaptation; however, the relationship with life satisfaction, while positive, was not significant. In the Muscovites, a preference for the integration expectation had a positive significant impact on their life satisfaction. In both groups in Riga we saw no significant impacts of the integration preference on the indicators of sociocultural and psychological adaptation. Thus, we can conclude that the minorities’ preference for the strategy of integration indeed contributed to their sociocultural adaptation to living in Moscow but not significantly to their sociocultural adaptation in Riga, and it did not contribute to their life satisfaction there. As for the majority groups, the preference for integration among the Russians in Moscow promoted their life satisfaction, but it did not promote such satisfaction for the Latvians in Riga. Therefore, the integration hypothesis was partially supported in both groups in Moscow (the migrants and the host population), but it was not supported in both groups in Latvia (the Russian minority and the ethnic Latvians).

Thus, all three hypotheses received partial support in Moscow, but the multiculturalism hypothesis was not confirmed with the Russians in Latvia, and the integration hypothesis was not supported with the Latvian Russians and Latvians in Riga.
The most important question is why the integration hypothesis did not receive support in Latvia. To answer it we decided to analyze some relationships among the main predictors in the models. First, a preference for integration was positively related to multicultural ideology, while the opposite relationship existed for assimilation in both groups in Moscow and in the Latvians in Riga. This pattern shows the different nature of these two acculturation strategies. However, we found positive and significant relationships between assimilation and multicultural ideology among the Russians in Latvia. Both findings require additional analysis of the sociopolitical and historical context in Latvia in order to understand the psychological outcomes of mutual acculturation of the minority and majority groups. Some parallels in previous research on intercultural relations in Estonia might shed light on our results. In Berry’s (1997) terms, the Estonian formulation of integration policy incorporates only the participation dimension; the cultural-maintenance dimension is not supported. Thus, the political terminology of integration is much closer to the acculturative expectation of assimilation. The ethnically connoted nation-state model equates integration with forced assimilation, and as the majority of Estonian Russians do not wish to assimilate, integration for them means “something to avoid.” Therefore, the term integration itself has a negative meaning among ethnic Russians there (Kruusvall et al., 2009). Similarly, we described the Latvian context and policy as promoting assimilation more than integration, despite the opposite wording. This policy might explain why integration did not predict any positive outcomes for either of the groups in Latvia. The positive relationships of multicultural ideology with assimilation and the negative relationships of multicultural ideology with integration also support this thesis.

Second, perceived security and intercultural contacts were not related to each other in Moscow but had a significant negative relationship in Riga. In other words, to have friendly intercultural contacts in Moscow a person need not feel secure. However, in Riga there are significant negative relationships between security and contact; intercultural contacts there may make Russians and Latvians feel less secure. However, it could be vice versa: low security impedes intercultural contact. Either way, this negative relationship tells us that these two groups are almost isolated from each other and avoid intercultural contacts to reduce their sense of insecurity.

The core question is whether intercultural contacts between Latvians and Russians are a threat to their security. Are there positive consequences of frequent friendly contacts? Of course there are. Russians contribute to the integration and assimilation in the society of Latvia, and Latvians promote ethnic tolerance. Thus, we see the main directions for national integration in Latvia: to facilitate friendly intercultural contacts between Latvian and Russians, while at the same time providing a sense of cultural security (and reducing a sense of threat) in both groups. This is the real meaning of multicultural ideology and of a multicultural policy.

There are some limitations to our study. The first limitation concerns the samples and reduces the generalizability of the findings: they are not representative for Russia as well as for Latvia because data were collected only in Moscow and
Riga. The second limitation concerns the snowball sampling technique, in which respondents were recruited from a narrow circle of friends and acquaintances. To overcome these limitations, we plan to test these three hypotheses in other regions of Russia and in neighboring countries to compare the findings in different sociocultural contexts. This approach should allow us to assess the general character of these hypotheses, as well to identify some cultural specifics.

**Conclusion**

Our research tested the three hypotheses of multicultural relations in dominant and nondominant groups in Russia and Latvia and let us come to the following conclusions:

For the multiculturalism hypothesis, perceived security promoted tolerance toward other cultural groups in three of the samples (the migrants in Moscow, the Russian Muscovites, and the Latvians) and promoted both tolerance and support for multicultural ideology in the Latvians. No significant relationships of these factors were found among the Latvian Russians.

For the contact hypothesis, intercultural contacts promoted mutual acceptance: a preference for integration and assimilation strategies among the migrants in Moscow and the Russian minority in Riga, a preference for the integration expectation in the Russian Muscovites, and ethnic tolerance among the Latvians in Riga.

For the integration hypothesis, a preference for integration among the migrants in Moscow promoted their better sociocultural adaptation but had no impact on the Latvian Russians. The preference for the integration expectation had a significant impact on the life satisfaction of the Muscovites but had no effect on the Latvians in Riga.

Thus, all three hypotheses received partial support from the migrants and the dominant group in Moscow, but the multiculturalism hypothesis was not confirmed with the Russians in Riga, and the integration hypothesis was not supported by the Latvians or the Russians in Riga.

In general, we believe that the key conditions for positive intercultural relations are the presence of a sense of security, friendly intercultural contacts, and the acceptance of multiculturalism in the larger society, both in public attitudes and in public policy.
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Intercultural relations in Kabardino-Balkaria: Does integration always lead to subjective well-being?
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This article examines intercultural relations in Kabardino-Balkaria. Among a great number of ethnic groups living in Kabardino-Balkaria, Kabardians and Balkars are one of the largest (they are so-called titular ethnic groups). Russians are the second largest of the ethnic groups after Kabardians. We report here the results of an empirical study of the intercultural relations, mutual acculturation, and adaptation of Kabardians and Balkars (N = 285) and Russians (N = 249). Specifically, we examine the relevance of three hypotheses formulated to understand intercultural relations: the multiculturalism hypothesis, the integration hypothesis, and the contact hypothesis. We conducted path analysis in AMOS with two samples: a sample of Russians and a sample of the two main ethnic groups (Kabardians and Balkars), and we further compared the path models with each other. The results revealed significant effects of security, intercultural contacts, multicultural ideology, acculturation strategies, and acculturation expectations on attitudes, life satisfaction, and self-esteem in both samples. These findings partially confirm the three hypotheses in both groups. However, we also identified a regionally specific pattern. We found that, in the Russian sample, the integration strategy was negatively related to well-being, while contact with the dominant ethnic group was positively related to well-being. At the same time, in the sample of Kabardians and Balkars, acculturation expectations of integration and assimilation were positively related to well-being. In the article, we discuss these regional specifics.

Keywords: acculturation strategies/expectations, intercultural contact, intercultural relations, multicultural ideology, life satisfaction, perceived security, perceived discrimination/threat, ethnic tolerance

In our study, we sought to verify three hypotheses of intercultural relations (the multiculturalism hypothesis, the integration hypothesis, and the contact hypothesis). Although these hypotheses have received support in many intercultural contexts, it is important to evaluate them in different ways in different countries and regions. In Russia, which is a multicultural society with many ethnonational...
republics, each republic has its own particular features of intercultural relations. Thus, the hypotheses can be confirmed only with acknowledgment of certain specific regional characteristics. In this study, we focused on the specific way each of these hypotheses works in the context of intercultural relations in the Kabardino-Balkar Republic (KBR). Kabardino-Balkaria can be viewed as a new context in which to examine these issues. Russians, who are the former Soviet political elite in the Republic, are now in a minority position. In contrast, there has been a growth of ethnic consciousness among the Kabardians and the Balkars, who are the titular population. To begin, we briefly describe the history and specific features of intercultural relations between Russians and the titular ethnic groups in the KBR.

The context of the intercultural relations of Russians and the titular ethnic groups in the Kabardino-Balkar Republic

Kabardino-Balkaria was formed in 1922 as an autonomous oblast by merging the Kabardian autonomous region and the Balkar region of the Mountain Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. The Russian population of these regions was involved in this process too. Since then, in Kabardino-Balkaria the principle of parity has been accepted by each side. The principle of parity means equal representation of Kabardians, Russians, and Balkars in the government structures of the Republic (Akkiyeva, 1999).

Nowadays the Kabardino-Balkar Republic (KBR) is a part of the North Caucasian Federal District of the Russian Federation. The Russian population is the second largest after the Kabardians. Although both Russians and Balkars have an essential impact on the Republic, Kabardians are the most influential. It is important to note that Kabardians and Balkars are Sunni Muslims and the Russians are Orthodox Christians.

Russians have been living in the KBR for several generations. However, the outflow of the Russian population from the region has been increasing. From 1989 to 2010 the Russian population in the KBR decreased from 31.9% to 22.5% (Vsesoyuznaya ..., 2015; Itogi ..., 2010, 2012). A survey conducted in 2007 among Russians in Kabardino-Balkaria (N= 520) revealed that every fourth Russian would like to leave the Republic. More than one-third (37%) of the people aged 18–24 years intended to leave (Akkiyeva, 2013). Dzadziev (1999) claims that the main reasons for the Russian population outflow were socioeconomic and ethnopolitical factors. The replacement of qualified Russian specialists by specialists from the titular ethnic groups of the North Caucasus republics was the most important socioeconomic factor. In the period before and after II World War, Russians were brought to the Republic to set up the industry sector, and qualified workers among the titular ethnic groups were trained at this time. As a result, qualified workers from these groups displaced Russian workers. At the same time, an increase in interethnic tension between the titular ethnic groups and the Russian population, caused by the process of “sovereignization”\(^1\) (Dzadziev, 1999), was the most impor-

\(^1\) Sovereignization is defined as the aspiration to achieve independence and the process for doing so.
tant ethnopolitical factor. During the sovereignization of the republics of the North Caucasus, the Russian population acquired the status of an “ethnic minority” with decreased representation in government structures and prestigious employment areas (i.e., the principle of parity was not respected) and with decreased prospects for social growth (Dzadziev, 1999).

In this way, the process of sovereignization became a source of the growth of ethnic identity among the titular ethnic groups in the North Caucasus. In ethnosophiological research in the KBR by Kobakhidze (2005), the majority of respondents had positive ethnic identity. In addition, the results revealed a pronounced tendency toward hyperidentity (excessively expressed ethnic identity) in the Kabardians — and a tendency toward hypoidentity (weakly expressed ethnic identity) in the Russians. Kobakhidze explains the tendency toward hyperidentity in the titular ethnic groups as a result of “retraditionalization”. Retraditionalization, which was supported by the North Caucasus ethnic groups after the collapse of the Soviet Union, is the revival of traditional mechanisms of social self-regulation and universal principles of self-organization and the increasing significance of social relationships based on traditional etiquette rules.

This tendency toward traditionalism is a factor in ethnic cultural maintenance and leads to strengthening of the ethnic component in the structure of group social identity. Kobakhidze (2005) notes that it is likely that other ethnic groups that are communicating with those of the North Caucasus on a daily basis react to the increasing significance of the titular groups’ ethnic identity by opposite changes in the structure of their own identities. We agree that these opposite tendencies in the transformation processes of ethnic-group identities influence interethnic attitudes. Previous research (Lepshokova, 2012) with Russians and Balkars living in Kabardino-Balkaria and Moscow has shown that Russians in Kabardino-Balkaria and Russians in Moscow (where they are the majority ethnic group) have strongly pronounced and positive civic identity, which is stronger than their ethnic identity, probably because Russian ethnic and civic identities are the same to a certain extent. The level of positivity of civic identity of Russians in the KBR is significantly higher than the level of positivity of civic identity of the Russian population in Moscow and of Balkars living in the KBR. This finding indicates that mechanisms of social-psychological defense are activated in Russians as an ethnic minority in the KBR through the high level of civic, but not ethnic, identity.

Thus, the KBR is a unique region in regard to intercultural relations. This region was historically formed as a multicultural region consisting of three dominant groups: Kabardians, the largest “titular” group; Russians, an ethnic minority within the KBR; and Balkars, the third largest group in the Republic belonging to the titular group, too. Thus, from our point of view, this region is a unique field for social and psychological studies of interethnic interactions and for testing intercultural relations hypotheses.

Regarding the acculturation strategies of the Russians in Kabardino-Balkaria, the strategy of integration is the most preferred, followed by the strategies of marginalization, separation, and assimilation (Lepshokova, 2012).
The research hypotheses

In a multicultural society, day-to-day intercultural encounters are inevitable and are of vital importance (Hui, Chen, Leung, & Berry, 2015). In order to understand intercultural relations in the KBR, we tested three hypotheses of intercultural relations: multiculturalism, integration, and contact (Berry, 2013a).

Multiculturalism as a psychological concept is an attitude related to the political ideology regarding acceptance of the culturally heterogeneous composition of the population of a society (Berry & Kalin, 1995). Existing studies show that the level of support for multiculturalism varies in different countries. A positive attitude toward multiculturalism has been found in Canada (Berry & Kalin, 1995) and New Zealand (Sibley & Ward, 2013). Neutral attitudes have been found in the Netherlands (Breugelmans & Van de Vijver, 2004), the United States (Citrin, Sears, Muste, & Wong, 2001), and Australia (Ho, 1990). A slightly negative attitude has been found in the United Kingdom and Spain (Van de Vijver, Breugelmans, & Schalk-Soekar, 2008).

Based on the Canadian data, Berry, Kalin, and Taylor (1977) proposed the multiculturalism hypothesis, “the belief that confidence in one's identity will lead to sharing, respect for others and to the reduction of discriminatory attitudes” (Berry, 2006, p. 724). Multiculturalism exists in those countries in which the ethnic majority does not feel the threat that may come if minorities seek to preserve their own cultures (Richardson, op den Buijs, & Van der Zee, 2011; Tip et al., 2012) and allows (or helps) minorities to preserve their original cultures (Liu, 2007).

Historically, Russia has always been a multicultural society; over 180 ethnic groups have lived together here for several centuries. Although most Russian republics are characterized by the presence of an ethnic majority, in fact almost every republic is ethnically heterogeneous. Each individual republic has a unique system of intercultural relations, and the Kabardino-Balkar Republic is no exception. The basic notion of the multiculturalism hypothesis is that only when people are secure in their identities will they be in a position to accept those who differ from them; conversely, when people feel threatened, they will develop prejudice and engage in discrimination (Berry, 2013a). The multiculturalism hypothesis is confirmed in many studies (Berry & Kalin, 2000; Ward & Masgoret, 2008).

According to the contact hypothesis, intercultural contact will contribute to mutual acceptance in certain conditions, especially when there is equality of rights (Allport, 1954). Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) performed a meta-analysis of a variety of research from different countries. The results they obtained generally support the contact hypothesis: intergroup contact is usually negatively related to pronounced prejudices, in both the dominant and the nondominant groups. In addition, cross-ethnic friendships are related to psychological well-being (Bagci, Rutland, Kumashiro, Smith, & Blumberg, 2014; Hui et al., 2015; Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008).

Berry (2011) has proposed that the choice of an integration strategy is related to a greater number of ethnic minorities or migrants becoming successfully adapted. With an integration strategy ethnic minorities will try to join in the life of the new society and will become a part of it without losing ties to their ethnic group. For the ethnic majority, the choice of an integration strategy assumes psy-
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Psychological acceptance of the culture of ethnic minorities. If the ethnic majority allows minorities to preserve their cultural heritage and includes them in social life, we can assert that the ethnic majority is the one choosing the integration strategy. If minorities have ties with members of their own group and the host population, they are better adapted and have a higher subjective well-being (Berry, 2013a). A meta-analysis of studies devoted to the evaluation of the influence of integration on psychological adaptation allows us to confirm the positive relationship between these constructs (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013). The hypothesis of the impact of integration on adaptation and subjective well-being is called the integration hypothesis (Berry, 2013a). However, in some studies the importance of the strategy of assimilation in the adaptation of ethnic minorities is demonstrated also (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk, & Kinunen, 2011; Kus-Harbord & Ward, 2015; Ward, 2013).

On the basis of the aforementioned conceptualizations and the description of the social context of the KBR, we formulated the following hypotheses:

1. The multiculturalism hypothesis: the higher one’s sense of security, the higher one’s willingness to accept those who are culturally different. Specifically:
   1a. The higher the perceived security and the lower the perceived discrimination among the ethnic minority (the Russians), the higher the support of multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance.
   1b. The higher the perceived security and the lower the perceived threat among the titular ethnic groups (the Kabardians and the Balkars), the higher the support of multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance.

2. The contact hypothesis: intercultural contact promotes mutual acceptance (under certain conditions, especially that of equality). Specifically:
   2a. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts of the ethnic minority-group members (the Russians) with the members of the titular ethnic groups (the Kabardians and the Balkars), the higher the Russians’ level of ethnic tolerance, the higher their preference for the integration and assimilation strategies, and the higher their life satisfaction and self-esteem.
   2b. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts of the members of the titular ethnic groups (the Kabardians and the Balkars) with the minority group members (the Russians), the higher the titular groups’ level of ethnic tolerance, the higher their preference for integration and assimilation, and the higher their life satisfaction and self-esteem.

3. The integration hypothesis: those who prefer the integration strategy have higher psychological and sociocultural adaptation. Specifically:
   3a. The higher the preference for the acculturation strategy of integration among the ethnic minority (the Russians), the higher their level of life satisfaction, self-esteem, and sociocultural adaptation.
   3b. The higher the preference for integration and assimilation among members of the titular ethnic groups (the acculturation expectations of the Kabardians and Balkars), the higher their level of life satisfaction and self-esteem.

The proposed model for the study is presented in Figure 1.
Research aim

Our goal was to test and evaluate the relevance of the three hypotheses of intercultural relations in Kabardino-Balkaria.

Research design and procedure

We used a “snowball” sampling strategy, asking our friends, acquaintances, and colleagues who live in Kabardino-Balkaria to distribute a questionnaire among Russians, Kabardians, and Balkars. Participation in the study was voluntary. The Russians completed the questionnaire for the ethnic minority with acculturation strategies. The Kabardians and the Balkars completed the questionnaire for the ethnic majority with acculturation expectations. The questionnaire took approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Sample

The sample consisted of 534 respondents: 249 were Russians who had been living in Kabardino-Balkaria for more than 20 years, and 285 were Kabardians and Balkars, as representatives of the titular ethnic groups of the Republic (162 Kabardians and 123 Balkars). Social-demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1.
**Table 1.** Social-demographic characteristics of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority (Russians)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titular ethnic groups (Kabardians and Balkars)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures**

The study used the Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies questionnaire (Berry, 2013b); the scales were translated into Russian and adapted for use in Russia (Lebedeva, 2009; Lebedeva & Tatarko, 2013). For this research, we used the following responses on a 5-point scale: 1 — totally disagree; 2 — disagree; 3 — not sure/neutral; 4 — agree; 5 — totally agree.

**Perceived security.** The overall perceived-security score was calculated as an average of three items from three domains of security (cultural, economic, and personal). Cultural security was measured by one item, such as “There is room for a variety of languages and cultures in this Republic”; economic security was measured by one item, such as “This Republic is prosperous and wealthy enough for everyone to feel secure”; personal security was measured by one item, such as “A person’s chances of living a safe, untroubled life are better today than ever before”. Cronbach’s alpha was .59 for the Russian sample and .49 for the Kabardian and Balkar sample.

**Intercultural contacts.** Intercultural contacts were measured by parallel questions for the Russians and for the members of the titular ethnic population. We asked respondents about the number of their close friends and their frequency of contact with them. The Russians were asked about friends among the Kabardians and the Balkars, and the Kabardians and the Balkars were asked about their friends among the Russians. This combination of number and frequency of intercultural contacts is termed the *intensity of contacts*. We asked only about close friendly contacts because friendly contacts implicitly involve equality, one of the conditions stipulated in the contact hypothesis. Cronbach’s alpha was .87 for the Russian sample and .82 for the Kabardian and Balkar sample.

**Multicultural ideology.** This construct assessed support for multiculturalism as a public policy and practice. It was measured by four items, such as “We should recognize that cultural diversity is a fundamental characteristic of Kabardino-Balkaria”, “A society that has a variety of ethnic and cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur”. These items were used both for the Russians and for the Kabardians and the Balkars. Cronbach’s alpha was .77 for the Russian sample and .65 for the Kabardian and Balkar sample.

**Ethnic tolerance.** This construct was measured by three items, such as “We should promote equality among all groups, regardless of ethnic origin.” This scale
was used with both samples. Cronbach's alpha was .78 for the Russian sample and .73 for the Kabardian and Balkar sample.

**Perceived discrimination.** Perceived discrimination was measured by three items, such as “I have been discriminated against at work (promotion, benefits) / during my studies because of my ethnicity”. This scale was used with the Russians only; Cronbach's alpha was .91.

**Perceived threat.** Perceived threat was measured by three items, such as “I feel people of other ethnicities have something against me”. This scale was used with the Kabardians and the Balkars only; Cronbach's alpha was .91.

**Acculturation strategies of the Russians.** For the purposes of this research, we used only the acculturation attitudes of integration and assimilation, which are the two strategies that indicate a willingness to engage with the larger society. The integration scale includes four items, such as “I feel that Russians should maintain our own cultural traditions but also adopt those of the titular population of the Republic”; Cronbach's alpha was .78. The assimilation scale included four items, such as “I prefer social activities which involve Russians only”. Cronbach's alpha was .88. These scales were used with Russians only.

**Acculturation expectations of the titular ethnic group.** Paralleling the strategies scale used with the Russians, the scales measuring the acculturation expectations of integration and assimilation were used with the Kabardians and the Balkars. The integration expectation was measured using three items, such as “I feel that Russians should maintain their own cultural traditions but also adopt those of the Kabardians/Balkars”. Cronbach's alpha was .62. The assimilation expectation was measured using four items, such as “I feel that Russians should adopt Kabardian/Balkar cultural traditions and not maintain their own”); Cronbach's alpha was .90. These items were used with the Kabardians and the Balkars only.

**Sociocultural adaptation.** This scale assessed competence in daily intercultural living among migrants/ethnic minorities (Wilson, 2013). The Russians indicated how much difficulty they experienced while living in Kabardino-Balkaria in each of five areas of daily life, such as interpersonal communication and community involvement. Items were recoded positively. Cronbach's alpha was .86.

**Life satisfaction.** This scale included four items, such as “In most ways my life is close to my ideal”, “So far I have got the important things I want in life”; it was used with both samples. Cronbach's alpha was .91 for the Russian sample and .85 for the Kabardian and Balkar sample.

**Self-esteem.** This scale included four items, such as “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself”, “I feel that I have a number of good qualities”; it was used with both samples. Cronbach's alpha was .85 for the Russian sample and .87 for the Kabardian and Balkar sample.

**Demographic variables.** In addition to these psychological constructs to measure the observed variables, questions about respondents’ backgrounds, such as gender, age, and level of education, were included. We used these questions with both samples.
Data processing

We used path analysis with AMOS version 19 (Arbuckle, 2010). Independent models were constructed for each sample and were compared with each other.

Results

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the measures and the results of the t-test for the two samples.

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, and results of the t-test for the samples of Russians (N=249) and Kabardians and Balkars (N=285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M (R/KB)a</th>
<th>SD (R/KB)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived security</td>
<td>3.33/3.53</td>
<td>.84/.88</td>
<td>2.59**</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural contacts</td>
<td>3.24/2.89</td>
<td>1.12/1.21</td>
<td>3.42***</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discriminationb</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threatc</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural ideology</td>
<td>3.80/3.94</td>
<td>.83/.72</td>
<td>-2.11*</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic tolerance</td>
<td>4.08/3.99</td>
<td>.89/.94</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>1.90/2.30</td>
<td>.91/1.14</td>
<td>-4.40***</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3.65/3.64</td>
<td>.78/.62</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>4.17/4.20</td>
<td>.63/.66</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>3.54/3.86</td>
<td>1.02/.78</td>
<td>-4.10***</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural adaptationd</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aRussians/Kabardians and Balkars; b, d used in the group of Russians only; c used in the group of Kabardians and Balkars only. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

We found significant differences in perceived security, intercultural contacts, multicultural ideology, assimilation, and life satisfaction of the two groups. Perceived security, multicultural ideology, assimilation, and life satisfaction were significantly higher in the sample of Kabardians and Balkars than in the sample of Russians. We also found that intercultural contacts was significantly higher in the sample of Russians than in the sample of Kabardians and Balkars. Cohen’s d coefficients were relatively low; they indicate that the differences between the two groups on these variables might depend on the sample sizes.

In order to obtain an overall assessment, we examined the three hypotheses of intercultural relations (multiculturalism, contact, and integration) together by combining them into one model for each sample. This approach allowed us to examine the similarities and the differences in the structure of relationships across samples.

Results for the Russian sample are shown in Figure 2.
The multiculturalism hypothesis for the Russian sample (1a) was partially supported: perceived security was a significant positive predictor of multicultural ideology (β = .23, p < .001), but it was not a predictor of ethnic tolerance (β = .03, n.s.). Perceived discrimination was a significant negative predictor of ethnic tolerance (β = -.18, p < .01) and of multicultural ideology (β = -.29, p < .001).

In addition perceived security directly influenced life satisfaction (β = .22, p < .001). Also, perceived discrimination was a significant negative predictor of the integration strategy, (β = -.16, p < .05), self-esteem (β=.13, p < .05), and sociocultural adaptation (β = -.25, p < .001); it was a significant positive predictor of an assimilation (β = .28, p < .001) strategy.

The contact hypothesis for the Russian sample (2a) was partially supported: the Russians’ friendly contacts with the Kabardians and the Balkars significantly and positively predicted the assimilation strategy (β = .31, p < .001), life satisfaction (β = .26, p < .001), and self-esteem (β = .18, p < .01). However, intercultural contacts negatively predicted ethnic tolerance (β = -.27, p < .001).
The integration hypothesis for the Russian sample (3a) was partially supported. The integration strategy was a significant positive predictor of sociocultural adaptation ($\beta = .18, p < .01$) and a significant negative predictor of life satisfaction ($\beta = -.21, p < .001$), but it was not a predictor of self-esteem ($\beta = .02, \text{n.s.}$). We did not find a significant impact of the assimilation strategy on the sociocultural adaptation, life satisfaction, or self-esteem of the Russians.

Consistent with the multiculturalism hypothesis for the sample of Kabardians and Balkars (1b), the levels of support for multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance were positively predicted by their perceived security ($\beta = .20, p < .001$ and $\beta = .18, p < .01$, respectively). Perceived threat was a significant negative predictor of ethnic tolerance ($\beta = -.25, p < .001$) and multicultural ideology ($\beta = -.27, p < .001$). Thus, the multiculturalism hypothesis was fully supported in the sample of Kabardians and Balkars. In addition, we found that perceived threat was a positive predictor of the acculturation expectation of assimilation ($\beta = .63, p < .001$).
The contact hypothesis for the sample of Kabardians and Balkars (2b) was partially supported. Intercultural contacts positively predicted the integration strategy ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$), but it did not predict ethnic tolerance ($\beta = .10$, n.s.), the assimilation strategy ($\beta = -.02$, n.s.), life satisfaction ($\beta = .09$, n.s.), or self-esteem ($\beta = .05$, n.s.).

The integration hypothesis for the sample of Kabardians and Balkars (3b) was partially supported. The integration acculturation expectation was a positive predictor of self-esteem ($\beta = .23$, $p < .001$) but not of life satisfaction ($\beta = .09$, n.s.). We also found that the assimilation acculturation expectation was a positive predictor of life satisfaction ($\beta = .25$, $p < .001$) but not of self-esteem ($\beta = -.01$, n.s.).

**Discussion**

How have the above-mentioned hypotheses been confirmed and in light of which specific regional factors? The *multiculturalism hypothesis* was supported in the sample of Kabardians and Balkars (the titular ethnic groups) and was partially supported in the Russian sample (the ethnic minority). Perceived security predicted multicultural ideology in both samples, but it predicted tolerance only in the sample of Kabardians and Balkars. Also, perceived threat was a negative predictor of multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance among the Kabardians and the Balkars, whereas perceived discrimination was a negative predictor of multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance among the Russians. These results are in line with Berry’s conceptualization (Berry, 2013a).

In addition, we found that perceived threat in the Kabardians and Balkars predicted the acculturation expectation of assimilation. This phenomenon has been found in previous studies (Callens, Meuleman, & Valentová, 2013) and can be explained by the group-threat theory (Bobo, 1999), which states that when a minority group challenges the societal position of the majority group by, for example, maintaining its own culture, the majority group will feel threatened and prefer assimilation (Davies, Steele, & Markus, 2008; Tip et al., 2012).

Perceived discrimination was also negatively related to the integration strategy and the sociocultural adaptation of the Russians. These findings are similar to those of research showing that young immigrants were most likely to be categorized in the integration profile when little discrimination was perceived (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006).

Special attention should be paid to the positive relationship between the perceived discrimination of the Russians and a strategy of assimilation. Researchers argue that if people feel rejected by others in the larger society, they reciprocate this rejection by choosing a strategy that avoids contact with others outside their own group (Berry, 2013a). However, some studies indicate that minority members can react to discrimination by following an individual path to social mobility and can thereby dissociate themselves from the low status/devalued in-group (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). This strategy depends on the intergroup structure and presupposes that the group boundaries are seen as relatively permeable. If this is the case, then membership in the higher status group (the titular group) can be achieved (Verkuyten & Reijerse, 2008). In early research, this phenomenon was called “passing” (Berry, 1970).
Intercultural contacts were significantly and positively related to the assimilation strategy but were negatively related to ethnic tolerance. In addition, intercultural contact of Russians with the titular ethnic groups had a significant and positive effect on their self-esteem and life satisfaction. We suppose that the absence of equal status of the titular ethnic groups and the Russian minority in the KBR is one of the reasons why the contact hypothesis was partially confirmed with Russians: equality is one of the main prerequisites of the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954).

The contact hypothesis also was partially confirmed with the titular ethnic groups: the frequency of their intercultural contacts with Russians was positively related to the acculturation expectation of integration among the Kabardians and the Balkars but had no relationship to their ethnic tolerance.

The integration hypothesis was partially confirmed for both groups in the KBR: the preference of the Russians for the integration strategy had a positive connection with their sociocultural adaptation and a negative relationship with their life satisfaction. The positive relationship between the integration strategy and sociocultural adaptation has been confirmed in numerous studies (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2013; Sam & Berry, 2006). The negative relationship between the integration strategy and the life satisfaction of the Russians is consistent with data obtained by Kus-Harbord and Ward (2015) in a study of ethnic Russians in Estonia. This study revealed that interaction between the acculturation dimensions of maintenance and participation demonstrated that participation in Estonian culture was associated with lower life satisfaction under the conditions of high cultural maintenance.

As we mentioned before, Russians were the former Soviet political elite in the KBR, but now they occupy a minority position in the ethnic hierarchy, as they do in other ethnonational republics of Russia. But the life satisfaction of the Russians in our study was predicted directly by their relationships (intercultural contacts and perceived security) with the host population in the KBR.

The preference of the Kabardians and the Balkars for integration was related positively and significantly to their self-esteem, but it was not related to their life satisfaction. An assimilation expectation had the opposite effect: it was not related to self-esteem but was positively related to life satisfaction.

In other words, within the ethnic majority, the integration hypothesis transformed into the assimilation hypothesis. However, both integration and assimilation contributed to the well-being (life satisfaction and self-esteem) of the titular ethnic groups in the KBR.

Conclusion
We can conclude that the three research hypotheses were partially confirmed. The multiculturalism hypothesis was partially confirmed in the sample of Russians (ethnic minority) and fully confirmed with the Kabardians and the Balkars (the titular ethnic groups). But we also found an additional positive relationship between perceived discrimination (for the Russians) or threat (for the Kabardians and the Balkars) and the assimilation strategy/expectation.

The contact hypothesis was partially confirmed for the host population in the KBR and for the Russian ethnic minority. Moreover, the frequency of Russians' contacts with the titular ethnic groups was negatively related to ethnic tolerance, a
relationship that stands in opposition to the contact hypothesis. Yet frequency of contact was positively related to the acculturation strategy of assimilation, a finding that corresponds to the contact hypothesis.

The integration hypothesis was partially confirmed in both samples in the KBR. For Russians, the integration strategy led to sociocultural adaptation but reduced their life satisfaction. The titular ethnic group’s acculturation expectation of integration predicted their higher self-esteem, and their acculturation expectation of assimilation predicted their life satisfaction.

The intercultural relationships described by these three hypotheses were derived from Canadian multicultural policy and can have regional specifics in other countries, as proved by the sample of this region of Russia. They are partially confirmed yet still possess a number of specific features that cannot be ignored.

Limitations
We considered Kabardians and Balkars as one majority group in the Republic. However, they may differ in the way they perceive Russians and in the way Russians perceive them. Thus, it would be interesting to split Kabardians and Balkars into two separate subsamples and to test the hypotheses on three samples to receive more precise results.
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This article is based on the empirical data gained from a previous study “Ethnic-confessional relations in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) in 2011–2013”. In the mid-nineties in the 20th century, the number of nationalities that were nontypical for the Far East, Siberia and the Far North of Russia began to enlarge, and the trend continues year by year. According to the analysis results, people who migrate are attracted to the republic. The capital of the republic, the industrial cities of Yakutsk, Mirny, and Aldan, as well as the settlements of Niznij Bestyakh of the Megino-Kangalasskij district and Kysyl-Syr of the Viluiskij district, are the center of the migration stream. To define the ethnic and confessional complementarity of the local population, a test-scale by Yu.I Zhegusov was used. The authors of the study refused a simple dichotomous division of ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, and suggested a more complicated structure. In ethnic-confessional complementarity, the following levels and degrees were used:

- positive complementariness is expressed as ‘insiders’ who may be closely related (friendly terms, blood relationship)
- neutral complementariness is expressed as ‘outsiders’ with whom one may co-exist, but avoids close relations
- negative complementariness is expressed as ‘outsiders’ who are undesirable to live in a neighborhood with
- critical level of complementariness is expressed as ‘enemies’ who constitute a danger and threat.

On the whole, the research shows some peculiarities:

- Russians are mostly comfortable with representatives of other ethnic groups and religions. In Yakutia, they feel confident in the context of ethnic and migration process intensification.
- Yakuts show an alarmist public mood and worry about their future, and they are afraid of losing their ethnic status and national identity as a result of the uncontrollable process of migration and assimilation.

Keywords: ethnicity, complimentarity, nationalism, Russia, Yakutia
Introduction

The purpose of this article is to separate the level of complimentarity between the dominant ethnic and religious groups — Yakuts (etnonim — Sakha, further: Sakha) and Russian — from the general context of the study “Ethno-confessional relations in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) for 2011-2013”.

Complimentarity is one of the key factors of interethnic and interconfessional solidarity in conditions of migration expansion and the transformation of Russian society. The topic of ethno-confessional complimentarity is based on the fact that in the last twenty years, significant social transformations of the ethnic and religious composition in the Russian Federation have occurred: ethnic groups that are atypical of the Russian Far East and North migrated to the Sakha Republic, and urbanization and desecularization continued.

In its dependence on identity, inter-ethnic and inter-confessional complimentarity affects interdisciplinary subject areas of science, such as psychology, cultural anthropology and ethnosociology, which studies ethnicity and inter-ethnic relations.

Positive complimentarity is expressed by shared values, a similar worldview, and close cultural and taste preferences, and negative complimentarity appears in opposite value orientations, with a different attitude, and is alien to cultural and taste preferences. Complimentarity reflects a subconscious feeling of mutual sympathy (antipathy) between members of ethnic groups, which determines the division into “us” and “them”. The positive complimentarity at different times passes from the unconscious mutual attraction of consortium to conviction, which is the formation of common habits, attitudes, and tastes united by a common way of life (Gumilev, 2008, p. 210).

Negative complimentarity manifests itself as antipathy, intolerance, and in its most extreme version, genocide. It is well known that positive or negative complimentarity characterizes relations between different ethnic groups and connects with their mentality as an ethnopsychological phenomenon. It provides an opportunity to explain why, regardless of the level of cultural development; in some cases it is possible to establish a friendly ethnic contact, and in others, relations between ethnic groups become undesirable, hostile and even bloody. The problem of positive or negative complimentarity under the modern conditions of globalization as well as the problem of increased migration flows are relevant.

We propose to distinguish between two concepts: ‘complementarity’ and ‘complimentarity’. The etymology of the term ‘complementarity’ comes from the Latin ‘complementarity’, which refers to additionality. The meaning of the term complimentarity is more encompassing than ‘complimentarity’ because the first term provides an opportunity to reflect a variety of life aspects: politics, economics, social life, and spirituality. ‘Complementarity’ considers structures that fit together, complement one another and interact in harmony. ‘Complementarity’ is more related to the conscious actions of people because the state of ‘complementarity’ and coherence requires concerted efforts and joint control of interactions. The moral basis of ‘complementarity’ is a partnership based on mutual trust. In turn, ‘complimentarity’ becomes a stable pillar of society.
Negative complimentarity manifests itself as antipathy, intolerance, and in its most extreme version, genocide. It is well known that positive or negative complimentarity characterizes relations between different ethnic groups and connects with their mentality as an ethnopsychological phenomenon. It provides an opportunity to explain why, regardless of the level of cultural development; in some cases it is possible to establish a friendly ethnic contact, and in others, relations between ethnic groups become undesirable, hostile and even bloody. The problem of positive or negative complimentarity under the modern conditions of globalization as well as the problem of increased migration flows is relevant.

The term *complimentarity* (from French *compliment*) was used by Lev Gumilyov as a principle that is associated with the subconscious mutual sympathy of individuals (Gumilev, 2008, p. 209). Complimentarity reflects a subconscious feeling of mutual sympathy (antipathy) among members of different ethnic groups; it determines the division of ‘us’ and ‘them’. The positive complimentarity over a certain time period passes from the unconscious mutual attraction, consortium, to conviction, which is the formation of common habits, attitude, and taste united by a common way of life (Gumilev, 2008, p. 210).

Thus, this topic is relevant because the changes taking place in contemporary reality occur too quickly and unpredictably, especially for mass perception. Concepts such as “uncertainty”, “risk” (Beck, 2000), “fluidity” (Bauman, 2008), and “precaretization” (Standing, 2014) have become the basis for modern process description language. In the context of “fluid modernity” (Bauman, 2008), the problem of readiness of the mass consciousness for the complementary / complimentary interaction between ethnic and religious groups has become important.

Yakutia is a federal subject in Northeastern Russia. Yakutia has been part of the Russian state since 1632. Since 1991, its official name has been the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia). The territory encompasses 3,083,523 square kilometers (geographically the largest region of the Federation), and the population is 956,000 people.

Historically, within the territory of Yakutia in the twentieth century, the national composition was determined as follows: the largest ethnic groups were the Yakut or Sakha, with 466,492 people, and Russian, with 353,649 people. Traditionally, the territory of Yakutia is inhabited by indigenous peoples. Russians, who have a history of family members living in Yakutia for several generations, are more mobile. Russians came to Yakutia as a result of deliberate government policy, such as the peasant colonization in the end of the 17th and early 18th centuries; organization management and the direction of officials; political exile in the 18th century through the beginning of the 20th century; Soviet industrialization and political exile in the 1930s and early 1950s; development of the North from 1956-1991; and so on.

This purposeful policy of the state is typical for the whole history of the Siberian portion of Russia. The concepts of frontier and frontier cooperation (Basalaeva, 2012) are valuable for understanding the nature of the interaction between representatives of Russian and Yakut ethnic groups. In terms of the socio-cultural transformation of Russian society, the topic of “frontier and frontier coopera-
tion” is very popular among researchers from Siberia and the Russian Far East (Ganopolskii, 2005; Shirokov, 2007; Basalaeva, 2012, Mansurov, Mezentsev, & Polikarpov, 2014).

By the end of the Soviet period in the history of Yakutia, a steady, “familiar” ethno-confessional configuration appeared: Yakutians of Russian nationality with a constantly updated stable contingent of the Yakut/Sakha (the Yakut used to be reluctant to migrate to other regions of the USSR), the representatives of Indigenous Peoples of the North (Evens, Evenki, Chukchi, Yukagir, Dolgan) and others (representatives of the peoples of the USSR). As far as the confessionalism of representatives of the major ethnic groups in the Soviet Union is concerned, the country officially followed an atheistic policy, and the religiosity of the population was in a latent state.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the announcement of the sovereignty of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), the representatives of the non-indigenous population began to leave the republic (in 1989 the population was 1,094,065 in the Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (YASSR)).

Since the mid-1990s, the influx of migrants that are non-typical of the indigenous rooted population of the Far East, Siberia and northern ethnic groups and religions has increased. In recent years, citizens of the People’s republic of China (PRC) have migrated to the Yakut. People from the North Caucasus, Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan) and the Yakutians (rooted population of Yakutia with a long family history) have been somehow “familiar” since 1960-1991.

The fact that migrants were perceived as atypical in the years from 1992 to 2014 by indigenous and rooted residents of the republic is connected with the change of the nature of migration and the quality of workers. In the Soviet era, especially between 1960 and 1991, Yakutia was visited by specialists who were professionally educated and trained. The Ethnic and religious identity of Soviet specialists was not advertised and had a secondary character.

During the socio-economic reforms of the 1990-2000s, local civil and ethnic conflicts became the impetus for the new migratory flows.

For example, according to the Federal Migration Service of the Sakha (Yakutia) Republic, during the length of the study (10 months in 2013), the migration flows increased by 28(7%).

Within 10 months in 2012, 31,872 entering migrants were recorded, and within 10 months in 2013, 41,029 migrants were reports. In total, 79% of the migrants were foreign nationals who entered for the purpose of employment. The following cities became the centers for migration flow: Yakutsk — 56%, Mirnyi District — 8.9%, Aldan District — 7.7%, and Neryungri region — 6.7%. These data suggest the migration attractiveness of the republic for foreign citizens. In general, it should be noted that migratory streams are determined by specific and varying conditions of time and place.

Empirical study by questionnaires revealed significant differences in ethnic and confessional complimentarity in Russian and Yakut/Sakha.
Method

Goals of research

The purpose of this article is to separate the level of complimentarity between the dominant ethnic and religious groups, Sakha and Russian, from the general context of the study “Ethno-confessional relations in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) for 2011–2013”.

Every society, including the local community of Yakutia, is permeated by invisible, but objectively existing, lines of demarcation, the social boundaries that on the one hand divide the people and social groups and on the other hand are the basis of the formation of other communities.

To determine the ethnic and religious complimentarity of the representatives of the traditional ethnic communities in Yakutia (the Sakha and the Russians), a special test range was developed by the sociologist Yuri Zhegusov. This test renounces the simple dichotomous division into ‘us’ and ‘them’ by offering a more detailed scheme. For example, in ethnic and religious complimentarity the following extent was identified:

- positive complimentarity is expressed by ‘them’, individuals with whom you can have a close relationship (friendship, kinship). Complementarity is further intertwined with complimentarity and psychological sympathy;
- there is a neutral complimentarity towards ‘them’, individuals with whom you can live peacefully, but without establishing a close relationship. This demonstrates that psychological alertness to others is complemented by the pragmatics of complementarity;
- negative complimentarity appears to ‘them’, individuals with whom cohabitation is not desirable. In this case, complementarity is not shown;
- critical degree of complimentarity can be traced to ‘enemies’, individuals of which are dangerous and represent a threat. Complementarity is not possible here.

Sample

For this study, we chose the following survey points: the cities of Yakutsk, Neryungri, Mirny, and Aldan, as well as the urban-type settlements of Nizhniy Bestyakh and Kysyl-Syr. Urban and urban-type settlements were chosen for the study first because 40% of the population of Yakutia lives in these locations and second because of the flow of migrants. Rural settlements are predominantly mono-ethnic and economically unattractive. However, the data indicate the high attractiveness of the republic for migrants.

The study was conducted using the sociological method of questionnaires. During the survey, we used a mixed strategy: at work and at home, in the presence of interviewers and without them. The sample survey was territorial, probabilistic, and stratified. We collected 1,649 questionnaires; 25% of the questionnaires were collected in Yakutsk, 22% in Aldan, 16% in Neryungri, 14% in Mirny, 14% in the
village Nizhniy Bestyakh in the Megino-Kangalassky district, and 9% in Kysyl-Syr in the Vilyui district. Concerning the ethnic composition, 51% of the total number of respondents were Russian, 36.6% were Yakuts, and 12.4% were of other ethnic groups.

**Results**

*Ethnic and religious complimentarity of the Russians*

According to the results of a survey (Figure 1), positive complimentarity was identified among Russian respondents in relation to Slavic people: the Ukrainians and Belarussians. Additionally, Russian respondents consider as ‘us’ the Yakut/Sakha people (indicated in the diagram by white), who have been living together for several centuries.

The Russians show a neutral complementary in relation to the indigenous peoples of the North: the Buryats, Tartars, Jews, Kazakhs, Armenians, Kirghiz, Ossetians, Koreans, Uzbeks, Abkhazians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, Tajiks, Ingush and Dagestanis and Chinese, i.e., Russians consider the listed nationalities as ‘them’ (marked in grey in the figure).

The survey revealed that Roma and Chechens are ‘strangers’ for Russians (black). The negative experience of social interactions with the Roma in everyday life contributed to the formation of such negative social stereotype of Roma among the Russians. The perception of Chechens by the Russians as ‘strangers’ was formed due to armed conflict with separatists in Chechnya, which involved a large number of military and law enforcement personnel.

![Figure 1. Russian ethnic complimentarity in relation to other nationalities.](image-url)
As for the Russian religious complimentarity (Figure 2), they perceive parishioners of the Orthodox Church as ‘us’. Russians perceive other denominations as neutral, except the group of ‘sectarians’, a designation which initially carries a negative connotation.

**Ethnic and religious complimentarity among the Yakut / Sakha**

Quite a different picture of complimentarity is seen among Yakut/Sakha respondents (Figure 3). The Sakha perceive only the Russians as positively complimentary, and the Sakha perceive the Russians as ‘friends’, more strongly than the Russians perceive the Sakha as ‘friends’. The Index of Sakha complimentary to the Russians is 1.25 points, and the Russians to the Sakha is 1.41 points.

According to the results of the study, the neutral complimentarity of the Sakha is observed in relation to the representatives of indigenous peoples, such as Ukrainians, Belarusians, Buryats, Tatars, Kazakhs and Koreans.

The Sakha perceive more than half of the representatives of the ethnic groups noted in the questionnaire with negatively complimentary: the Jews, Kyrgyz, Ossetians, Armenians, Uzbeks, Chinese, Georgians, Abkhazians, Azerbaijanis, Ingush, Dagestanis, Chechens, Tajiks and gypsies.

The picture of the Yakut confessional complimentarity is quite unexpected (Figure 4). Thus, representatives of the Sakha perceive Orthodoxy closer than paganism and shamanism (which are considered to be their traditional beliefs).

The Yakuts have neutrally complimentary to Protestants, Catholics, Buddhists and Jews.

The Yakut respondents are mistrustful of Hare Krishnas, Muslims and sectarians.
Figure 3. Complimentary of the Yakut/Sakha in relation to other nationalities.

Figure 4. The Yakut/Sakha complimentarity relating to other confessions.
Conclusion
The method of measuring ethnic and religious complimentariness that has been used in this sociological research has revealed the following features: Russians, in general, have a calm attitude that dominates in relation to the majority of members of other ethnic groups and religions. Russians traditionally have more extensive ties and frequent contacts with representatives of ethnic and religious groups throughout Russia. Therefore, in Yakutia, they feel more confident in the conditions of the ethnic processes’ intensification and the migration of peoples. On the contrary, Yakut / Sakha show alarmist sentiments; they are concerned about their future. They are afraid of losing their ethnic status and identity as a result of uncontrolled migration and assimilation.

In conclusion, the critical degree of complimentariness, which can be traced to “enemies”, appeared to not to exist; neither Russians nor Sakha, given a list of representatives of ethnic groups and religions, named anyone from the list.

There may be several reasons for Yakuts to be alert against “foreigners”:

1. Changes in the nature and intensity of the migration processes.

   For example, there is an exonym in the Yakut language, nuuchcha, to identify Russians who have lived in Yakutia since the eighteenth century. That is, Orthodox Russian are mentally “registered” in the Yakut public consciousness.

   There is no special definition for other members of ethnic and religious groups. Their names entered the Sakha language from the Russian language;

2. The Russians living in Yakutia consider Yakutia as one of many possible territories in which they can live. Many Russians, even those who have roots in Yakutia, now think about the prospect of leaving this place.

   For the Sakha, Yakutia is their homeland, the land of their national epos Olonkho, which they call Yakutia Sakha Sire (the Land of the Yakuts). It is not typical for them to have a desire to move to another place, not even in the event of an unfavorable economic situation. By migrating within the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), many Yakut / Sakha retain their ancestral identity and an attachment to their place of birth.

   Overall, the following conclusion can be made:

   • Russians, on the whole, have a calm attitude that dominates in relation to the majority of members of other ethnic groups and religions. In Yakutia, they feel more confident in the conditions of the ethnic processes’ intensification and the migration of peoples.

   • Yakut / Sakha show alarmist sentiments and are concerned about their future. They are afraid of losing their ethnic status and identity as a result of uncontrolled migration and assimilation.
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The representation of love among Brazilians, Russians and Central Africans: A comparative analysis
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This paper is dedicated to the cultural specificities of three typical collective groups with respect to the representation of love. The research subject focuses on the cross-cultural similarities and differences in how love is conceptualized among highly educated citizens of Brazil (50), Russia (50), and Central Africa (50) (age range 21–60; M = 34). We used “The Classical ideas of love: acceptance and distancing” questionnaire (I.A. Djidaryan, E.V. Belovol, & O.V. Maslova) and the “Directed associations with ‘love’ as the word-stimulus” technique (on the basis of C.G. Jung’s associative experiment and P. Vergès's methodology).

The results show similarities and differences in how love is represented among the groups. The following similarities were found: Love is seen as all that is good and kind about a person, a way to become better. At the peripheral level, the social representation of love includes friendship, patience, and passion. At the point of cross-cultural differences, it was found that: a) The main emotion reflecting how love is represented for Brazilians is honesty, for Russians — suffering, for Central Africans — tenderness; b) Brazilians understand love as a sensual, personal moral choice; Russians perceive love as an obstacle, a problem in itself; Central Africans conceptualize love as God-given and ennobling of the person; c) love is conceptualized as something inherent and family-oriented among Russians, intrapersonal and intimate among Brazilians, and divine among Central Africans. The results mean that within peripheral confines, the notion of love among the groups matches to a certain extent R. Sternberg's triangle of love, while its core zone is culturally specific.

Keywords: love representation; cross-cultural specificity; value-semantic aspect of love; love and culture

Introduction

Love is regarded as one of the fundamental aspects of life, yet for a long time there has been no concrete scientific method that allows for thorough research of this phenomenon. The main reason is that the topic of love goes beyond the theoretical...
confines of science. In addition, people in the world of art, who focus on persuasion more than they do on the pursuit of truth, and particularly scientific truth, are usually the ones who study this topic. Another reason for the difficulty in studying the concept of love is the fact that it is so complicated!

In 1958 H. Harlow informed his colleagues that psychology does not realize the importance of the problem of love and paradoxically invests less time in studying this question than do ordinary people in their everyday life (cited in Fehr, Shaver, Simpson, & Dovidio, 2015). The stimulus towards psychological research on the question of love came from the development of positive psychology in the 1980s. This area in psychology focused mainly on positive changes in personality, rather than the problems and pathological issues on which classical psychology has focused its attention. From this point of view, love is an intrapersonal resource in which the acknowledgment of your existence by someone else grants you the opportunity of going beyond your own person.

Psychologists are aware that people experience love across the geographic spectrum. The classical theory, Sternberg's triangular theory of love, identifies three apexes: intimacy, passion, and commitment (Sternberg, 1986). His triangle shows both the strength and style of love. The triangle’s apexes differ in distance and are positioned in different ways depending on the person. He outlined eight different concepts of love which can be altered at any time during the development of the individual. Sternberg’s triangle is considered international in application and its uniqueness is defined by the distance, size, and changeability of its different aspects as time goes by.

Despite the universal characteristics of love and the universal symbols by which they are described, different cultures conceptualize love in very different ways. Society and culture dictate people’s expectations of others, how people describe their experiences, and the ways in which they build their relationships. Communication is making our world smaller and smaller. People are meeting others from completely different ethnic backgrounds more and more often. The interaction among cultures is becoming more prevalent and intercultural marriages and families, once rare, are growing. However, with the prevalence of such marriages come frequent disappointments, worries, and misunderstandings. From a practical psychological point of view, the need for people from different cultures to understand love is an important task. Thus the study of how love is understood by different cultures is both interesting and relevant, not only from a scientific standpoint, but also to help people all over the world experience an improved quality of life.

Fehr & Russel (1991) conducted several prototypical analyses of love in six studies. They focused on the natural language concept of love, which is not the same as the classical categories of love that various researchers have described. Their research method made it possible to study the topic more meticulously, while allowing for a less stringent categorization of the different concepts of love: a) in relation to the subject (a mother’s love, a father’s love, a brother’s love, romantic love, etc.); b) in relation to the ways of experiencing love. This approach, in which the differences in love languages are outlined by the participants themselves, is juxtaposed to a firm descriptive scientific analysis of love; based upon everyday contact among people, it gives an unscientific picture of how ordinary people perceive love. Fehr (2006) noted that the advantages afforded by an atypical analysis of love, in
comparison with a descriptive analysis, are such that opportunities are offered to investigate both cultural and individual perceptions of the topic.

Research on the cultural perception of love is based on the theory of social representations (Moskovici, 1998). The social representation structure includes the core zone and the periphery (Abric, 2001). The core zone is the constant and main part of the social representation, which systematizes the social representation, giving it meaning. The core zone is always equal and constant. Destructions in the core element bring to changes in the social representation itself. It is related to the collective memory, its values, standards, and the history of the group. The core zone provides stable development, defense from destruction, and maintains the connection between social representations and objective reality. In describing the structure of social representations, we applied P. Vergès’s methodology, which is useful because with it the core zones of social representations are composed of concepts associated with stimuli from a large number of respondents. In other words, they have low ranks and high frequency.

The cultural differences in how love is perceived have become quite a popular topic for research, especially within and between the so-called individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Church (2016) specifies that modern psychology is revising the problem of consistency that relates to early personality traits from a specific cross-cultural point of view. Companionate love is being studied intensively. This type of love includes feelings of affection, compassion, caring, and tenderness (Barsade & O’Neill, 2014). It is contrasted with passionate love, which is defined as “a wildly emotional state characterized by emotional extremes, physiological arousal, and sexual attraction” (Fehr et al., 2015, p. 496). One can assume that compassionate love is typical among representatives of collective cultures, love which a person accepts within his family and other referential groups that conform to his way of life.

Russian psychologists have done research on happiness, with samples from 34 countries. It was found that love comprises an important part of the social representation of happiness among both optimists and pessimists in all the cultures that were studied. Kokurina and Solina (2014) underline that love is “presented as an independent value, primarily associated with striking emotional experiences, which has aspects of psychological addiction” (p. 93).

The connection between self-determination and openness towards love relationships as a resource state for wellbeing is the mutual consolidation of happiness among interpersonal relationships. This increases the impact of one’s own position in life, not depending on another person, according to Knee, Hadden, Porter, and Rodriguez (2013).

Research by Soloski, Pavkov, Sweeney, and Wetchler (2013) shows that love became an integral part of marriages in western countries in the mid 1900s. They note the importance of intergenerational connections in love relationships, writing that high interparental conflict generates a low level of love, while maintenance of the relations even though separated from parents is connected to a higher quality of love. This study emphasizes the link between the way people experience love within the family system on the horizontal scale (intrafamily communication as a small social system) and on the vertical scale (intergenerational connections). The levels are fundamentally different within individualistic and collectivistic cultures.
In individualistic cultures, it seems that love is understood as personal experiences that are not acquired from the family nor from a group, but in a couple relationship and more intensive interpersonal groups (Fehr et al., 2015). However, the representation of love among Chinese young people (as representatives of a typical collective culture) showed no differences between them and their American counterparts (who are representatives of a typical individualistic culture). The two groups shared similar ideas of love, which included “altruism,” “intrusive thinking,” “self-actualization,” “emotional fulfillment,” “sexual attraction, biology” (Jankowiak, Shen, Yao, Wang, & Volsche, 2015). The adaptation of the questionnaire “The passionate love scale” used by Yildirm, Hablemitoglu, and Barnett (2014) with Turkish students, also revealed that love is understood by the Turkish students in the same way as in an individualistic culture. Suffice it to say that according to Espín (2013), the psychotherapist is presented with a very serious question in working with bilingual and multilingual clients who categorize love differently than does the mainstream national culture. Therefore, this issue must be on the table for discussion by specialists.

We have pointed out a few similarities and differences in how society perceives love within individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Presumably, most individualistic and collectivistic cultures have similarities and differences in their conceptualization of love based on value-semantic coding, gender, age, educational level, etc. Moreover, the research suggests that there are different concepts of love within collectivistic cultures, but with unified features such as valuing others and a sense of belonging to established groups. It seems that within peripheral confines, the notion of love among the groups matches R. Sternberg’s triangle of love (intimacy, passion, commitment), while its inner content is culturally specific (Sternberg, 1986).

This article analyzes the concept of love and provides a thorough analysis of the characteristics in the value-semantic aspect of love in three cultural groups: Brazilians, Russians, and Central Africans. These groups were chosen based on their geographical, linguistic, and ethno-cultural differences. However, in ethno-psychology they are all considered collectivist. This is where their similarities converge. The similarity is seen as evidence of the universal value of love within collectivist cultures, whereas their differences involve the meaningful relationships with others who are apart of a specific society that is considered primary for them (soft and friendly in Brazil; compassionate and understanding in Russia; and genuinely vital in the Central African Republic).

**Method**

**Participants**

150 participants were involved in the empirical research, which consisted of 25 men and 25 women in each cultural group. Their ages ranged from 21 to 60 in each of the three groups, (M = 34). We randomly selected the participants from the University of Brasilia (Brasilia), People’s Friendship University of Russia (Moscow), and the University of Bangui (Bangui). The following demographic characteristics were noted: age, gender, level of education, affiliation to or membership in the culture in question. To establish parity in gender, age, and the extent to which one is affiliated to a specific culture, we chose participants who are highly educated and
currently living in the capital of their respective countries. We did not collect any additional information on the participants that could have been valuable in studying the different representations of love; however, these factors are important and merit future study.

**Materials**
The following diagnostic materials were provided: “The Classical ideas of love: acceptance and distancing” questionnaire (Djidaryan, Belovol, & Maslova, 2014) and “Directed associations with ‘love’ as the word-stimulus” (on the basis of C.G. Jung’s associative experiment).

“Directed associations with ‘love’ as the word-stimulus” is based on the theory of social representations (Moskovici, 1998). This scale of measuring a person’s conscious understanding of love was chosen because it lends itself to an effective system for valuing the social representations of love that are unique to a specific group, with relevance to its core and peripheral zone concepts. The core zone concepts are those associated with the first-place stimulus in the largest number of respondents; they have a low rank and high frequency.

To determine how love is represented among the three cultural groups, “The Classical ideas of love: acceptance and distancing” (Djidaryan et al., 2014) was used. This questionnaire was designed to measure the value-semantic aspects of love. It consists of 26 aphorisms about love, taken from different epochs within prominent nations around the world (Shakespeare, Tolstoy, A. de Saint-Exupéry, Balzac, Voltaire, and others). The participants were instructed to compare their perception of love with these classical ideas. The options provided in the questionnaire are “totally agree,” “agree,” “difficult to answer,” “do not agree,” and “strongly disagree.” The questionnaire has three (3) indicators and each statement has a subscale, ranging from one to five (1-5): love as a burden; love as devotion; love as an ennobling power. We have chosen this type of questionnaire because it focuses mainly on the value-semantic aspects of love as an interpersonal and intrapersonal resource within the social context of the topic currently in question, as opposed to measuring emotional and behavioral aspects of love. This questionnaire affords us the opportunity to measure the phenomenon of “love” for people from the point of view of their social representations in the three groups that have been studied.

**Procedure**
An examiner conducted an interview at her office with each participant individually, lasting 30 minutes on average. In the first stages of the research, we used the “Directed associations with ‘love’ as the word-stimulus” prototypical analysis with the objective of finding the participants’ most natural association with “love.” The examiner told each participant to name the first three words that come to mind when hearing the word “love.” All sessions were taped so the data could later be analyzed.

In the second stage of the research, we asked the participants to complete the questionnaire “The Classical ideas of love: acceptance and distancing.”

The respondents from the Central African Republic and Brazil completed both procedures in their native language (French and Portuguese, respectively). Lan-
guage experts of each cultural group translated both questionnaires from Russian into the respondents’ native language and back into Russian for analysis. To ensure accuracy, experts both from the source languages (French and Portuguese) and the target language (Russian) evaluated the translation. The process began with one of the experts translating a word from the source language into the target language; then another expert translated that word or phrase from Russian back into French and Portuguese. When uncertainty arose as to the accuracy of a particular word or phrase, an opinion was sought from a third expert; however, this was very rarely required.

During the prototypical analysis there were 450 associations from which a list was compiled that contains a minimum frequency of 4, which includes 15 concepts for Brazilians, 16 for Russians, and 18 for Central Africans. The core zone of love representation consists of those aforementioned concepts that are associated with the greatest number of respondents from each of the three samples. They have a low rank and high frequency. The concepts held by the group were determined by Vergès’s methodology (1992). The separation of the concepts in each group was performed by calculating the mean and the median rank of the frequent occurrences.

To arrive at more reliable results based on the questionnaire “The Classical ideas of love: acceptance and distancing” among the three cultural groups, we utilized Tucker’s phi coefficient to answer the questions regarding a connection between the scales that are being studied and the participants’ affiliation to one of the three cultures. The values obtained were ($X^2 = 50.03$, $p = 0.02$; phi = 0.578, $p = 0.02$ for the “love as an encumbrance” scale; $X^2 = 44.32$, $p = 0.05$; phi = 0.544, $p = 0.05$ for the “love as devotion” scale; $X^2 = 44.64$, $p = 0.01$; phi = 0.546, $p = 0.01$ for the “love as an enobling power” scale). These allowed us to conclude that there is the existence of a moderate positive association between cultural belonging and the scales of the questionnaire. The analogous process in relation to gender did not reveal any statistically significant association between gender and the three love scales. However, we cannot completely exclude the influence of gender and the usefulness of research in that area. So as to test for possible gender differences in the research sample based on the method’s scales, we used an additional Mann-Whitney U test. Our H1 hypothesis, concerning the differences between men and women on the specific scales, was rejected ($U = 2577.5$, $p = 0.38$ for the “love as an encumbrance” scale; $U = 2425.0$, $p = 0.14$ for the “love as devotion” scale; $U = 2769.5$, $p = 0.87$ for the “love as an enobling power” scale).

The inter-correlation of the scales in the questionnaire did not verify statistically significant connections among the scales for the three samples. The rating for the test based on internal unity is adequately high (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.809 for Brazilians; 0.872 for Russians; 0.821 for Central Africans). Nevertheless, the method we used was not adapted for other cultural samples and is still being tested for reliability with other cultural samples, for conformity of the questionnaire’s translation and scales’ equivalence. Principle component analysis showed that within all the groups of participants, we can outline three factors (which correlate with the three scales of the questionnaire). Among Brazilians, Russians, and Central Africans, the first factor shows 53.03%; 47.94%; and 51.68%, respectively, of variance (factor weights 0.968; 0.998; and 0.996, respectively); the second factor – 30.93%;
34.37%; 31.59% of variance (weights 0.996; 0.973; 0.962); the third factor – 16.04%; 17.69%; 16.73% of variance (weights 0.960; 0.972; 0.963). This data allowed us to make the questionnaire more reliable and ensure that the scales are equivalent. The calculations were done using the SPSS 22.0 computer program.

**Results**

“The Classical ideas of love: acceptance and distancing” questionnaire (Djidaryan et al, 2014) was conducted using the Kruskal–Wallis test, which showed the similarities and differences in how love is represented in each of the three cultural groups. The test reveals that on the scale “love as an encumbrance,” there are significant differences in response to the following statements: “Love is an obstacle in people’s lives” ($X^2 = 11.697$, $p = 0.003$); “love is just a nasty joke that nature plays to ensure the continuation of the human race” ($X^2 = 6.16$, $p = 0.04$); “love is the triumph of imagination over reason” ($X^2 = 16.608$, $p = 0.000$); and “love is blind; one can fall in love with anyone, even a billy goat” ($X^2 = 8.051$, $p = 0.018$) (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Cross-cultural differences and similarities for love as an encumbrance among Brazilians (N = 50), Russians (N = 50), and Central Africans (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Statement</th>
<th>Mean rank Brazilians</th>
<th>Mean rank Russians</th>
<th>Mean rank Central Africans</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love as an encumbrance</td>
<td>1. Love is a game in which there is always cheating.</td>
<td>70.86</td>
<td>84.89</td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Love is an obstacle in people’s lives.</td>
<td>68.88</td>
<td>91.81</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>11.679</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Love is just a nasty joke that nature plays to ensure the continuation of the human race.</td>
<td>69.52</td>
<td>87.46</td>
<td>69.54</td>
<td>6.160</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. All that is fascinating about love is found in the changes of life.</td>
<td>80.70</td>
<td>66.62</td>
<td>79.18</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. When it comes to love, the most noteworthy moments are getting together and breaking up; everything else is insignificant.</td>
<td>81.04</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>78.37</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Love is the triumph of imagination over reason.</td>
<td>66.01</td>
<td>95.22</td>
<td>65.27</td>
<td>16.608</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Love is blind; one can fall in love with anyone, even a billy goat.</td>
<td>66.74</td>
<td>89.10</td>
<td>70.66</td>
<td>8.051</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Love is the collection of gifts, wasted and, in the final analysis, worthless.</td>
<td>73.01</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>71.87</td>
<td>1.719</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love as an encumbrance Scale</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>89.22</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>7.524</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>14.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Cross-cultural differences and similarities of love as devotion among Brazilians (N = 50), Russians (N = 50), and Central Africans (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean rank Brazilians</th>
<th>Mean rank Russians</th>
<th>Mean rank Central Africans</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Asymp. sig.</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love as devotion</td>
<td>1. To love deeply means to forget about yourself.</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>63.31</td>
<td>81.57</td>
<td>6.294</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To love is to live the life of the one you love.</td>
<td>91.66</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>91.69</td>
<td>44.765</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Love is not about gazing at each other, but about looking outward together in the same direction.</td>
<td>83.86</td>
<td>54.88</td>
<td>87.76</td>
<td>19.081</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Where there is love, there is God.</td>
<td>86.95</td>
<td>47.61</td>
<td>91.94</td>
<td>35.318</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. All that I am and all in which I trust is found in love.</td>
<td>73.09</td>
<td>81.11</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Compassion is the height of love and, possibly, the very definition of love.</td>
<td>84.38</td>
<td>56.29</td>
<td>85.83</td>
<td>16.170</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Love is the only reasonable and satisfactory answer to the question regarding the meaning of human existence.</td>
<td>83.59</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>84.45</td>
<td>12.287</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. In the eyes of the one who is in love, the entire universe merges in the person of the beloved.</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>70.96</td>
<td>77.89</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Love is the ability to bring gifts.</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>4.886</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love as devotion Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.93</td>
<td>50.92</td>
<td>88.65</td>
<td>24.151</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>15.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the scale “love as devotion,” there are significant differences in response to the statements: “To love deeply means to forget about yourself” ($X^2 = 6.294$, $p = 0.043$); “to love is to live the life of the one you love” ($X^2 = 44.765$, $p = 0.000$); “love is not about gazing at each other, but about looking outward together in the same direction” ($X^2 = 19.081$, $p = 0.000$); “where there is love, there is God” ($X^2 = 35.318$, $p = 0.000$); “compassion is the height of love and, possibly, the very definition of love” ($X^2 = 16.170$, $p = 0.000$); “love is the only reasonable and satisfactory answer to the question regarding the meaning of human existence” ($X^2 = 12.287$, $p = 0.002$) (Table 2).

On the scale “love as an ennobling power” there are significant differences in response to the statements: “Love is the author of all that is kind, warm, illuminating, strong, and noble” ($X^2 = 9.112$, $p = 0.011$); “of all the passions, love is the strongest because it simultaneously takes control of your mind, of your body, and of your heart” ($X^2 = 9.135$, $p = 0.010$); “love is a mystical fire” ($X^2 = 6.779$, $p = 0.034$); “difficulties, hardship, and obstacles strengthen love” ($X^2 = 14.700$, $p = 0.001$); “things base
and vile, holding no quantity love can transpose to form and dignity” ($X^2 = 21.482$, $p = 0.000$); “love bears all things, hopes all things, believes all things, endures all things, and thinks no evil” ($X^2 = 8.079$, $p = 0.018$) (Table 3).

Table 3. Cross-cultural differences and similarities for love as an ennobling power among Brazilians ($N = 50$), Russians ($N = 50$), and Central Africans ($N = 50$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean rank Brazilians</th>
<th>Mean rank Russians</th>
<th>Mean rank Central Africans</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Asymp. sig.</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Love is the author of all that is kind, warm, illuminating, strong, and noble.</td>
<td>82.70</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>82.85</td>
<td>9.112</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Love is the desire to make someone else happy.</td>
<td>80.17</td>
<td>65.14</td>
<td>81.19</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Of all the passions, love is the strongest because it simultaneously takes control of your mind, of your body, and of your heart.</td>
<td>82.71</td>
<td>61.08</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>9.135</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Love is a mystical fire.</td>
<td>81.78</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td>81.80</td>
<td>6.779</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Love is a great teacher.</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>80.23</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Difficulties, hardship, and obstacles strengthen love.</td>
<td>85.23</td>
<td>57.45</td>
<td>83.82</td>
<td>14.700</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Things base and vile, holding no quantity love can transpose to form and dignity.</td>
<td>85.79</td>
<td>53.78</td>
<td>86.93</td>
<td>21.482</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Love is similar to everything and at the same time resembles nothing.</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>74.63</td>
<td>78.67</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Love bears all things, hopes all things, believes all things, endures all things, and thinks no evil.</td>
<td>80.34</td>
<td>61.95</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>8.079</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparative analysis shows that there are significant differences in the three scales among Brazilians, Russians, and Central Africans, with significantly high scores on the scale “love as an encumbrance” for Russians and on the scales “love as devotion” and “love as an ennobling power” among Central Africans. The scores of the Brazilians on all the scales were closer to those of the Central Africans.

In order to analyze “associations connected with ‘love’ as a word-stimulus,” we applied the P. Vergès method. The core zone of “love” as a social representation among Brazilians ($F ≥ 6.4$, average rank $≤ 1.78$) is based on such value-semantic definitions as honesty ($F = 25$, average rank $= 1.5$); feelings ($F = 8$, average rank $= 1.5$); family ($F = 7$, average rank $= 1.42$); and morality ($F = 7$, average rank $= 1.71$). The periphery of “love” as a social representation among Brazilians includes passion ($F = 4$, average rank $= 1.5$); lack of conscience ($F = 4$, average rank $= 1.25$); loyalty
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(F = 3, average rank = 1.5); friendship (F = 2, average rank = 1.5); patience (F = 2, average rank = 2.14); inner voice (F = 6, average rank = 2.5); sincerity (F = 6, average rank = 1.83); respect (F = 5, average rank = 1.8); unreasonableness (F = 4, average rank = 2.3); torment (F = 4, average rank = 2.25); understanding (F = 4, average rank = 2.14).

The core zone of “love” as a social representation among Russians (F ≥ 3.75, average rank ≤ 1.73) includes confidence (F = 9, average rank = 1.44); family (F = 7, average rank = 1.42); hope (F = 5, average rank = 1.4); suffering (F = 5, average rank = 1); passion (F = 4, average rank = 1.5); self-sacrifice (F = 4, average rank = 1.5); friendship (F = 4, average rank = 1). The periphery of “love” as a social representation among Russians consists of understanding (F = 3, average rank = 1.66); patience (F = 3, average rank = 1.33); devotion (F = 3, average rank = 1); children (F = 3; average rank = 1); reciprocity (F = 2, average rank = 4); love itself (F = 2, average rank = 2); whiteness (F = 2, average rank = 2); responsibility (F = 2, average rank = 2); fairytale (F = 2, average rank = 2.5).

The core zone of “love” as a social representation among Central Africans (F ≥ 5.44, average rank ≤ 1.84) is described by love itself (F = 19, average rank = 1.68); feelings (F = 8, average rank = 1.5); tenderness (F = 7, average rank = 1.71); ability to share (F = 6, average rank = 1.83); respect (F = 6, average rank = 1.66). The periphery of “love” as a social representation among Central Africans consists of patience (F = 7, average rank = 2.14); being attached to someone (F = 7, average rank = 2.28); forgiveness (F = 7, average rank = 1.85); heart (F = 4, average rank = 1.75); support (F = 2, average rank = 1.5); friendship (F = 2, average rank = 1.5); surrendering completely (F = 3, average rank = 2.66); serving others (F = 4, average rank = 2.5); God is love and love is God (F = 4, average rank = 2.25); passion (F = 4, average rank = 2); belief (F = 2, average rank = 2); fidelity (F = 3, average rank = 2); marriage (F = 3, average rank = 2).

Discussion

The study confirmed the hypothesis of the existence of similarities and cross-cultural differences in the concept of love among Brazilians, Russians, and Central Africans as representatives of collectivist cultures. Confirming the results of earlier studies, in all the groups that we studied, love in directed association is often represented by compassionate love (Barsade & O’Neill, 2014; Fehr et al., 2015; Church, 2016). This finding attests to the significance of the group and the importance of how another person feels love as characteristics of collectivist culture. For most Brazilians, Russians, and Central Africans in this study, love is represented as a source of all that is joyful, the manifestation of all that is unique and good in people. This concretizes the ideas of an understanding of love as a personal resource (Kokurina & Solina, 2014) and seeking well-being with self-determination (Knee et al., 2013).

In the present study, there are noted similarities of love representation at the peripheral level: passion, friendship, and patience. Continuing to use the metaphor of Sternberg’s love triangle (1986), we obtained similar characteristics which can be compared in a certain way with Sternberg’s triangular vertices. So, the notion of love as “passion” among the studied groups coincides with Sternberg’s theory, while
“patience” can be roughly comparable to the “decision / commitment” in Sternberg’s triangle, as well as “friendship,” implying “intimacy” as a close relationship. Despite that, the core zone characteristics of love are culture-specific. This correlates with the viewpoint of Fehr (2006) on her culturally defined prototypical love construct. In other words, love differs among cultures, with characteristics pertaining to other historical, ethno-cultural, and socio-psychological specifiers.

This data is all the more encouraging in light of extant data that suggests that the core zone of “love” as a social representation among Brazilians, Russians, and persons from Central Africa is not identical (Moscovici, 1998; Abric, 2001; & Fehr, 2006). For Brazilians, the core zone of love consists of honesty, feelings, family, and morality. It confirms the sensual and ethical character of love in the family context among Brazilians. The main representation of love for Brazilians is honesty. The periphery of “love” as a social representation by Brazilians consists of passion, lack of conscience, loyalty, friendship, patience, inner voice, sincerity, respect, unreasonableness, torment, and understanding. The periphery also strengthens the core zone’s conscientiousness, which connects to the moral aspect of love. Perhaps, for the participants from this cultural group, love proceeds from one’s internal voice, in situations where the feeling is reasonable and moral. Love comprises faithfulness and sincere respect; it reminds one to pay attention to one’s inner state.

The core zone of love for Russians consists of confidence, family, hope, suffering, passion, self-sacrifice, and friendship. Consequently, Russians most often connect the idea of love with family, serious relations (trust, self-sacrifice), hope, and emotions. But the emotions Russians associate with love are not the same as for Brazilians. The main feeling of love by Russians is suffering. This is also confirmed by the periphery of “love,” which includes understanding, patience, devotion, children, reciprocity, love itself, whiteness, responsibility, and fairytale. It is remarkable that for these participants, love is in the same value-semantic group as reciprocity, a fantastic, white wedding dress, family, children and, as mentioned above, sacrifice and patience. For Russians, the concept of love is concretized in the main element of a family: children. This stresses the significance of intergenerational connections and social representations of love within the culture (Soloski et al., 2013). Moreover, the idea of love is strongly expressed in the designation of important psychological qualities and conditions that promote strong family life – patience, understanding, responsibility, devotion, friendship, passion, and reciprocity. Love includes both a romantic vision as well as a temporary painful condition and problematic characteristics in relationships.

The core zone of love for persons from Central Africa includes love itself, feelings, tenderness, ability to share, and respect. The main feeling of love expressed by Central Africans is tenderness – softness and a light feeling. In this case love is conceptualized as a positive emotion, important in and of itself. The periphery of “love” as a social representation among Central Africans consists of patience, being tied to someone, forgiveness, heart, support, friendship, surrendering, completely serving others, God is love and love is God, passion, belief, fidelity, and marriage. Thus, the periphery of love for Central Africans is more characterized by actions than by concepts: to serve another, to support another, to be attached, to be given completely, to get married, to trust. These results coincide with the benefits of the
contradictory analyses of love in comparison to the descriptive representation of love, because the participants, in this case, had the opportunity to express love either by defining it or by taking different actions (Fehr & Russel, 1991). In the periphery of love for Central Africans, there is the statement “God is love and love is God,” which is connected with their religion. This statement expresses the pure and gentle feeling of love for another human being. Love is divine; people are the extension of God on Earth and therefore, exude pure and tender feelings to those around them.

In contrast to descriptive research into universal characteristics of love which does not identify differences between representatives of individualistic and collectivistic cultures (Yildirm et al., 2014; Jankowiak et al., 2015), in this study we view the distinctions in concepts of love as deeply implanted, quite similarly, in the roots of the collectivist cultures studied and serve as a distinguishable cultural code (Espín, 2013). The core zone of love for Brazilians is honesty, for Russians – suffering, and for Central Africans – tenderness. For Brazilians, the feeling of love is more passionate and conscientious, intuitive and honest. For Russians, love is understood as the continuation of family; it is romantic and fantastic at the same time, being both problematic and responsible in reality. For Central Africans, the feeling of love is more divine and ennobling, atmospheric, light, and joyful.

Evidently, Brazilians and to a greater extent, Central Africans, are generally stronger, more categorical, and emotional than Russians, since the former express their representation of love as devotion and as an ennobling power. The participants from Russia sometimes chose negative statements to convey their perception of love. They generally concurred with the statements that love can disturb life and that love can be evil. We can conclude that for Russians, love is not generally conceptualized as a call to overcome difficulties; on the contrary, it is represented as a complex and difficult issue, connected with the personal effort to overcome doubt as well as to make someone else happy. The data reveals that persons from Central Africa have the highest value of love, as something God-given. From this point of view, love exists in all good things and is connected with kindness and warmness. Brazilians understand love as “looking outward together in the same direction” and as a passion that takes hold of mind, body, and soul. Given the results, it could be concluded that Brazilians internalize love as a passionate feeling arising between two people, which definitely includes the sensual aspect of love.

Evidently, the role of culture in how love is conceptualized reflects a single value-semantic cultural code and shows the translation and decoding of love as the most important human relationship. Being collectivist, these cultures underscore the importance of the presence of others (children, a partner, God) in a relationship. It is noteworthy, however, that the specific notion of love in each of the cultures coheres with the general cultural values (sensuality in Brazil, compassion in Russia, vitality in Central Africa).

Some limitations of the study merit comment. The subjects were representatives from metropolitan universities, i.e., from specific social groups, which do not fully reflect the society of each of the three groups. A more in-depth comparative study of the capitals’ populace and other regions of the specific country would be beneficial, as would additional information concerning the participants, for exam-
ple, the differences between individual and cultural perceptions of love and how they correlate with each other. Culture can seem to take on feminine and masculine roles, as well as various types of love, all of which merit more in-depth study.

Future research efforts are needed to overcome these limitations, with the goal of recognizing the contribution of cultural and individual experiences in the representation and comprehension of the complex phenomena of love in collectivist as well as individualistic cultures. These groups may have not only different cultural perceptions of love, but different individual and cultural experiences, which serve as competitive parameters for each other. Evidently, interactions between the representatives of the above-mentioned groups can begin with a general understanding of love that can include, but not be limited to, commitment, equal relations, an inclination, and at the same time, tranquility in relation to another. It is necessary to move to a more culturally specific understanding of love, which will allow people from today’s multicultural society to become better acquainted with representatives of other cultures.

**Conclusion**

The value-semantic aspect of love among the participants from Brazil, Russia, and the Central African Republic includes both similarities and cross-cultural specificity. The similarities (love as friendship, patience, passion; love as a way to make somebody happy; love as an uplifting feeling) demonstrate the similarities of the representation of love in different cultural societies. The differences among the three groups describe the cultural specificity of love, not only as a personal feeling, but also as a social representation with a core zone and peripheral levels that vary from culture to culture.

The findings are useful for ethnic, cross-cultural psychologists and for positive psychologists, because love is considered as an essential personal force. The results of this study are of particular interest for practicing psychologists, who can use the cross-cultural specificity of love representation in couple and family counseling, especially in multicultural marriages. It is also useful for diagnostics, formation, and correction of the value-semantic personal sphere, as love representation reflects psychological maturity, with a balance between acceptance and distancing.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors extend their thanks to all the participants as well as to Thomas Jhona-ton, People’s Friendship University of Russia, for technical assistance.

**References**


The representation of love among Brazilians, Russians and Central Africans…


Original manuscript received October 15, 2015
Revised manuscript accepted January 15, 2016
First published online March 30, 2016
Assimilation or integration: Similarities and differences between acculturation attitudes of migrants from Central Asia and Russians in Central Russia

Tatiana A. Ryabichenko*, Nadezhda M. Lebedeva

International Scientific-Educational Laboratory for Socio-Cultural Research, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

*Corresponding author. E-mail: tanarimail@gmail.com

When acculturation strategies of migrants and acculturation expectations of a host society do not coincide, psychological outcomes for members of the groups in contact can differ significantly. Berry (2013) proposed that intercultural relations can be understood on the basis of three hypotheses: the multiculturalism hypothesis, the integration hypothesis, and the contact hypothesis. Our goal was to test these three hypotheses in Russian majority and Asian minority groups. Migrants from Central Asia (N = 168; 88 ethnic Uzbeks and 80 ethnic Tajiks) and ethnic Russians (N = 158) were surveyed using a self-report questionnaire that included measures developed by the Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies project. Data processing was carried out using Structural Equation Modeling with the Russians and the migrants separately. We found significant and positive relationships between perceived security and multicultural ideology in both groups. We found a positive relationship between intercultural contacts and the integration strategy among the migrants from Central Asia. Intercultural contacts in the group of Russians was positively related to the expectation of integration and negatively related to the expectation of assimilation. The integration strategy of the migrants was positively related to their self-esteem, while the assimilation strategy was positively related to their sociocultural adaptation and life satisfaction. Among the Russians, the integration expectation promoted their better life satisfaction and self-esteem. The multiculturalism hypothesis was partially supported with both the migrants from Central Asia and the Russians: perceived security promoted an acceptance of multicultural ideology but didn’t promote ethnic tolerance. The contact hypothesis was partially supported in both groups: interethnic contacts were positively linked to the integration strategy of the migrants and the integration expectations of the Russians. The integration hypothesis was fully supported in the sample of Russians and partially supported in the sample of migrants. The migrants’ adoption of the assimilation strategy promoted their life satisfaction and sociocultural adaptation.

Keywords: acculturation, adaptation, assimilation, integration, intercultural relations, multiculturalism, well-being
Assimilation or integration...

Introduction
Mutuality in the acculturation strategies of ethnic minorities and the acculturation expectations of majorities is a source of successful adaptation and favorable intercultural relations. However, many factors have an impact on acculturation and mutual adaptation, such as length of residence, cultural distance, language proficiency of migrants, their professional skills, their education, the economic and political situation in the country, and its migration policy. In our study we were interested in possible discrepancies between the acculturation strategies of migrants and the acculturation expectations of the host population and in any consequences of these discrepancies.

The percentage of immigrants from Central Asian countries less economically developed than Russia (such as Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan) grew up from 24.4% in 2000–2004 to 40.4% in 2010–2013. Russia’s attractiveness for migration from post-Soviet Central Asia is determined by a common history and widespread Russian language usage in interpersonal communication during the Soviet period. Additionally, the visa-free regime between Russia and these countries facilitates movement across borders. The number of migrants from Uzbekistan working in Russia was estimated at 399,000 in 2011, and the estimate for migrants from Tajikistan was 166,000. These constitute the largest migrant-labor groups in Russia; members of these groups see migration to Russia as a strategy for success in life. The decision to migrate is reinforced by the experience of those who have already emigrated and who have been able to improve the financial situation of their families (Di Bartolomeo, Makaryan, & Weinar, 2014). Ryazantsev and Korneev (2014), after analyzing the migration situation, concluded that it constituted a new social phenomenon: “Sustainable life strategies among the Central Asian population . . . focus on success exclusively through labor migration” (p. 13).

Despite the fact that migration from these countries to Russia began in the early 1990s, difficulties in the mutual adaptation of the host population and the migrants have not disappeared. When this migration started, the main flow of migrants was mostly ethnic Russians or Russian speakers who returned to Russia after the collapse of Soviet Union. However, since the end of the 1990s the structure of migration has changed. At present, many of the migrants are natives of the Central Asian countries. Although these migrants include students, small businessmen, and well-educated and highly qualified people, the main migration flow from Central Asia is migrant workers. Low wages and high unemployment rates, especially among the rural population in Central Asia, serve as powerful push factors for young and frequently less skilled migrants who do not speak Russian and who are thus often perceived as culturally and socially distant by the host population in Russia (Di Bartolomeo et al., 2014; Zayonchkovskaya & Tiuriukanova, 2010). Researchers emphasize the crucial role of perceived cultural and social distance in shaping attitudes toward Central Asian migrants (e.g., Abashin, 2013; Zayonchkovskaya, Poletaev, Doronina, Mkrtchyan, & Florinskaya, 2014).

Muscovites increasingly perceive migration as a threat to their cultural security. The causes for perceived insecurity include: patterns of behavior that do not meet local cultural norms; the deterioration of health and the epidemiological situation; a reduction in the level of education in schools as a result of migrants’
children having poor knowledge of the Russian language; the existence of “rubber apartments” (a term that refers either to apartments where hundreds of people are fictitiously registered but do not live or to apartments that house large numbers of migrants in a small area), which worsen general living conditions; the involvement of migrants in crimes; and the saturation of the labor market. Despite the presence of migrants from many other regions and countries, Muscovites consider migrants from Central Asia as the most problematic and risky groups. In turn, migrants face problems with registration, finding housing and legal employment, accessing medical services, enrolling children in school, and corruption (Zayonchkovskaya et al., 2014).

The aim of our study was to test three hypotheses of intercultural relations in the Russian majority and the Central Asian minority groups: the multiculturalism hypothesis, the contact hypothesis, and the integration hypothesis (Berry, 2013; Lebedeva, Tatarko, & Berry, 2015).

We chose to study the Central Federal District of Russia because this region attracts the highest number of migrants—approximately 43% of officially employed foreign workers in the region as a whole and 30% in Moscow (Di Bartolomeo et al., 2014).

**Acculturation and adaptation**

Acculturation is a result of intercultural contact. It involves changes on two levels: (1) cultural changes in both groups and (2) behavioral or psychological changes in individuals. Berry (1990) proposed that the positive and negative orientations of migrants toward maintaining their heritage culture and toward contact with the host society could be combined in four different acculturation strategies: integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. Integration involves contact and identification with both cultures. Separation involves identification with only the culture of one’s heritage country and contacts with one’s own group members. Assimilation involves identification with the host country’s culture and nonacceptance of one’s heritage culture. Marginalization is the absence of identification with both cultures. These four strategies lead to different consequences on the individual level. Many studies have revealed variations in the adaptation of migrants across these four acculturation strategies (Berry & Sabatier, 2010, 2011; Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2013; Ward, 2008). Integration is usually associated with the best adaptation, while marginalization results in the least successful psychological and sociocultural adaptation and intergroup relations.

The acculturation expectations of members of the larger society are defined by the same two dimensions as migrants’ acculturation strategies (Berry, 1990). The integration expectation of the majority group is associated with more positive psychological outcomes and favorable intergroup attitudes. The role of the dominant group in the acculturation process of migrants and minorities is important. The acculturation expectations of members of the larger society have an impact on how intergroup relations develop even more than the attitudes of members of the minority groups because the majority group has greater access to resources and influence, and the involvement of this group in the public and political life of the
state has a longer history and therefore is stronger (Geschke, Mummendey, Kessler, & Funke, 2010).

Previous studies have revealed that the relationship between acculturation strategies and adaptation is strongly influenced by the social and political context of the receiving society (Berry & Sabatier, 2010; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz, 2003; Kus-Harbord & Ward, 2015) as well as by the duration of migrants’ residence in the host country (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk & Kinunen, 2011). Additionally there are differences between psychological and sociocultural adaptation (Masgoret & Ward 2006) and differences in the relationships between different acculturation strategies and kinds of adaptation. Ward and Rana-Deuba (1999) found that integration predicted psychological adaptation, while assimilation better predicted sociocultural adaptation. The study of Jasinskaja-Lahti and colleagues (2011) confirmed the positive impact of integration on psychological adaptation but not on socioeconomic adaptation. In the same study, length of residence in the host country predicted sociocultural and socioeconomic adaptation but not psychological adaptation. The researchers concluded that integration as well as assimilation might promote socioeconomic adaptation in culturally diverse countries at the beginning of the acculturation process. We believe that the relationship between different acculturation strategies/expectations and the different types of adaptation requires additional studies in different contexts and with different ethnic groups.

**The research hypotheses**

According to Berry (2013) three hypotheses (the multiculturalism hypothesis, the contact hypothesis, and the integration hypothesis) are crucial for understanding intercultural relations. The multiculturalism hypothesis connects individuals’ perceived security to their acceptance of those who are culturally different. The contact hypothesis proposes that contact with individuals from other groups promotes positive intercultural attitudes (it is important that the contact be equal and voluntary). The integration hypothesis proposes that double cultural engagement (integration of both cultures) promotes psychological and sociocultural adaptation. For our study, we formulated the following hypotheses:

1. The multiculturalism hypothesis: the higher a person’s sense of security, the higher the willingness to accept those who are culturally different. Specifically: the higher the perceived security, the higher the support of multicultural ideology and ethnic tolerance (for both the immigrant group and members of the larger society).

2. The contact hypothesis: intercultural contact and sharing promote mutual acceptance (under certain conditions, especially that of equality). Specifically:
   2a. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts with the larger society among immigrants, the higher their preference for integration or assimilation strategies.
   2b. The higher the intensity of friendly contacts with immigrants among members of the larger society, the higher their level of ethnic tolerance and their preferences for integration or assimilation expectations.
3. The integration hypothesis: the higher one’s preference for the integration strategy, the higher one’s psychological and sociocultural adaptation. Specifically:

3a. The higher the preference for the acculturation strategy of integration among immigrants, the higher their level of life satisfaction, self-esteem, and sociocultural adaptation.

3b. The higher the preference for integration expectation among members of the larger society, the higher their level of life satisfaction and self-esteem.

**Method**

This study was conducted in the Central Federal District of Russia among 158 ethnic Russians and 168 migrants from Central Asia (80 ethnic Tajiks and 88 ethnic Uzbeks). Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>34 21.52</td>
<td>124 78.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>103 61.31</td>
<td>65 38.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were surveyed using a self-report questionnaire. For migrants the questionnaire was translated into Uzbek and Tajik (translation and back translation were used). The data of migrants were collected using a snowball sampling procedure in Federal Migration Service Centers, markets with migrant workers, and universities. All participants were informed that participation was voluntary and that their responses were anonymous. The questionnaires contained demographic questions and measures developed in the Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies (MIRIPS) project. The items were translated into Russian and adapted for use in previous studies (Lebedeva & Tatarko, 2009). The complete MIRIPS questionnaire is available on the project website: http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/mirips.

**Measures**

Most of the answers to questions were given on a scale from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”). The scales were formed by averaging their corresponding items.

*Perceived security.* This scale included five items (α_Russians = .51; α_migrants = .60) related to perceptions of threat/security in various fields: culture (e.g., “There is room for a variety of languages and cultures in this country,” “We have to take steps to protect our cultural traditions from outside influences”); these were for the threat questions and were reversed for the security questions), economics (e.g., “The high level of unemployment presents a grave cause for concern”; this question was reversed), everyday life (e.g., “A person’s chances of living a safe, untroubled life are better today than ever before”).
Intercultural contacts. Intercultural contacts were measured by tallying the number of Russian close friends for migrants (e.g., “How many close Russian friends do you have?”) or the number of close friends from other ethnic groups for Russians, and, for both groups, the frequency of contact with these friends (e.g., “How often do you meet with close [Russian] friends?”). The responses on the first item ranged from 1 (“none”) to 5 (“many”), and on the second one they varied from 1 (“never”) to 5 (“daily”). Cronbach’s alphas were .91 and .76 for Russians and migrants, respectively.

Tolerance. The tolerance scale measured the degree of acceptance of culturally different individuals or groups. We used three items ($\alpha_{\text{Russians}} = .67; \alpha_{\text{migrants}} = .56$) (e.g., “It is a bad idea for people of different races/ethnicities to marry one another”; this question was reversed).

Multicultural ideology. This scale consisted of four items ($\alpha_{\text{Russians}} = .75; \alpha_{\text{migrants}} = .67$). It measured the degree of acceptance and positive assessment of cultural diversity and participation (e.g., “A society that has a variety of ethnic and cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur”).

Acculturation strategies of migrants/acculturation expectations of Russians. The integration strategies of migrants and the integration expectations of Russians were assessed with four items (e.g., “I feel that Uzbeks/Tajiks should maintain their own cultural traditions but also adopt those of Russians,” “I feel that migrants should maintain their own cultural traditions but also adopt those of Russians”). Cronbach’s alphas were .75 and .70 for Russians and migrants, respectively. The assimilation strategies of migrants and the respective assimilation expectations of Russians were assessed with four parallel items also (e.g., “I feel that Uzbeks/Tajiks should adopt Russian cultural traditions and not maintain our own,” “I feel that migrants should adopt Russian cultural traditions and not maintain their own”). Cronbach’s alphas were .71 and .68 for Russians and migrants, respectively.

Self-esteem. This scale consisted of four items ($\alpha_{\text{Russians}} = .80; \alpha_{\text{migrants}} = .73$) from Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) (e.g., “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself,” “I am able to do things as well as most other people”).

Life satisfaction. We used four items ($\alpha_{\text{Russians}} = .69; \alpha_{\text{migrants}} = .76$) from the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) (e.g., “So far I have got the important things I want in life”).

Sociocultural adaptation. This scale was used for the migrant sample only. It included 10 items from the Revised Sociocultural Adaptation Scale (Wilson, 2013) ($\alpha_{\text{migrants}} = .94$). The items measured respondents’ self-ratings of difficulties in different social domains: for example, community involvement, personal interests, religion, communication.

Russian-language proficiency. Proficiency was measured by four items (“How well do you understand/speak/read/write Russian?”) ($\alpha_{\text{migrants}} = .89$).

Demographic variables. Ages of respondents and duration of residence of migrants in Russia were measured in years.
Data processing
To test the predicted model with the three hypotheses we followed a Structural Equation Modeling approach (Kline, 1998). Two path analyses were performed using SPSS AMOS 20 software (Arbuckle, 2011) with the Russian and the migrant samples separately.

Results
The migrants’ average duration of residence in Russia was 5.81 years (SD = 4.55). The majority of respondents (60.1%) arrived in Russia in the previous 5 years, and less than half (39.9%) arrived in the previous 3 years.

The mean of the Russian-language proficiency of the migrants was sufficiently high despite the fact that they completed their questionnaires in their native language: 3.88 (SD = .84).

The mean of the integration preferences of the migrants was significantly higher than the mean of the integration expectations of the Russians (t = –5.23, p < .001). The means of intercultural contacts and perceived security were also significantly higher in the group of migrants (t = –9.25, p < .001 for contacts, and t = –3.08, p < .01 for security). The two groups did not differ in life satisfaction, but we found differences in the level of self-esteem, which was higher among the migrants (t = –3.54, p < .001).

The descriptive statistics of the variables used in the study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and Pearson’s correlation coefficients for the variables used in the study among Russians (N = 158) and migrants (N = 168)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived security</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.22*/</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>–.11</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural ideology</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>–1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic tolerance</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>–.14/</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>–.08/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>–.19/</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>–21/</td>
<td>–.14/</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>–.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>–.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural adaptation</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Migrants/Russians. *p < .05. **p < .01.
The tested model is presented in the Figure 1. Sociocultural adaptation was used in the group of migrants only.

Standardized regression coefficients for the empirical model for the group of migrants are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Standardized regression coefficients for the empirical model for the group of migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Multicultural Ideology</th>
<th>Ethnic Tolerance</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Life satisfaction</th>
<th>Sociocultural Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived security</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

The empirical model for the group of migrants is presented in Figure 2. Goodness-of-fit indicators of the model for migrants were satisfactory ($\chi^2 = 30.53$, $df = 16$, $\chi^2/df = 1.91$, RMSEA = .07, CFI = .90, GFI = .96).
A significant positive relationship was found between perceived security and multicultural ideology ($\beta = .27, p < .01$). As we can see, the multiculturalism hypothesis was partially supported: perceived security was positively associated with multicultural ideology; however, security was not associated with the ethnic tolerance of migrants. The contact hypothesis was also partially supported: contacts were positively associated only with the integration strategy. The relationship between contacts and ethnic tolerance was positive but did not reach the level of significance ($\beta = .13, p = .08$). The integration hypothesis was partially supported also. The relationship between integration and self-esteem was positive ($\beta = .19, p < .05$), while the relationships between the integration strategy and life satisfaction and sociocultural adaptation were not significant. Additional findings for the migrant group were the positive relationships between the assimilation strategy and both life satisfaction ($\beta = .31, p < .001$) and sociocultural adaptation ($\beta = .20, p < .01$). We also found positive correlations between multicultural ideology and the self-esteem of migrants ($r = .19$) and between ethnic tolerance and self-esteem ($r = .19$).

Standardized regression coefficients for the empirical model for the group of Russians are presented in Table 4.
Table 4. Standardized regression coefficients for the empirical model for the group of Russians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Multicultural ideology</th>
<th>Ethnic tolerance</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Life satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived security</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>–.12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>–.14*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R2 = .09* R2 = .03 R2 = .02 R2 = .03 R2 = .05 R2 = .04

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

The empirical model for the group of Russians is presented in Figure 3. Goodness-of-fit indicators of the model for Russians were satisfactory (χ² = 13.89, df = 10, χ²/df = 1.39, RMSEA = .05, CF I = .97, GFI = .98).

![Figure 3. The empirical model for the group of Russians. *p < .05, ***p < .001.](image-url)
A significant and positive relationship was found between perceived security and multicultural ideology ($\beta = .29$, $p < .001$); this result coincides with the result for migrants. The sense of security of Russians was positively associated with multicultural ideology but was not associated with their ethnic tolerance. Therefore, the multiculturalism hypothesis was partially supported. The contact hypothesis was also partially supported. Contacts were negatively associated with the expectation of assimilation ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$) and were positively associated with the expectation of integration ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$). The integration hypothesis was fully supported: we found positive and significant relationships between integration and self-esteem ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$) and between integration and life satisfaction ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$).

Discussion

In our study, the integration strategy and the integration expectation were the preferred ways to engage each other among both the migrants from Central Asia and the Russians. This result coincides with the results of previous studies on acculturation in different countries as well as in Russia (Berry & Sabatier, 2010; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2011; Lebedeva & Tatarko, 2009).

We found significant and positive relationships between perceived security and multicultural ideology in the migrants and the majority group but did not find significant relationships between perceived security and ethnic tolerance in either group.

The number and frequency of intercultural contacts were positively (but not significantly) linked to ethnic tolerance in the migrants. Intercultural contacts in the group of Russians were negatively linked to the acculturation expectation of assimilation and positively related to the expectation of integration. We found a significant positive relationship between intercultural contacts and the integration of the migrants as well.

The assimilation strategy of the migrants was positively and significantly related to their sociocultural adaptation and life satisfaction. These results are consistent with the results of some previous studies (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2011; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). The main aim of migrants from Central Asia in moving to Russia is to improve conditions of life for their families. At the beginning of the acculturation and adaptation process, the strategy of assimilation might seem the best way to reduce perceived cultural and social differences with the host population in order to preempt negative attitudes from the host population. Nevertheless, as predicted, the integration strategy of the migrants was positively related to their self-esteem.

By definition, the integration and assimilation acculturation strategies differ in their level of cultural maintenance. A rejection of one’s own culture by the migrants lowered their psychological well-being, mainly their self-esteem. Among the Russians the integration expectation promoted their better life satisfaction and self-esteem. We can conclude that the Russians did not expect that migrants would reject their own culture, while the migrants considered adopting Russian culture to be important.
**Conclusion**

Our evaluation of the three hypotheses of intercultural relations in groups of migrants from Central Asia and members of the host population in Central Russia had the following results:

1. The multiculturalism hypothesis was partially supported with both the migrants from Central Asia and the Russians: perceived security promoted an acceptance of multicultural ideology but did not promote ethnic tolerance.

2. The contact hypothesis was partially supported in both samples: intercultural contacts promoted preferences for the integration strategy and expectation but were not associated with the assimilation strategy and expectation.

3. The integration hypothesis was fully supported in the sample of Russians: the integration expectation promoted self-esteem and life satisfaction. This hypothesis was partially supported in the migrant sample: the integration strategy of the migrants had a positive impact on their self-esteem but did not promote their life satisfaction or their sociocultural adaptation.

4. There were some similarities and differences in the relationship between acculturation strategies (of the migrants) and expectations (of the Russians) and their adaptation. For the migrants, assimilation was the best acculturation strategy for achieving better sociocultural adaptation and higher life satisfaction, while integration was the best strategy for achieving high self-esteem. For the Russians, the best acculturation expectation for achieving high self-esteem and life satisfaction was integration. The similarity in the relationship between integration and self-esteem in both samples supports the integration hypothesis and corresponds to most previous findings. However, the finding that the assimilation strategy among the migrants led not only to better sociocultural adaptation (which has been found previously) but also to higher life satisfaction was not predicted. We suppose that such differential findings might be overcome with time. The relationship of the integration strategy to the self-esteem of the migrants is a promising sign that cultural maintenance for migrants will be as useful and functional as cultural participation in the larger host society over time.

**Limitations**

One of the limitations of this study is that migrants from Uzbekistan and Tajikistan were considered as a uniform group of labor migrants from Central Asia, although differences could exist in the acculturation of these groups. The second limitation concerns the generalizability of the findings from the Central Federal District of Russia (Moscow) to Russia as a whole. The sample size was not large because of difficulties in accessing migrants, many of whom are often in the country illegally. This limitation could affect the reliabilities of the scales.
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INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE STUDENTS’ ENVIRONMENT
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This article focuses on the role of the media in shaping the worldview of today’s youth. In Part 1, social attitudes and social stereotypes are described in the context of ethnic relations. Part 2 describes the research into social distance and ethnic and religious stereotypes conducted by I.V. Abakumova and A.V. Grishina. The study was conducted in two stages. First we analyzed various TV and radio programs, articles in the press and on the Internet, about migrant workers, published from March 2009 to March 2012, to identify the image of migrant workers in the Russian media, for further study of the perceptions of migrant workers by students in different professional fields. In the second stage, we modified E. Bogardus’s “Social Distance Scale” in order to assess respondents’ attitudes toward media images of migrant workers and, more importantly, to determine the social distance at which the respondent tolerates the images and therefore the migrants themselves. The last part of the article reports the main findings and conclusions of the study.
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Studies of the constantly changing reality in today’s world are increasingly taking up the role of the media, a subject of continuing research by both Russian and foreign psychologists, political scientists, sociologists, and linguists since the 1950s.

Despite varied approaches to the study of the media, all researchers agree that the media has a huge psychological impact on its audience, both in people’s activity and their value-semantic sphere, transforming its motives, needs, attitudes, and values, and forming stereotypes. The concept of “attitude” (“set”) was introduced into Russian psychology by D.N. Uznadze of the Georgian school of psychology. He understood attitude as “a person’s willingness, prior to any mental or behavioral acts, to perform them appropriately in a given situation”. The person acquires most attitudes from subjective experience and culture, and in today’s society, ready-made
Ethnoreligious attitudes of contemporary Russian students toward labor migrants…

attitudes are broadcast in the media, making it unnecessary for people to form their own attitudes to various subjects, processes, and phenomena, and thus greatly simplifying social interactions among those who have the same attitudes.

The basic attitudes are cognitive, affective, and behavioral. To differentiate among these functions, let us describe the “LaPiere paradox”. In 1934, the American psychologist R. LaPiere travelled through a considerable number of small American towns, accompanied by two Chinese students. They stayed in hotels, visited restaurants and cafés, and, with one exception, were received quite normally. After the trip, LaPiere sent a letter to the owners of these hotels and restaurants, asking, “Will you accept members of the Chinese race as guests in your establishment?” Ninety-three percent said “no”. LaPiere’s data was later confirmed by other researchers.

This example shows that a discriminatory attitude toward members of a particular ethnic group was superseded by the behavior of a hotel or restaurant owner toward a client (Evgenyeva, 2013). Thus, the actual social distance between the subjects conflicts with the discriminatory attitudes of one of the subjects; furthermore, this attitude turns out to be more stable than the previous subjective experience of interaction with the other ethnic group. But on the other hand, in real, not indirect, interaction between members of different ethnic groups, ethnic and religious attitudes can change, even becoming completely the opposite (Abakumova & Grishina, 2013).

Social attitudes are not stable and can be transformed under the influence of external and internal factors. Thus, ethnic and religious attitudes are influenced not only by subjective interaction with other ethnic groups, but by the media. In the cognitivist approach, a change in social attitudes is treated by the “theory of congruity” (F. Heider, T. Newcomb, L. Festinger, C. Osgood, P. Tannenbaum, G.M. Andreeva). This means that attitudinal changes occur every time an incongruity occurs in an individual’s cognitive structure — for example, when a negative attitude toward an object confronts a positive attitude to a person who describes this object positively. Incongruities can occur for various other reasons. It is important that the individual’s need to recover cognitive congruity, i.e., an orderly, “unambiguous” perception of the external world, is the incentive to change one’s attitude (Evgenyeva, 2013). For example, if a public figure or politician respected by the majority of media consumers expresses the opinion that Russia needs migrant workers, the audience’s negative ethnic and religious attitudes can change to positive ones.

The concept of social attitude is close to the concept of a social stereotype, understood as a simplified schematic image of the social object (for example, the image of a social group), widespread in a certain large social group, which is characterized by a high degree of consistency of individual views and emotional overtones in the group.

N.N. Bogomolova identifies certain characteristics of the stereotypes of large social groups:

- a schematic and simplistic image of the social object;
- the prevalence of certain stereotypes in the group, usually at a level of 60-80%;
- the emotional and evaluative nature of stereotypes;
- the stability and sustainability of stereotypes, their resistance to new information about the object;
- inaccurate stereotypes (Bogomolova, 2008).
Social stereotypes researchers agree that these play useful socio-psychological functions, allowing the individual to organize and simplify the plethora of complex information received from the environment, while also protecting and preserving the individual’s value-semantic system.

Bogomolova also notes another function of social stereotyping: intergroup differentiation in the process of intergroup perception. Such an evaluative comparison of social groups (one’s own or someone else’s) can take many forms: opposition, which implies a maximum preference of one’s own group and at least a bias against other groups; or comparison, which B.F Porshnev defined as “a form of peaceful identity”. The relations between social groups affects the content and orientation of social stereotypes (Bogomolova, 2008).

The most common form of social stereotypes are ethnic stereotypes. The first psychological studies of ethnic stereotypes were published in the mid-1930s by O. Klineberg and J. Dollard in the context of their “frustration and aggression hypothesis”. However, the greatest impact on the understanding of ethnic stereotypes was made by T. Adorno in his work *The Authoritarian Personality*, where it was shown that individuals of the same ethnic group have significant differences in the degree of their susceptibility to ethnic stereotyping. Adorno described the type of person most prone to the absorption and diffusion of ethnic prejudice as an “authoritarian personality”. The authoritarian personality, according to Adorno, is characterized by rigid thinking, conformity to accepted values, intolerance toward any manifestation of weakness and empathy, a tendency toward repression, expressed suspicion, and worship of authority (Bogomolova, 2008).

T. Pettigrew believed that the basis for the formation of social stereotypes in general and ethnic stereotypes in particular is conformism, an unconditional surrender to the prevailing social norms.

The problem of ethnic stereotypes has been developed in Russian psychology by I.S. Kon, B.A. Dushkov, V.P. Levkovich, N.G. Pankova, A.G. Asmolov, E.I. Shlyagina, V.F. Petrenko, and G.U. Soldatova. Taking the psychosemantic approach of V.F. Petrenko, research has been conducted on the ethnic auto- and hetero-stereotypes of Russian students and the perceptions and attitudes of different social groups of Russian citizens regarding foreign countries and different nationalities, showing that the younger audience’s perception of typical representatives of various nationalities (including their own) is dominated by a psychological group differentiation mechanism, not in the form of contrasting, but rather of comparing the groups, which leads to complementary images. Not only are none of the qualities repeated, but they are all bipolar opposites.

In today’s information society, the process of mutual perception of large social groups moves to a new level, since the media is now one of the main mediators in contacts between two groups. And for some social groups, such as young people, who lack both mature mechanisms to counter the influence of the media, and subjective experience of interaction with other social groups, it is the media which broadcasts ready-made attitudes and stereotypes for mass consumption, especially ethnic and religious attitudes (Grishina, 2010).

To identify the image of migrant workers in the Russian media for further study of the perceptions of students in different professional fields of study, we analyzed
a variety of TV and radio programs, articles in the press and on the Internet, about migrant workers, published from March 2009 to March 2012. We found that in the Russian media, the images of national minorities are ridiculed, whereas the dominant social group exalts its own image through detraction from the image of minorities. The terms “guest workers” and “illegals” are used in all types of media with a pronounced negative connotation, much more often than other phrases, giving the audience a persistent negative attitude to all migrants, regardless of their actual professional affiliation, skills, etc. Images of migrants emphasize their incompetence, ignorance, lack of education, and absolute failure to integrate themselves within the host society. At the same time, negative information about migrants is often linked in the media with certain ethnic groups, inculcating ethnic stereotypes and prejudices among the audience.

In order to assess respondents’ attitudes toward media images of migrant workers and, more importantly, to determine the social distance at which the respondent tolerates the images and therefore the migrants themselves, we modified the Bogardus “Social Distance Scale.” The concept of social distance was introduced by the sociologist Georg Simmel as an indicator of social groups’ and individuals’ position in social space, their interrelationship — i.e., their proximity or remoteness from each other, their degree of interconnectedness.

The experiments were conducted at the state universities of Rostov-on-Don: the Southern Federal University (SFEDU), and the Rostov State Transport University. There were a total of 200 participants: students from the economics, law, physical science, and psychological departments; 147 women and 53 men. The study was carried out by the horizontal dimension and incorporated both group and individual work. All study participants were asked to fill out identical forms for testing and questioning.

Picture 1. Stimulus material for the Social Distance Scale (modified by L.V. Abakumova and A.V. Grishina)
The subjects were asked to rate 11 images taken from the media and to mark the distance at which they would willingly associate with members of the group (from “A close relationship, a marriage” to “Should not be allowed to enter my country”) (Picture 1).

In our research, social distance was defined not with respect to different ethnic groups, but the images of these groups as broadcast in the media in coverage of labor migration issues.

Images of athletes and coaches, depicted in pictures 9 and 11, were placed at the lowest social distance in all respondent groups, which signifies a close relationship through marriage or friendship. Images of teachers, researchers, nannies, shown in pictures 3, 4, and 5, were placed at an average social distance, which signifies membership in my professional group or neighborhood. The greatest social distance was identified by all groups with the images shown in pictures 6 and 7. The distance for the image of unemployed migrants from neighboring countries (picture 6) was the biggest, and respondents from all professional groups believe that such migrant workers should not be allowed to enter the Russian Federation.

The group of economics students displayed the smallest social distance for all the images (except picture 6), indicating their greater engagement with and tolerance toward labor migrants. The group of law students, on the other hand, showed the greatest social distance for all images, which indicates a generally negative attitude toward labor migrants (Abakumova & Grishina, 2011).

In the first stage of our study, we used the following diagnostic tests to investigate the value-semantic sphere of students from different professional fields: “Meaning of Life Orientations” (D.A. Leontiev), “Value Orientations” (M. Rokich), “Tolerance Index” (G.U. Soldatova). The results of the research into the students’ value-semantic sphere are given below.

We can identify these differences in value-semantic characteristics among students of different professional fields: Psychologists and lawyers showed higher scores on all scales compared with physicists and economists, which suggests greater comprehension of their lives to this point and satisfaction with life in general.

For psychologists, physicists, and economists, the priorities are terminal values in personal life, with concrete and abstract values equally represented. For lawyers, the priorities are specific values and values of professional fulfillment.

All the professional groups have their priority values, but, unlike terminal values, the hierarchy of instrumental values is identical for all groups surveyed. Thus, the hierarchy of instrumental values is not based on professional field, but is connected with the age of respondents. For students, the most important values of means are:

1) good manners, the ability to behave in accordance with social standards of behavior;
2) cheerfulness, optimism, sense of humor;
3) education, high cultural level;
4) responsibility, sense of duty, keeping one’s word;
5) honesty, truthfulness, sincerity.
For psychologists and lawyers, one of the priority values is courage in defending one's own opinions.

Significant differences among groups respecting different types of tolerance have not been identified. In all groups, tolerance is at an average level, which means a combination of tolerant and intolerant traits — in some social situations they behave tolerantly, in others intolerantly.

For a more complete picture of the image of migrant workers and the general attitude of students to labor migration, they were all given identical questionnaires. All students participated in the study voluntarily. Completion of all phases of the study took about two academic hours. Mathematical treatment of the data included standard statistical methods.

The first questionnaire contained questions about the students' attitude to labor migration as a social phenomenon. The following are significant answers:

- Russia does not need migrant workers;
- labor migrants “take away” local citizens’ jobs;
- wages of migrant workers and the local population, for the same job, should be the same;
- employers bring in migrant workers as a “cheap labor force”;
- according to physics students, Russia needs qualified specialists from abroad.

The second questionnaire studied students' attitudes to the media role in forming the image of migrants. The following were the answers:

- the media portrays migrants negatively;
- the most popular images of migrant workers in the media are the characters of the “Our Russia” TV program;
- attitudes to migrants are not shaped by the media;
- TV has the greatest impact on the image of migrant workers;
- discussion of labor migration in the media leads to intolerance, but it also draws attention and interest to this problem;
- the most commonly used terms in the discussion of labor migration are “illegal” and “guest worker”.

This study allows us to draw a number of conclusions. Under the influence of stereotypes broadcast in the media, youth form stable images, which convey negative expectations in relation to different social groups. The images created about migrants emphasize their incompetence, ignorance, lack of education, and absolute failure to integrate themselves into the host society. At the same time, negative information about migrants is often linked in the media with certain ethnic groups, forming ethnic and religious stereotypes and attitudes in the audience. Students' image of a migrant worker is significantly distorted. Regardless of the students' professional field, in all groups there was a persistent aversion toward a particular migrant worker category (job classification), as well as unconditional acceptance of the other categories of migrants, which the subjects did not classify as “migrant
workers” although these are (skilled experts in various areas). This trend is becoming a social and psychological risk (Abakumova & Grishina, 2011).

We recommend taking a special approach to the selection and broadcasting of ethnic information in the media, in order to promote tolerance and to prevent such negative social phenomena as xenophobia against immigrants. It is important not to allow in the media the tendentious selection of ethnically tinted facts, leading to the bifurcation of society into “us” and “foreigners,” “friend” and “enemy”. Some steps in this direction have already been taken. Article 51 of the Russian Federation Law “On Mass Media” prohibits the use of the journalist’s right to disseminate information in order to discredit a citizen or individual categories of citizens on the basis of gender, age, race or ethnic origin, language, religion, profession, place of residence and work, or in connection with their political beliefs.

Many experts in the field of migration agree that it is necessary to overcome one-sided media coverage of migration processes. Along with the reflection of negative issues associated with these processes, the media has to protect the rights of migrants and to promote their integration into Russian society.

Another important issue in changing the attitude of young people to labor migration is to refrain from characterizing migrants as competitors against native Russians in the labor market. For a young student audience, one of the most important requirements is professional self-realization and finding a good job. Emphasis in the media on “an uncontrollable number of labor migrants”, “their willingness to do any kind of work”, and, most importantly, the media’s exaggerated claims about the desire of employers to recruit migrant workers, lead to a persistent negative stereotype that “the migrant worker is our main competitor in the labor market”.

We recommend that the media present information about the qualifications of migrant workers and the desired salary that corresponds to their skill levels, showing that this is what determines whether they are hired. As shown by our studies (2006, 2008, 2010), businessmen who hire migrant workers believe “that migrant workers are working where the local population is unable to work” and that “the Russian population does not work well and asks for high wages” (Abakumova & Grishina, 2011). In this connection, media reporting on highly skilled migrants will not only reduce social tensions and the social distance between these social groups, but will also create an appropriate representation of young people in the competitive labor market, which will likely increase their motivation to get vocational training and increase their skills within their specialty.

The mechanism for forming such a positive image should be developed using impact technologies that produce a convincing effect.

To translate persuasive information (Abakumova & Voskoboev, 2010), which is still significant only for the broadcaster of state and public values, into something that is also personally significant for youth, the latter must be shown that behavior based on this information will not only not be contrary to their values, but will also help to meet their specific needs and will correspond to their expectations.

Using persuasive technologies lessens the alienation of the young person from the subjects who are the focus of the broadcast. This result can be achieved by di-
rected action of the broadcaster, using value-semantic difficulties to clarify meanings, as a means to overcome value-semantic barriers; if this is not done, each person begins to feel conflict or duality about the situation (Abakumova & Bakulin, 2010).

While solving a «task about meaning», overcoming value-semantic barriers and creating a positive expectation by accepting the assimilated content, there occurs an inner change in the personality, because of the interrelationships of motives on several overlapping planes (Abakumova, 2003):

- the motive for the personality to overcome internal and external obstacles for the sake of its achievement;
- comparing the motive with other possible motives for the same activity in the subject's mind;
- in evaluating the motive in its relation to the norms and ideals adopted by the personality; the interrelationship of the motive with real personal opportunities.

The subjective experience of comprehending information predicated upon objective values or objectified meanings, is characterized by semantic increments, the dynamics of which can also be called a product of persuasion — that is, a values-based increment.

Legislative regulation of the coverage of labor migration issues in the media is certainly useful. However, the main factor determining the reasonableness of a media report is the personality of the journalist himself, his moral qualities, citizenship, and sense of social responsibility. Let's draw up a list of questions that a journalist should ask himself before submitting his story on the subject of international relations in general and labor migration in particular:

1. Can I be objective in covering this subject?
2. Does my personal attitude to a particular ethnic or social group affect the material I am submitting?

If one is intolerant oneself toward certain ethnic groups or all other ethnic groups, the professionalism and responsibility of a journalist requires either a complete withdrawal from writing about a whole range of issues affecting international relations, or maximum exclusion from one's texts of all value judgments, presenting only reliable facts.

3. How will this information be regarded by the ordinary spectator?
4. Who is the target audience for this material?

Here we should consider developing recommendations for media materials narrowly aimed at a specific target audience, depending on professional field.

Our study shows that despite an externally imposed stereotyping process, students who represent various professional groups are ready to entertain different attitudes toward migrant workers, due to the significant differences identified in their value-semantic sphere.

In addition, it is necessary to organize work with students at the universities (both from the host population and migrants) to develop mutually tolerant attitudes, which is an important component in the spread of anti-terrorist ideology and the development of anti-extremist values in the younger generation.
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The study of ethnocultural identity is remarkably up to date when considering the interactions of different countries, the ethnic groups studied within the limits of mono- and multiculturality space, and the processes of acculturation, assimilation, and others. Ethnocultural identity is based on the desires of the individual and the nation viewed integrally; it is achieved in substituted forms through integration in the cultural and symbolic space of society. The aim of this article is to analyze the meaning-of-life and value orientations of Armenian and Russian students in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Armenia. In order to study ethnocultural identity as part of the self-concept we carried out a study with students at the Russian-Armenian (Slavonic) University (Yerevan, Armenia) and the South Federal University (Rostov-on-Don, Russia): at the initial stage we conducted two focus groups (the number of respondents in each group was 10); at the second stage we conducted a study the number of respondents was 160. When the Armenian and Russian youth described their ethnicity, high values of social self — in particular, national civic identity — correlated with high and medium levels of meaning-of-life orientations. Armenians and Russians in title ethnus and in the associated diaspora had a number of similarities and differences in value orientations. The majority of respondents in the focus groups noted their positive emotions connected with being Armenian or Russian. The ethnic Russians in Armenia pointed out the ease of communication with Russian speakers, regardless of ethnicity, but noted the difficulty of social interaction because of their insufficient knowledge of the Armenian language. The formation and development of ethnic self-consciousness may be carried out at two levels: understanding the values and ideas of ethnicity and assessing the ethnocultural and ethnopsychological features of one’s ethnic group. The ethnic identity of Armenians in Russia has been transformed, and they are now characterized by similar values as ethnic Armenians in Armenia. Ethnic Armenians and ethnic Russians are in continuous interaction in Armenia and in Russia. This interaction is a key to positive ethnic attitudes in both groups as evidenced by their tolerance for other ethnic groups and their solidarity and it enriches the representatives of both ethnic groups at the regulatory value level, making them carriers of both culture.

Keywords: ethnocultural identity, meaning-of-life orientations, value orientations
Introduction

Theoretical and methodological framework

Over the past several decades the problems of ethnic identity have come to the fore because of people’s desire for the preservation and development of their unique cultures.


The theories forming the methodological framework for analyzing the concept of meaning are the following: personalistic theory: J. Lacroix, P. Lundberg, R.Ricker, W. Stern; humanistic theory: A. Maslow, C. Rogers, D. Royce, A. Powell, F. Phoenix; existential theory: J. Bugental, V. Frankl (Bratchenko, 2001; Frankl, 1992; Rogers, 1959). General psychological theories that laid the foundations for the psychology of the meaning of life rely on the meaning-of-life approach to understanding human representation; these theories were devised by L.S. Vygotsky, A.N. Leontiev, B.V. Zeigarnik, O.K. Tihomirov, A.G. Asmolov, I.V. Dubrovin, V.P. Zinchenko, V.A. Ivannikov, D.A. Leontiev, V.V. Stolin, E.V. Subbotsky (Asmolov, 2007; Leontiev, 1975; Vygotsky, 2005).

Relevance of the research

Studies of Armenian and Russian youth have been carried out by both Russian and Armenian psychologists. Recent cross-cultural research on young ethnic Armenian and Russian representatives of their ethnic groups in their own countries and in the associated diaspora are reflected in the works of Russian and Armenian psychologists: A.K. Belousova, V.G. Kysko, A.A. Nalchajyan, A.S. Berberyan, M. Vardanyan, O.R. Tuchina, and others (Berberyan, 2012; Berberyan, Tuchina, 2014, Kysko, 2008; Nalchajyan, 2010).

Our work is relevant because of blank spots in the theoretical analysis of the concept of ethnic identity and the factors that determine its formation and development, the lack of quantitative and qualitative indicators as part of the empirical research, and the lack of psycho-pedagogical support at the level of psychological services in the context of ethnic identity.
The object of our research was to examine the psychological characteristics of ethnocultural identity in a sample of Armenian and Russian youth in Russia and Armenia. The subject of our research is the phenomenon of ethnocultural identity in the aggregate, its intrinsic and functional specificity, and its structural parameters and historical forms. Our aim was to study the meaning-of-life and value orientations as well as the professional orientations of Armenian and Russian students in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Armenia. Cross-cultural studies of this kind are the latest trends for the disclosure of the psychological characteristics of ethnic Armenians and Russians in Armenia and of ethnic Armenians and Russians in the Russian Federation.

The theoretical significance of our work lies in our deep theoretical analysis of the concepts of ethnocultural identity, the meaning of life, and values in the works of Russian, Armenian, and foreign psychologists. The practical significance of our work lies in the possible future implementation of the results of cross-cultural study we conducted and interpreted with a use of qualitative and static processing (by SPSS) in coming to our conclusions.

**Background of the research**

Identity is a dynamic structure developing nonlinearly and defined by the aspiration of the individual toward integrity and uniqueness. Ethnic identity is composed of personal characteristics that reveal a personality that is developing through the awareness and self-understanding of the ethnic identity in the context of global sociopolitical changes in society. Ethnocultural identity is self-identification with an ethnic community; it is based on ethnic values, self-understanding, and self-assessment of membership in a group. Ethnocultural identity can be seen as a complex, multilevel hierarchy that is transformed under the influence of global processes.

The personal nature of ethnic forms of culture leads to self-awareness and identity as a free person; the subject’s own activities are endowed with value-semantic features. At a young age the value-sense aspect can develop in productive and reproductive situations. The main characteristics of this productive, active, and creative development of the semantic sphere are its “openness, reflexivity, as a consequence, ordering, non-stereotype, harmony,” willingness to follow the call of potential, and “flexibility of consciousness as a core center” (Abakumova, 2003, p. 98).

The ethnic and cultural diversity of modern society, in spite of the intense flow of information and globalization processes, covers virtually the entire civilized world. This phenomenon was dubbed by scientists the “ethnic paradox of our time” (Stefanenko, 2000), which is manifested in the simultaneous “co-existence” of globalization and civilization and of the spiritual and material culture of ethnic communities in the context of a surge of interest in ancient rituals, customs, and folklore.

The concept of identity in the interpretation of research has a multifaceted and broad meaning. It is part of the dichotomy of social/personal, and it adds to, updates, and often replaces the traditional ideas of self-concept, self-image, and “self-and-others. Based on the logic of the theoretical analysis, the concepts and methodological principles for the study of identity are the same as the principles for the study of personality.
The concept of identity was presented in detail in the work of the famous psychologist Erik Erikson (1968); he outlined the scale of the notion by arguing that identity crises go far beyond philosophical and socio-psychological study and present an interdisciplinary problem.

J. E. Marcia (Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1993) suggested the model of identity status; he defined identity as a special structure of the Ego, the internal, self-creating, dynamic organization of abilities, beliefs, and individual stories. In our view, Marcia’s suggestion that this structure is revealed through patterns of solving problems is important.

According to this approach, solving any problem, even the most insignificant, helps people realize personal characteristics and the meaningfulness of their lives in the formation of identity. If we link this approach to the development of identity, we can claim that in the process of becoming a person a number of problems associated with the social environment, like privacy and self-determination, in the system of the value-oriented sector are solved.

The determination and value-willed aspects are the main focus of A.S. Waterman’s work (1999), where he defines a direct correlation between identity and a system of goals, values, and beliefs that act, according to Waterman, as “elements of identity”: identity, moratorium, premature identity, diffuse identity. The formation of the model of ethnic identity by Marcia and colleagues (1993) is interesting for the purposes of our study because the model takes into account two criteria: (1) the presence or absence of a crisis; (2) the presence or absence of student-significant goals, values, and beliefs.

We consider the theory of identity as being in the psychological research paradigm of personal identity. However, many authors believe that traditional psychoanalysis is not in a position to fully present identity because it does not use the category of social protection. Methods of psychoanalytic reasoning and consideration of the environment as the “outside world” or the “objective world” do not take into account its total reality. Thus, we can conclude that psychological science, in the presence of various typologies, underrepresents the relationship between different kinds of identity that would allow for the basic problem of self/society.

An integral part of the social identity of a person is the notion of ethnic identity. It implies awareness of belonging to a certain ethnic community. According to Stefanenko (2000), ethnic identity is first and foremost the result of cognitive-emotional awareness of oneself as a representative of the ethnos and is also the result of a certain degree of identification with the ethnos and separation from other ethnic groups.

Among many definitions, we would like to highlight that of Shpet (1996), who regards ethnic identity as the experience of identity with one ethnic community and separation from another. This definition implies that the structure of identity consists of two components: (1) a cognitive understanding of the hallmarks of one’s own group, and (2) the attribution of oneself to it on the basis of ethno-differentiating symptoms and affects (an assessment of one’s group and an emotional attitude toward membership in it).

Ethnic identity is not only an awareness of identity with a certain group but also one’s evaluation of it and one’s emotional attitude and feelings toward it. According to Soldatova (1998, p. 49, “Dignity, pride, resentment, fear are important criteria of
interethnic comparisons. These feelings are based on a deep emotional connection with the ethnic community and moral obligations toward it, which emerge in the process of the socialization of an individual”.

We can define identity as a dynamic structure that develops nonlinearly and is predicated on the desire of the individual for uniqueness and integrity. In relation to the members of an ethnic community, one may have both positive and negative attitudes. The nature of this relationship is affected by many factors, including one's importance and ethnosocial status. It has been found that some members of non-Russian ethnic groups in Russia perceive their groups as more attractive because higher status is associated with an increase in self-esteem and pride in their people (Berberyan, 2012).

Factors affecting the formation and expression of ethnic identity are the following:

1. subjective factors of individual human life
2. global sociopolitical changes in a country
3. the heterogeneity/homogeneity of the ethnic environment
4. ethnic and cultural distance

In many studies on the development of ethnic identity, the results show a trend among the members of minority groups to identify themselves with the dominant group; such identification is connected to children’s early awareness of the social structure in a society. The focus on “intra-orientation” usually occurs with age and the development of ethnic identity in the ethnic minority. An individual may identify himself with two social groups: — a majority group and a minority group; regardless of individual’s own nationality, and despite the assignment of a particular group either of them may become socially desired (or a point of reference).

The consideration of ethnic identity as a personal characteristic will reveal potential personality development through young people’s awareness and self-understanding of their ethnic identity in the context of global social-political changes in the society. We know that the impact of social context on ethnic identity depends on whether a person lives in a mono-ethnic or multiethnic environment. However, few studies have been conducted on the differences in the self-identity and the self-attitude of people living in different ethnic environments.

D.A. Leontiev (2003) defines the semantic aspect of a person as a specially organized set of semantic structures and the relationships between them; these structures ensure the coherent semantic regulation of the vital activity of the person in all its aspects”. In the end, the meaning of our existence really is understanding, and the main purpose of the subject is to search for the meaning of life, to understand it. Understanding the world, a person has to understand itself not as an object and has to recognize the inside from the perspective of the meaning of existence” (Znakov, 2000, p. 15).

Hypothesis
Our general hypothesis was that high valuation of the social self — in particular, self-described national-civic identity — correlates with high and medium levels of general life orientations in Armenian and Russian youth. Our local hypotheses
were the following: (1) According to the methodology of personal semantic differentials, the power factor is higher in both groups of ethnic Russians, and the activity factor is higher in the groups of ethnic Armenians. (2) Ethnic Armenian youth when describing themselves don’t use the component of the “past,” which correlates with a high level of anxiety. (3) The cognitive and affective components of the national identity of most Armenian and Russian students stipulate the adoption of national heroes as reference groups.

Method

Subjects

We conducted a study of ethnic Armenian and Russian student youth in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Armenia; the total number of respondents was 160. The subjects were divided into four groups: (1) the titular group of ethnic Armenians, (2) ethnic Armenians of the diaspora in Russia, (3) the titular group of ethnic Russians, (4) ethnic Russians of the diaspora in Armenia. Answers to a questionnaire on the awareness of ethnicity, in which respondents described their family tree, confirmed this division along ethnic lines.

Observation & testing

Methods chosen for the study were the following four tests and one questionnaire:

1. Life Meaning Orientations Test (D.A. Leontiev)

This test is an adapted version of the Purpose-in-Life Test of James Crumbaugh and Leonard Maholick. The method was developed on the basis of Frankl’s (1992) desire for meaning and logotherapy theory, and its aim was to validate this theory’s components. The Russian version, the Meaning-of-Life Orientations Test, was developed on the basis of factor analysis and adapted by D.A. Leontiev in 1968–1988. In addition to being an indicator of general life meaningfulness, it comprises five subscales reflecting three concrete meaning-of-life orientations (purposes in life, life process or interest and emotional saturation, life productivity or satisfaction of self-realization) and two aspects of the locus of control (control locus-self, control locus–life). The first three factors form meaning-of-life orientations: purposes in life (the future), life process (the present), and satisfaction of self-realization (the past). The two remaining factors characterize the locus of inner control as a general ideological conviction that self-control is possible.

The following five subscales are used in the test:

- Purposes in life. Scores on this scale characterize future purposes’ presence or absence in the respondent’s life; these purposes fill life with meaning, intention, and time perspective. Even if the general life-meaningfulness level is high, low scores on this scale indicate a person who lives in the present or even in the past.

- Life process or interest and emotional saturation. The content of this scale coincides with the famous dictum that the only meaning of life is to live.
It shows whether respondents perceive their life processes as interesting, emotionally saturated, and meaningful.

Life productivity or satisfaction of self-realization. Scores on this scale reflect respondents’ estimates of their past, their sense of previous productivity and meaningfulness in life.

Locus of control–self (master of life). High scores correspond to respondents’ conceptions of themselves as strong people, with sufficient freedom of choice to build their lives in accordance with their own goals and objectives and understanding of the meaning of life. Low scores correspond to respondents’ frustration in attempting to control the events of their lives.

Locus of control–life. High scores indicate respondents’ belief that they have control of their lives and are free to make decisions and to implement them. Low scores indicate fatalism, the belief that human life is not subject to conscious control, that freedom is illusory, and that it is pointless to think about the future.

2. “Personal Semantic Differential” Method

This method was developed on the basis of the modern Russian lexicon and is characterized by ideas formed in our culture about the structure of personality. The semantic-differential technique was developed by C. Osgood in 1957 and has since been widely used worldwide in psychological diagnostics. Personal Semantic Differential method was modified by employees of the V.M. Bekhterev Psychoneurological Institute. The method gives respondents the opportunity to explore their attitudes toward themselves and others; it is based on identifying individuals’ representations of self-importance, level of claims, volitional self-regulation, and communication skills in the development of interpersonal relations. Originally 120 words denoting personality traits were chosen from S. Ozhegov’s Russian language dictionary. The final version of the method includes 21 personality traits. While interpreting the data obtained in the diagnostics by the Personal Semantic Differential method, we focused on the fact that subjective and emotional-semantic representations of oneself and others are reflected in these scales, as are interpersonal relationships; these representations can only partly correspond to reality, but they are of significance in themselves.

The developed version of the method involves three classical factor poles of the semantic differential: Assessment, Force, and Activity. Adjectives denoting personality are used as the scales’ polar positions.

The Assessment factor indicates subjects’ self-esteem, self-acceptance, recognition of their socially approved characteristics, critical attitude toward themselves, and self-satisfaction. Subjects with high values on this factor accept themselves, are aware of themselves as carriers of positive, socially approved characteristics, and in a certain sense are satisfied with themselves. Low scores indicate acritical attitude toward oneself, dissatisfaction with one’s own behavior and level of achievement, and an insufficient level of self-acceptance.
The *Force factor* in the self-assessment reflects the development of volitional sides. High values are an indicator of self-confidence and independence, as well as of the tendency to rely on one’s own strength in difficult situations.

The *Activity factor* in the context of self-assessment is evidence of an extroverted personality. Positive values on this scale indicate high activity, sociability, impulsivity; negative values on this scale indicate high introversion, a certain passivity, and emotional reactions.

3. **Twenty Statements Test (M. Cun T. McPartland)**

This procedure asks for 20 answers to the question: “Who am I?” In this method of psychological diagnostics (nonstandardized self-description), the respondent can answer explicitly, although in some modifications options for answers are presented. The method was developed in 1954 by M. Cun and T. McPartland; several modifications of it are known.

The test is formed on the basis of Cun’s idea of self-concept. The methodological bases of the idea are concepts of social roles and role behavior in which self-perception is formulated through the prism of role performance. This formulation is reflected in self-descriptions given by the respondents. The following categories are most commonly used for an analysis: type of relationships, class, character traits, interpersonal style, and aspirations of others. A respondent has 12 minutes to formulate 20 different answers to the question “Who am I?”. Answers are given in the order in which they spontaneously come to mind. After that, the respondent evaluates each quality as positive, negative, or ambiguous, or uses a sign that means it is difficult to estimate.

The scale of identification characteristics includes 24 indicators that combine to form seven generalized components of identity: (1) social self (direct designation of sex, sexual role, educational and professional position, family affiliation, regional identity, ethnic identity, citizenship, ideological identity, group affiliation), (2) communicative self (friendship or circle of friends, communication or subject of communication), (3) material self (a description of owned property, evaluation of own security, attitude to the external environment), (4) physical self (a subjective description of physical data), (5) activity self (classes, activities, interests, self-assessment of activity ability), (6) perspective self (personal perspectives on and aspirations for social, communicative, material, physical, and activity selves), (7) reflexive self (personal identity, global self, existential self) and two separate indicators: identity problem and situational state.

4. **“Nonexistent Animal” projective method**

This projective method of personality diagnostics is based on psychomotor connection theory. It can be used to register a state of psyche, based on motility fixation in particular, motor drawing by the (dominant) right hand. The sheet of paper acts as a space model, and muscle condition fixes the attitude toward the space, the emerging trend. The space, in turn, is associated with the emotional overtone of the experience and the time periods of present, past, and future. The space is also connected with the effectiveness of the psyche’s work. The space behind and to the left of the subject is connected with the previous time period and inactivity (lack of
active communication between thought and performance, between planning and implementation). The right side, the space at the front and at the top, is related to a future time period and effectiveness. On the sheet the left side and the bottom are associated with negative and depressive emotions, uncertainty, and passivity. The right side (corresponding to the dominant right hand) is associated with positive emotions, energy, activity, concrete action.

In addition to these general laws of psychomotor connection and relationship to the space, theoretical rules of operating with symbols and symbolic elements and geometric shapes are used in the interpretation of the test material. The location of a drawing at the top edge of the sheet is interpreted as an indicator of high self-esteem (the closer to the top, the more pronounced the self-esteem is), contentment with one's position in society, activity, recognition by others, self-assertion. The location at the bottom of the picture indicates the opposite traits: self-doubt, low self-esteem, depression, indecision, lack of interest in one's position in society, lack of recognition, lack of self-assertion.

5. The authors’ questionnaire

We developed this questionnaire on the basis of several Russian psychological profiles (Stefanenko, 2000), Lebedeva and Tatarko, 2011), to identify the characteristics of ethnocultural identity. The questionnaire contains 15 questions, including questions about factual data — “What is your name/surname?” “How long have you lived in Armenia/Russia?” “What is your native language?” “What is the name of the city where you live?” — and questions requiring a subjective answer — “Which nationality do you refer yourself to?” “Is there is a second nationality that you refer yourself to?” “Please list qualities that in your opinion are ethno-integrating.” “Describe your feelings about living in Armenia/Russia”. These questions laid the base for interpreting the results of the empirical study on factual data and on affective and cognitive components.

Design

To investigate ethnocultural identity, we first used focus groups’ method and then conducted a study with students at the Russian-Armenian (Slavonic) University (c. Yerevan, Republic of Armenia) and the South Federal University (Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation).

In the first stage of the study we conducted focus groups in Armenia to identify the importance of the issues and to observe a wide variety of ethnic interactions in a single educational environment. The aim was to elicit ideas and thoughts about their ethnic identity from native Armenian students and Russian students in diaspora. The native language of the Armenian students was Armenian, and they had lived in Armenia for more than 15 years). The native language of the Russian students was Russian; they had lived in Armenia for over 5 years. The number of participants in each group was 10; there were representatives of different courses of study and different educational levels. No gender differences were found in the two groups of respondents.
The majority of respondents noted positive emotions in connection with their being Armenian or Russian. However, the Russians in Armenia celebrated their ease of interaction with Russian speakers, regardless of ethnicity; they also noted difficulties in social interactions because of their insufficient knowledge of the Armenian language. The Armenians revealed insufficient knowledge of traditions in contrast with the Russians. In some cases, they interpreted some native Armenian traditions and rituals in different ways and maintained, in particular, the tradition of the wedding. The importance of keeping traditions and performing rituals rather than having a semantic understanding of them prevailed when they spoke about such events as Trndez (Feast of Purification), Tsakhkazard (Palm Sunday), Vardavar (Water Day), and others. In the group of Armenians the overwhelming majority (85%) had knowledge of the history of Armenia at an above-average level, while the Russians had an average knowledge of the history (knowledge of important dates only).

In the second phase of the study we tested four groups of respondents: ethnic Armenians in Armenia, ethnic Armenians in Russia, ethnic Russians in Russia, ethnic Russians in Armenia. Statistics of the samples is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–21</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22–25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Armenians in Armenia</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Russians in Armenia</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Armenians in Russia</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Russians in Russia</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of study:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and humanities</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

According to analysis of the questionnaire regarding awareness of ethnicity, a trend was observed among ethnic Armenians as well as among ethnic Russians: they identified themselves as representatives of the nationality to which they belonged because of genetic origin.
The answers given to the next question — »What nationality would you prefer?” — are presented in Table 2. In all groups the subjective classification to their own nationality dominated (the affective component of ethnic identity).

**Table 2. Nationality preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which nationality would you prefer?</th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Armenia</th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Armenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No concrete nationality</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 is the reflection of respondents’ answers to the following questions: “What do you have in common with the people of your nationality?” and “On what grounds can a person’s nationality be determined, in your opinion?”. It means that ethno-integrating qualities, listed by respondents, are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Ethno-integrating qualities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you have in common with the people of your nationality?</th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Armenia</th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Armenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentality (46%) history, culture (29%) religion (7%) other (18%)</td>
<td>mentality (46%) history, culture (33%) religion (8%) other (13%)</td>
<td>native language (29%) history, culture (28%) other (43%)</td>
<td>native language (59%) history, culture (28%) other (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On what grounds can a person’s nationality be determined, in your opinion?</td>
<td>ethnicity (35%) temperament, emotions (23%) language (22%) religion (7%) other (13%)</td>
<td>ethnicity (41%) temperament, emotions (23%) language (23%) religion (8%) other (5%)</td>
<td>language (29%) ethnic origin (27%) model of behavior (15%) other (29%)</td>
<td>language (30%) ethnic origin (29%) model of behavior (15%) other (26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about their reference groups, the majority of respondents (87% of ethnic Armenians and 85% of ethnic Russians) named national heroes, in most cases heroes of the Great Patriotic War, as their reference group.

Use of the «Who am I?» method revealed the categories listed in Table 4. The majority of the respondents, both ethnic Armenians and ethnic Russians, in describing themselves, turned to their social and reflexive selves. The characteristics of their social self were mainly family identity, national and civic identity, educational and professional position.
Table 4. Categories of answers to the question “Who am I?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Who am I?”</th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Armenia</th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Armenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social self</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative self</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material self</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical self</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity self</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective self</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive self</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the Meaning-of-Life Orientations Test were distributed on the five subscales and general level of life orientations. In the analyses of all the groups, the average general level of life orientations dominated. See Table 5.

Table 5. Results of the Meaning-of-Life Orientations Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Armenia</th>
<th>Ethnic Armenians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Russia</th>
<th>Ethnic Russians in Armenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>32.38%</td>
<td>22.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Force, assessment and activity factors were measured in four aspects: real self, ideal self, a typical representative of Armenian nationality, a typical representative of Russian nationality. The results for ethnic Armenians are presented in Table 6. Table 7 presents the results for ethnic Russians.

Table 6. Results for ethnic Armenians in Armenia according to the Personal Semantic Differential method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Real self</th>
<th>Ideal self</th>
<th>Typical representative of Armenian nationality</th>
<th>Typical representative of Russian nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>Low positive</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>Low negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Low positive</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>Average negative</td>
<td>High positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>Average positive</td>
<td>Average positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Results for ethnic Russians in Russia according to the Personal Semantic Differential method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Real self</th>
<th>Ideal self</th>
<th>Typical representative of Armenian nationality</th>
<th>Typical representative of Russian nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Average positive</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>Low positive</td>
<td>High positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>Average positive</td>
<td>Average negative</td>
<td>Low positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Low positive</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>Low positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

We conducted a correlation analysis in order either to confirm or to challenge our hypothesis. We obtained two statistically significant results. First, there was a statistically important link between male and female respondents; Pearson chi-square = 0.869, Sig. = 0.000, indicating a high correlation between these groups. High values of social self — in particular, national-civic identity — as reported by the Armenian and Russian youth when describing themselves, correlated with high and medium levels of general life orientations; Spearman correlation = 0.847, Sig = 0.002. Thus our general hypothesis was confirmed.

Discussion

The data allow us to identify common signs of the personal-semantic aspect of self-understanding of one’s ethnocultural identity both within the studied ethnic group and under different conditions — in the country of origin and in diaspora.

Ethnocultural traditions and value orientations were in the most important position in the personal-semantic aspect of the students’ self-understanding of their ethnocultural identity in diaspora; they are perceived as a way to preserve ethnocultural identity and the reproduction of ethnicity.

The study revealed normative-evaluative features of the self-understanding of ethnocultural identity in the ethnic Armenians in Armenia and in Russia. A comparative analysis of the results allowed us to distinguish the following general features of Armenians’ ethnocultural identity in both groups:

- Extrovert and collectivist features made up the core of the Armenians’ ethnoc normativity, but the listed qualities in the diaspora group were directed primarily at members of their own ethnic community.
- Patriotism was an important part of the ethnocultural ideal in the diaspora group; it was seen simultaneously as ethnic patriotism and as state patriotism, positions that complemented each other.
- Respect for elders was a significant feature of the ethnocultural ideal; it underlay the preservation of the community’s ethnocultural identity.

The studied problem was relevant, as knowledge of the specifics of self-understanding enables prediction of a person’s behavior in interpersonal contacts; a
person’s resource capabilities depend on self-assessment of the adequacy and the degree of personal responsibility in the self-consciousness structure.

Psychological support when violations of a person’s ethnic identity occur would solve a wide range of problems: adaptation, acculturation, interethnic communicative interaction, ethnic tolerance.

Conclusions

Based on analysis of the results of our study, we have formulated the following conclusions:

1. The content of ethnocultural identity is a process of the integration and identification of distribution bases; such a process is caused by a subconscious desire for unity with the environment through integration in the cultural and symbolic sphere.

2. The ethnopsychological and normative-evaluative standards of a specific ethnic group are demonstratively and clearly manifested exactly in its youth, and, especially important for our purposes, the ethnic worldview and self-consciousness of youth contain the greatest potential for further development of ethnopsychological competence through a set of competent and professionally constructed training programs of ethnopsychological competence. Positive ethnic identity with high value indicators is particularly important to create a positive self-image; it assumes a positive attitude toward other ethnic groups.

3. The majority of respondents in the focus groups noted positive emotions in connection with their being Armenian or Russian. However, ethnic Russians in Armenia pointed out the ease of interaction with Russian speakers, regardless of ethnicity, but noted the difficulty of social interaction caused by their insufficient knowledge of the Armenian language.

4. High values of social self — in particular, national-civic identity — as evidenced by Armenian and Russian youth when describing their ethnicity, correlate with high and medium levels of general life orientations.

5. According to the Personal Semantic Differential method, there were no significant differences between the two groups in the factors of force and activity.

6. When describing themselves, the ethnic Armenian youth didn’t use the component of the “past,” which was associated with high levels of anxiety. In our opinion, this is due to the Armenian Genocide, an unexamined trauma.

7. The cognitive and affective components of the national identity of the Armenian and Russian students stipulate the adoption of national heroes as a reference group (for the majority of respondents).

8. Insufficient knowledge of traditions was revealed in the group of ethnic Armenians in Armenia, in contrast with the Armenians in Russia. In some cases, they interpreted some native Armenian traditions and rituals in different ways and maintained, in particular, the tradition of the wedding. Keeping traditions as well as performing rituals was important, rather than
gaining a semantic understanding of these traditions. The overwhelming majority (85%) of the ethnic Armenians in Armenia had knowledge of the history of Armenia at an above-average level, while the ethnic Armenians in Russia had average knowledge of the history (knowledge only of important dates). Gender differences in the two groups of respondents were not found.

9. Because ethnic Armenians and ethnic Russians are in continuous interaction in Armenia and in Russia, there are positive ethnic attitudes in both groups: tolerance for other ethnic groups, solidarity. This interaction enriches the representatives of both ethnic groups at the regulatory value level, making them carriers of both cultures. Complex programs for the development of the ethnic consciousness of youth should be directed not only at self-diagnosis but also at the development of moral values, national and civic identity, patriotism, a sense of belonging and ownership of what is happening in their country and around the world, teamwork, an understanding of the compatibility of interests, and other important ethnopsychological value orientations.

10. The study of the diversity of national identity as a socio-cultural phenomenon is a general humanitarian responsibility at the intersection of philosophy, psychology, and sociology.

Limitations and future research
First, the definition of ethnic identity in this article is the most important indicator of the continuity of self-concept, which is integrated into the social environment. Actualization of a subject’s understanding of certain aspects of identity is related to the demands of the socio-cultural community, which perceives this type of identity as a problem. The direction of future research could include behavior strategies, awareness of personal and social identity, and comprehension of the self in the structure of self-concept in different social contexts in post-Soviet space.

Second, the historical experience is an integral part of national identity, as a sense of complicity in the historical process determines the consciousness of belonging to a nation as a unified community. In the future, our research may include the following aspects: (1) historical experience as a kind of existential experience; (2) historical experience’s role in the formation of national identity and self-understanding (based on the study of Armenian and Russian youth). Such research will make it possible to identify common trends and characteristics of the formation of historical experience as well as its influence on the formation of national identity.
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In the context of a significant increase of mass migration, the modern educational environment acquires the features of multiculturalism and teachers’ readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes becomes a necessary condition for reduction of ethnic tensions and development of intercultural cooperation. Upon that, the formation of constructive intercultural relations requires the development of an ethnic worldview. In particular, readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes and the ethnic worldview are a precondition for the formation of real multiculturalism in interethnic relations. Objective of the research is to determine the intensity of the components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes and ethnic worldview components and to analyze their ratio concerning different subjects of educational processes. The problem of the correlation of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes and ethnic worldview was solved through a survey of 113 pupils, students and future pupils’ parents in the Sverdlovsk region. The exploratory factor analysis was applied to identify and describe the structural components of readiness under study structure and the structural components of the respondents’ ethnic worldview; the degree of intensity of the mentioned components was analyzed by using the criterion $\chi^2$-Pearson. To identify the correlations between the components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes and ethnic worldview, the analysis by the criterion $r$-Pearson was conducted. The structural components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes among pupils, students and parents were empirically described; it is revealed that most of their correlations with the ethnic worldview components are inverse. Readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes is developed among the pupils in components such as empirical, communicative and cognitive; among the future teachers — in relational components; none of the components is expressed among the future pupils’ parents. Multiethnic worldview is developed among the pupils in components such as ethnic
position and interethnic management. Among future teachers, the component of ethnic orientation is developed. Among the parents, it is the ability to go beyond the ethnic frame. The coordination of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes with an ethnic worldview is of a multifaceted nature. The intensity of particular components of the readiness under study (behavioral, empirical, emotional, communicative and cognitive) is associated with a monoeconomic worldview.

**Keywords:** readiness for interaction, the inoethnic subject, multicultural environment, educational process, ethnic worldview

**Introduction**
Currently, the separate existence of peoples and cultures is impossible due to the intensification of migration and demographic processes, the increase in number of ethnically mixed families and the formation of multinational groups in social institutions. In this regard, the issues of ethno-cultural natures become relevant, such as the prevention of ethnic conflicts, tolerance, issues of revival of a national culture and traditions and national characteristics in the process of training and education of the person (Arzamasceva, 2014). People face diversity in the multicultural environment and experience different systems of values, which often leads to misunderstanding and collisions, which in turn can escalate into conflicts. A significant decrease of the negative consequences caused by polyethnicity is feasible on the condition that a person acts as an active carrier of experience in the field of ethno-cultural and interethnic interaction and who is able to accept the peculiarities of specific ethnic groups to find adequate models of behavior to maintain a harmonious atmosphere and mutual trust to reach a high level of cooperation. The knowledge and skills of this kind are acquired not only and not as spontaneously as they are through specially organized activities. Accordingly, the problem of national contradictions and ethnic peculiarities begins to occupy the central place in the sphere of education.

The education system needs to provide consolidation and convergence of federal, regional and national multicultural curricula. In our opinion, multicultural education can be of service to this end (Gukalenko, 2014). A qualified teacher knowledgeable in questions of interaction with representatives of different ethnicities functions as a link in this process. Thanks to the purposeful work of a teacher in the field of ethnic interaction, other subjects’ (parents and students) knowledge in the sphere, as well as their experience, skills and competencies, is actualized and developed.

Along with defining a child (and an adult) as “a person of a different nationality” (“of a different ethnic group”) the term “inoethnic” is used. *Inoethnic people are considered to be those who are perceived as strangers by teachers, pupils and their parents of the titular ethnicity.* A synonym of this term is the word “non-Russian” that apparently also serves for designation of a stranger; for example, a child from the South of Russia can be called “non-Russian”. On the other hand, a Tatar, for example, being formally a representative of another nation, is perceived by a teacher as “Russian” or “not strange”. The term “not strange” in the context of this study refers to a student of the same nationality with the teacher — usually “Russian”; thus, “strange” refers to a child with a different nationality.
Preparation of a teacher for interaction with representatives of a different ethnicity in the framework of traditional education at university is often dissipated in the process of professional pedagogical training, and the specificity of the organization of interaction with children of different nationalities is not emphasized or is considered to be of secondary importance. The future teacher bases interactions with other ethnic groups on his or her personal experiences, regardless of the education he receives. Readiness for interaction with inoethnic people is formed in the course of various disciplines, but these disciplines have no single approach to its formation of readiness for interaction with inoethnic people. As practice shows, the level of ethnocultural education depends on students’ interest in the history of their own culture, opportunities to consider ethnic issues in the global context, on future teachers’ motivation for development and improvement of their personal qualities and on the presence of conditions for self-development of each individual (Fedorova, 2008).

The professional standard of being a teacher clearly defines the mission, functions, competences and responsibilities of a specialist. The teacher’s function of “educational activities” implies the formation of tolerance and behavioral skills in the changing multicultural environment (Federal pedagogical professional standard, 2013). The teacher should be aware of the historical diversity of cultures and civilizations, styles and forms of cultural and social life and the place of national culture in global historical-cultural process. The teacher should also become familiar with the role of ethnic and national factors in evolution of culture and civilization, know the peculiarities of multi-ethnic environment and be able to use the accumulated experience in development of individual creative abilities. Thereby, the issue arises concerning pedagogical university training aimed at preparation of specialists ready to interact with inoethnic subjects in the course of their work (for example, teaching the Russian language in classes with a large proportion of inoethnic children requires specific knowledge and skills) and whether these specialists are able to form and develop the corresponding readiness in other stakeholders in the educational process — pupils and parents.

The aggregate of these skills is called ethno-cultural competence, which assumes that the specialist possesses a volume of knowledge and skills that are not only essential for adaptation to the realities of a multicultural environment but are also sufficient to function in it actively (Poshtareva, 2006). Readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes is viewed by us as one of the indicators pointing to the development of the ethnocultural competence and appears as a holistic integrative quality of a person characterized with a high level of knowledge in the field of social reality, positive emotionally axiological attitude to the characteristics of different cultures and the ability to interact with their particular representatives. This conception corresponds to the traditional point of view on the readiness to act, that emerged in the framework of psychology and pedagogy (Bondarevskaya & Kul’nevich, 1999; Vasil’ev, 1978; D’yachenko & Kandybovich, 1978; Rubinshtein 1957/2012; Strekalova, 2015; Uznadze, 1940/2004).

Fostering readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects involves formation of an attitude of treating the polyethnicity as a global objective and positive reality; formation of a humanist attitude to representatives of different ethnic groups, their history and culture; formation of the system of values and ethical guidelines
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oriented on contacts with representatives of other ethnic groups; acquisition of knowledge of ethnic groups and interethnic relations; fostering respect for the sense of honor of other ethnic groups representatives; tolerance for different views and beliefs; tactful assessment of traditions, customs and rituals of different ethnic groups; development of skills and habits of ethnic interaction; and formation of skills and habits of overcoming the psychological barriers in communication, preventing situations that can cause emotional tensions in interethnic relations and avoiding conflicts (Belinskaya & Stefanenko, 2000).

Readiness for interaction with representatives of a different ethnicity one way or another is connected with individuals’ ethnic worldview. An ethnic worldview or ethnic consciousness conceptualizes the aggregate of all members’ ideas of their own and other ethnic groups including social and psychological attitudes and stereotypes (Stefanenko, 1999/2014). The ethnic worldview demonstrates certain trends in attitudes to one’s own and other ethnic groups. The following trends are identified: ethnic conformity, ethnorelativism, ethnocentrism and ethnic dominance.

Ethnocentrism is a strategy of considering norms and values of one’s own group norms and values as a model when regarding which other cultures are assessed. Ethnorelativism is the realization that all cultures are equal but different. Ethnic dominance is a tendency to subordinate and suppress other cultures. Ethnic conformity means the readiness to submit to the majority, adopting the norms of other cultures (Stefanenko, 2014).

An empirical study involving pupils, students and future pupils’ parents was conducted. The objective of the study was to determine the intensity of the components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes and the components of their ethnic worldview as well as to identify and describe the ratio of the mentioned components concerning different subjects of educational process. The hypothesis of the study was based on the assumptions that 1) readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational process is not formed spontaneously, for its significant prevalence at a high level of development among different subjects of educational process as specially organized conditions for its formation are required; correspondingly, no significant prevalence will be observed if specially organized formation is not provided, and 2) in comparatively mono-ethnic conditions of the region (for example, the northern part of the Sverdlovsk region, where more than 90% of the population is ethnic Russians), formation of a multi-ethnic worldview among different subjects of educational processes is impeded, which is expressed through their ethnic stereotyping, the aspiration to dominate and tendency to ethnocentrism and a poor representation of other ethnic groups in their ethnic worldview.

Method
The research was conducted in the Sverdlovsk region among 11th grade students, preschoolers’ parents and students enrolled in higher education. The research sample included 30 11th grade students, 23 senior preschoolers’ parents and 60 students of teacher training in higher education institutions. The total sample size was 113 participants.
The diagnostics of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes was held through multiple methods, including the following:

1. A proprietary questionnaire, “Readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of the educational process”, which was aimed at studying particular components of such readiness (Valiev & Karimova, 2014). The questionnaire includes 12 questions designed to explore a) the respondents’ awareness of the ethnic groups residing on the territory of the Sverdlovsk region; b) the importance of preparation for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational process and the respondents’ self-assessment of such a readiness; c) the respondents’ experience of such an interaction and feelings arising in this process; and d) the strategies selected by the respondents to cope with inter-ethnic conflicts in the process of interaction (multiculturalism, assimilation or adaptation).

2. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale (as cited in Pochebut, 2007), designed to measure social distance in contacts with other ethnic groups.

3. A Diagnostic test by G. U. Soldatova, which is designed to measure the characteristics of ethnic stereotypes (Soldatova, 1998). The methodic is designed on the basis of the semantic differential method and allows one to assess the emotional-evaluative component of a social stereotype. The stimulus material is a set of 20 pairs of qualities, with poles that differ in connotative (affective) parameters and with semantic meanings that are regarded as similar (for example, the positive pole has the quality “courageous”, and the negative one has the quality “reckless”). The objects of evaluation are the respondent; the “ideal”, a typical representative of the ethnic group the respondent belongs to; and the typical representatives of other ethnic groups involved in the process of inter-ethnic relations. The respondent is to assess a card where four pairs of properties are arranged according to their connotative parameters. In total, there are five cards with eight qualities on each card. When processing the results, the researcher receives the data concerning the orientation of an ethnic stereotype — positive or negative, the emotional certainty/uncertainty and intensity. It is also possible to analyze the information concerning ethnicity and the respondents’ self-esteem and ethnic preferences.

4. The values spectrum method by D. A. Leont’ev shows the degree of value of the objects under study. Two types of school environments, monoethnic and poly-ethnic, were chosen as the objects (Leont’ev, 1999/2007). The method belongs to the category of repertory grids, with the ultimate human needs by Maslow serving as the specified constructs. The respondent is asked to select from a list the ones that, in his or her opinion, are inherent to the object under assessment. The researcher is able to determine the degree of value of the studied objects and their value ranges.

5. A narrative method, allowing to identify the peculiarities of the respondents’ representation of their experiences gained while interacting with inoethnic subjects of educational processes (Kalmykova & Mergenthaler, 1998). The respondent is asked to tell a story about some significant event in his/her life.
In the present study, the respondents told a story about a particular important event in their lives when they interacted in educational processes with children and parents belonging to other ethnic groups. The following processing of the narratives is based on the qualitative analysis of the experience representations manifesting in the story. In the present study, the following parameters for the analysis were developed: 1) types of attitude to inoethnic subjects (negative, neutral or positive); 2) types of the subjects’ interaction in the course of history according to the classification by K. Thomas — cooperation, competition, adaptation, avoidance or compromise (as cited in Grishina, 2000/2008); 3) the inoethnic subject’s nationality in the course of history; 4) the modality of events representation by M. N. Epstein (Jepshtejn, 2001) — the conveyed attitude to the event and actions towards it: existential (contingent, possible, necessary or impossible); cognitive (doubt, supposition or certainty); potential (capacity or need); and 5) the position concerning the event — active (transformation of the circumstances), passive (submission to the circumstances) or contemplative (description of the current circumstances).

To reveal the peculiarities of the education process subjects’ ethnic worldview a modified projective test by S. D. Gurieva was applied (Gurieva & Kinunen, 2007; Valiev, Valieva, Vorob’eva, & Smirnov, 2014). This method is aimed at identifying unconscious tendencies of attitudes towards one’s own and other ethnic groups. According to the original method, the respondent is asked “to settle” any eight nationalities, including the one the respondent identifies himself/herself with, within a circle drawn in the form. Modification of the method consisted in the fact that the respondents were offered a blank A4 sheet of paper where they themselves drew the circle. This modification enabled us to introduce additional indicators for the data analysis. The following indicators are proposed: the breadth of ethnic worldview — representation of various ethnic groups and 2) ethnic tendencies — the predisposition to think, behave and act towards this or that ethnic group in a certain way. We introduced three additional indicators: 1) ethnic space size — the size of the drawn planet, 2) ethnic orientation — the part of the world to which a greater number of nationalities noted by the respondent belongs (Russia, CIS and World) and 3) ethnic worldview configuration — mutual position, proportion of the ethnic groups in the mind. Four types of the configuration were empirically identified — diffusive (disordered arrangement of the ethnic groups without any borders), radial (radial borders proceed from the center of the “planet”, dividing it in different proportions), vertical (the ethnic groups are located top-bottom with the delineation of boundaries between them) and nuclear (the “core” — circle-shaped boundaries of an ethnic group in the center of “the planet” with radial borders of other ethnic groups proceeding from it).

The obtained results were subjected to the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) procedure according to the Principal components method with Varimax rotation in the computer program STATISTICA 6.0. As a result, an eight-factor structure of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes and a five-factor structure of the educational process subjects’ ethnic worldview were obtained.
Results
The obtained factor structure of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects covers 52% of the total variance and includes 43 of the initial 96 variables. The first and second factors of this structure combine the values attributed by the respondents to MonoCSE and MultiCSE (Figure 1).

The first factor includes the indicators of MonoCSE value — the positive pole — and the value of MultiCSE integrity — the negative pole. Thus, one pole demonstrates the importance of ethnic homogeneity of the school environment and the other demonstrates the value of unity of the heterogeneous school environment in its diversity. This allows us to name the first factor as “ethnic homogeneity/diversity of school environment value”. The second factor is unambiguously interpreted as “multi- or mono-ethnic school environment authenticity value” because the corresponding values are situated at the poles of this factor. The third factor on the negative pole contains the variables pointing to the imposed accepting attitude to inoethnic subjects of the educational process, which is the attitude of forced adaptation. At the positive pole are the variables that can be attributed to personal attitudes because they contain doubt, uncertainty and the value of the school environment. This allows us to entitle this factor as “personal or imposed attitude to school environment”. The fourth factor includes positions associated with the activity or passivity in interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes with their assimilation or adaptation; therefore, this factor can be interpreted as “managing or leveling ethnic differences in school environment” because assimilation and adaptation are the corresponding ways to address ethnic differences. The fifth factor can be entitled “presence or absence of experience in interaction with inoethnic subjects in school environment” as these types of variables are displayed on the poles of the factor in question. Variables at the poles of the sixth factor allow us to name it as “positive or negative attitude towards interaction with inoethnic subjects in school environment”. The seventh factor is interpreted as “the closedness-openness in communication with inoethnic subjects in school environment” as multiculturalism implies acknowledgement, acceptance and actualization of the open position in communication on the part of interacting ethnic groups and adaptation; adaptation implies the closed position to a large extent as adaptation is a forced interaction.

The eighth factor is related to the perceptions of differences inherent to ethnic groups and their differentiation. The contemplative position in interaction with inoethnic subjects is the position of research and observation of ethnic differences implying no eagerness to change the differences or impose some manner of behavior on other ethnic group. This seems to be the reason for co-occurrence of this variable with the value indicator of the uniqueness of polyethnic school environment at one of the factor poles. Attribution of the value of uniqueness to the mono-ethnic environment at the opposite pole also reflects differentiation of this environment from others. This factor is entitled “differentiation of the mono- or multiethnic school environment”. Thus, comparing the content of each factor with the structural components of psychological readiness, the following factors were identified (in order): axiological (first and second factors), relational, behavioral, experimental, emotional, communicative and cognitive.
To identify the correlation of the components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes with the peculiarities of the respondents' ethnic worldview, the data were obtained on the basis of the modified methodology “Create a planet” by S. D. Gurieva and was subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The factor structure of the ethnic worldview of educational processes subjects accounts for 50% of the total variance and includes 23 of the initial 35 variables (Figure 2). The obtained factors' content can be interpreted in the same way as it was done in the previous study (Valiev et al., 2014).

The first factor “Ethnic orientation” determines the orientation of a subject towards a closed (the positive pole) or open (the negative pole) ethnic culture. The second factor “Ethnic distance” includes ethnic groups from distant or an immediate ethnic space. The third factor “Ethnic frame — organization of inter-ethnic perception” describes the inability (the positive pole — ethnocentrism) or ability (the negative pole — ethnorelativism) to go beyond the frame of experiences of perception and cognition of other ethnic groups. The fourth factor “Ethnic position” is associated with the peculiarities of ethnic authority and is the model for ethnic development (the positive pole) or ethnic oppression-dominance (the negative pole). The fifth factor “Inter-ethnic management” shows the characteristics of the unipolar or multipolar (diffusive configuration and a large size of the world at the negative pole) ethnic worldview organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Factor poles verifying the level of development of components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects’ of education ethnic worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
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Figure 1. Factor structure of ethnic worldview of subjects of educational space (the solid line — the positive pole of the factor, the dotted line — the negative pole of the factor; the prominent arrows — the prevailing factor loadings). * Factor loading. ** The fraction of variance caused by the factor.
In the first stage, before conducting the subsequent analysis of the data, the pole factors in both factor structures verifying the substantial development of this component were selected (Table 1). Accordingly, the signs of individual factor assessments were changed to reflect the level of development of components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects and the ethnic worldview. Thus, the high level of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in the process of education is shown by such indicators as school environment, ethnic diversity value, school environment authenticity value, personal attitude to the school environment, managing ethnic differences in the school environment, experience of interaction with inoethnic subjects in the school environment, positive attitude to interaction with inoethnic subjects in the school environment, openness of communication with inoethnic subjects in the school environment and differentiation of the multietnic school environment. The highly developed ethnic worldview, i.e., the multietnic one, is demonstrated through such indicators as orientation towards an open ethnic culture, the presence of immediate ethnicities in one’s worldview, ethnorelativism, the ethnic authority/model of development and a multipolar organization of worldview.

Using the transformed individual factor assessments, common trends of representation of the factor-component poles of readiness for interaction with inoethnic
subjects of educational processes and the respondents’ ethnic world view were revealed. Basing on the nature of the factor evaluation, each respondent was assigned to a certain pole of the factor that was denoted through a dichotomous scale. Some respondents were not included in the analysis because their factor evaluation coincided with the average for the factor, i.e., it was equal to zero, and could not be attributed to one or the other pole of the factor. The significance of the deviation of the obtained distribution from the uniform distribution was analyzed for each factor; the criterion $\chi^2$-Pearson was applied (Tables 2–3).

Table 2. Representation of structure of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Factor poles content</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Future teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE* ethnic diversity value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE ethnic homogeneity value</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiethnic SE authenticity value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.565</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monoethnic SE authenticity value</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal attitude to multiethnic SE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.667</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imposed attitude to multiethnic SE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Managing ethnic differences in SE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leveling ethnic differences in SE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Experience of interaction with inoethnic subjects in SE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.174</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of experience of interaction with inoethnic subjects in SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Positive attitude to interaction with inoethnic subjects in SE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative attitude to interaction with inoethnic subjects in SE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Openness of communication with inoethnic subjects in school environment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.348</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closedness of communication with inoethnic subjects in school environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Differentiation of the monoethnic school environment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.348</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiation of the multiethnic school environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SE — school environment.
Table 3. Representation of structure of maturity of respondents’ ethnic worldview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Factor poles content</th>
<th>Students f</th>
<th>Students $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Future teachers f</th>
<th>Future teachers $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Parents f</th>
<th>Parents $\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orientation towards open ethnic culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.174</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.067</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards closed ethnic culture</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presence of immediate ethnicities in worldview</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.909 p=0.088</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.400 p=0.121</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of distant ethnicities in worldview</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ethnorelativism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.130 p=0.144</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.067 p=0.005</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ethnic model of development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.522 p=0.061</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.067 p=0.302</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic dominance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Multipolar world organization</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.522 p=0.061</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.400 p=0.121</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unipolar world organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To consider the nature of the correlation between the studied readiness and ethnic worldview, the respondents’ individual factor scores were subjected to the correlation analysis by $r$-Pearson criterion. Firstly, a correlation analysis was applied to the whole sample independently of the respondents’ experience of participation in educational process (Table 4). Secondly, the correlations were computed for each group separately (Table 5). Both of the tables show significant correlations only.

Table 4. Correlations of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects with ethnic worldview on the whole sampling (n = 113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Worldview components</th>
<th>Components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Axiological**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic orientation</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-ethnic management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq 0.05$. ** Multiethnic school environment authenticity value.
Table 5. Correlations of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects with ethnic worldview in groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic worldview components</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects</th>
<th>Axiological**</th>
<th>Axiological***</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic orientation</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic distance</td>
<td>Future teachers Parents</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>-0.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic frame</td>
<td>Future teachers Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic position</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-ethnic management</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq 0.05$. ** School environment ethnic diversity value. *** Multiethnic school environment authenticity value.

Discussion

Tables 2 and 3 show that the following pole components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes are significantly presented in the group of students: the value of multi-ethnic SE authenticity, the value of experience of interaction with inoethnic subjects in SE, the value of opened communication with inoethnic subjects in SE and the value of differentiation of the multi-ethnic SE. The tendency of orientation towards the closed ethnic culture, i.e., adhering to the cultural identity in interaction with other ethnic groups, prevails in their worldview. The long ethnic distance, ethnocentrism and multipolar worldview are also presented at the level of tendency.

Thus, three of eight components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects of educational processes are most distinct in the group of students: experimental, communicative and cognitive. This supports the fact that the multiethnic school environment is not clearly valued by high-school students; the ambivalence of components, such as emotional, relational and axiological (overall value of SE), is represented among them; however, no locus of the behavioral component is represented. The component “school environment authenticity value” in the studied sample is more often represented at a low level. The orientation towards the closedness of ethnic culture in the students’ ethnic worldview is of use in the explanation of the students’ attitude to a multiethnic school environment that implies rather a formal contact with other ethnic groups with no active personal involvement.

In the future teachers’ group, personal attitudes to multiethnic school environments is significantly represented, and their ethnic worldview is characterized with an orientation towards an open ethnic culture and ethnocentrism. This shows that
future teachers are open to other ethnic groups and perceive them through the prism of their own ethnic norms and rules.

In the parents’ group, leveling of ethnic differences in the school environment and a lack of experience of interactions with inoethnic subjects in educational processes are represented. In the parents’ worldview ethnorelativism statistically prevails. The absence of experience of interactions with inoethnic subjects among the parents can be explained by the fact that during the respondents’ school years the amount of inoethnic subjects in educational institutions was significantly smaller. The pursuit of adaptation of representatives of other ethnic groups (i.e., to change them according to models, norms and rules of one’s own culture), and, at the same time, the realization of the equality of all ethnic groups could suggest that relativism is actualized among the parents in the circumstances of distant contacts and in the pursuit of adaptation (in the circumstances of a close contact). On the basis of the whole sample we can say that different subjects of educational processes present different trends in the prevalence of this or that component of both readiness for interaction with inoethnic representatives and ethnic worldview. The obtained results indicate that the hypothesis was confirmed: in the studied sample, developed readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes does not occur more often than an undeveloped one, and the prevalence of a multiethnic worldview over a monoethnic worldview was not revealed either.

The analysis of correlations obtained for the whole sample (Table 4) shows that seven of the five correlations are inverse correlations. In general, the connection of an ethnic worldview with a readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes in the sample under consideration is not close as all of the obtained correlations in their absolute values are below 0.30. The analysis of correlations in each respondent’s groups (Table 5) showed stronger, moderate or medium correlations. The value of the diversity of the school environment diversity among parents is correlated with ethnic distance in interaction (0.40) and with the ethnic orientation toward the closedness of ethnic culture among students (-0.46). The multiethnic school environment authenticity value is directly correlated with the parents’ abilities to go beyond their own ethnic group experiences in perception and cognition of other ethnicities (0.50). The absence of experience of interactions with inoethnic subjects in educational processes among the parents is interconnected with their long ethnic distance (-0.41), and, among future teachers, it is interconnected with the ethnic frame (-0.37). A positive attitude toward other ethnic groups among future teachers is connected with their long ethnic distance (-0.25). Parents’ multiculturalism in interactions with other ethnicities is correlated with their long ethnic distance (-0.47) and the multipolarity of the ethnic worldview organization (0.45), and, among students, it is correlated with perceiving their own ethnicity as a model for other ethnic groups’ development (0.47). On the whole, the correlations defined in the course of the study demonstrate complexity and variety of the correlation between readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes and a person’s ethnic worldview. The large number of inverse correlations both in the whole sample and in each group separately suggests that ethnic worldview and readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects
in educational processes are correlated on in terms of compensation. More to the point, it should be noted that a correlation between ethnic worldview and the relational component of readiness in this study was represented neither in the whole sample nor in any of the groups. This, from our point of view, is explained by the fact that a given component, as a manifestation of a person's semantic sphere, belongs to a deeper level of the psychic processes than worldview and could be only connected with the latter through other psychic processes, such as emotional or cognitive ones.

Conclusion
The study results allow us to make the following basic conclusions.

Readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes is represented in the following components: axiological, relational, behavioral, experimental, emotional, communicative and cognitive. The distinctness of these components is represented in different ways with different subjects of educational processes. There are more respondents among students with whom experimental, communicative and cognitive components prevail. The relational component prevails among future teachers. The future pupils' parents demonstrate a tendency for experimental and behavioral components of the readiness in question to be weakly distinct.

The ethnic worldview structure also differentiates among subjects of educational processes. Among the 11th grade students there are more respondents with a tendency to a higher level of development of components such as ethnic position and inter-ethnic management. Respondents who are future teachers demonstrate a higher level of development of ethnic orientation. Parents demonstrate the ability to go beyond the ethnic frame.

The correlation of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes with ethnic worldview is of a multifaceted character. At that, a multiethnic worldview is correlated with weak distinctness of certain components of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects in educational processes (behavioral, experimental, emotional, communicative and cognitive components), and, vice versa, a stronger distinctness of these components is correlated with the monoethnic worldview.

The further investigation of readiness for interaction with inoethnic subjects suggest that further work is needed with the instrumentation, the study sampling structure and a series of formative experiments.

Limitations
In the current study, the factor analysis of complex phenomena is actively applied. As is known, this type of statistical analysis is a research method allowing one to define the direction of further investigations by means of other methods. More to the point, the factor analysis results to a great extent are correlated with the researcher's personality and scientific thought. All of this imposes a certain restriction on the results of the study — they are to be considered to be a description of the reality under study at its first approximation.
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The research in question investigates life-purpose orientations and values of various groups of a population living in a multicultural area with a variety of ethnic and religious communities. Members may have different attitudes to one and the same set of values due to their specific cultural traditions and religious guidelines. A common set of life-purpose orientations and values as well as distinctly different ones were identified in the research. It employed an ethno-psychological questionnaire designed specifically to that end and psychometric instruments aimed at identifying the values of the adults of various ethnic identities and religious affiliations. Residents of a multi-cultural area in the south of Russia who belong to different denominations were surveyed. It is stated that there is a substantial difference between the sets of values held by Baptists and Buddhists and representatives of other ethnic and religious groups (Muslims and Christians) participating in this investigation. The survey found that all of the Baptist and Buddhist respondents were described by a high-to-medium level of civil identity. Indifference to ethnic standards and a failure to accept the culture of their own people were found among all of the respondents; it was displayed by a small proportion of Orthodox Christians, whereas all of the Buddhists under investigation had a positive ethnic identity, and a certain proportion of Muslims and Catholics as well as a tiny proportion of Orthodox believers reported that they placed a priority for ethnic rights over human rights. Among all of the denominations surveyed, the majority of respondents surveyed have a positive attitude towards both their own nation and other nations.

Keywords: axiological sphere of the person, life-purpose orientations, values, ethnic identity and religious affiliation, civil identity, strategy
Introduction

The contemporary science of psychology and pedagogy gives careful attention to the study of particular features of the sets of values cherished by various age-, social- and gender groups (Kruteleva & Abakumova, 2013; Kruteleva, Abakumova, & Karaa, 2013). This interest is accounted for by the psychological peculiarity of values as a factor that has an actual effect on the social and psychological climate resulting from some personal interactions. It is possible to assume that “semantic consonance” (viewed as a certain coincidence of semantic preferences) occurs in communities that are fairly homogeneous in terms of their most generalized life-purpose orientations (the way you perceive yourself, your family and people around you, your attitude to professional activity and nationwide values, etc.). The consonance in question harmonizes relations between people who happen to be very different in terms of many other aspects. Conversely, the situation in which people happen to stick to opposing values results in the lack of integration, alienation, and, not infrequently, active behavioral animosity of those who find themselves in the situation of “semantic dissonance” (Abakumova, 2008; Abakumova, Kagermazova, & Savin, 2013). A number of researchers have found that people’s personal characteristics depend on their ethnic identities and religious affiliations. Researchers discovered in southern areas of the Russian Federation that the religious affiliations of people greatly influence their attitudes toward moral values, features of legal awareness and priorities in the realization of life purposes and self-realization (Grimsoltanova, 2013; Kashirina, 2005).

The scientific problem in question is especially vital for modern Russia as a multinational state because the issue of defining the values of a particular culture or deciding on your own ethnicity or religious denomination is subject to both theoretical analysis and practical application, giving an opportunity to identify and sometimes prevent interpersonal conflicts brought about by the discrepancy in the priority given to some values over others (Abakumova, Kagermazova, & Savin, 2013). According to the All-Russian census of 2010, there are currently over 200 ethnic groups in the Russian federation, each with its own particular cultural, ethnic and denominational features. Which of these have the strongest effects on interactions within a multi-cultural society? This is a vexing question for many scientists who do research in the humanities. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that active migration processes have been recently taking place in a number of regions of Russia; these transform the existing traditional relationships between various communities and incur new risks for intercultural interaction. Both actual and potential conflicts encourage scientists to perform empirical diagnostics to bring to light the differences in value scales within ethnic and denominational groups that find themselves in new conditions of life (Abakumova, Grimsoltanova, & Miroshnichenko, 2014; Grimsoltanova, 2013; Rostova, 2012).

Within the framework of this research, we aimed at studying the specific features of life-purpose values of representatives of various ethnic identities and religious affiliations — Muslims (residing in Chechen Republic, Kabardino-Balkarian Republic), Christians (Orthodox, Catholics), Baptists (residing in Rostov region, Krasnodar Territory and Stavropol Territory) and Buddhists (residing in Republic of Kalmykia and Astrakhan Region). The total number of respondents is a group of 625 adults (aged 35–55).
The hypotheses to be examined are as follows: ethnic identities and religious affiliations may condition the individual's world outlook and may prove to be the factor shaping the behavioral mechanisms of interethnic interaction in a multicultural and multi-confessional area; herewith, value scales of different groups of population of various ethnic identity and religious affiliation may affect the psychosocial climate in certain regions of the country.

Method
Two types of instruments were employed to confirm the hypotheses put forward. A survey was conducted, in which answers to the author-devised questionnaire were analyzed by means of content analysis, and psychometric testing was carried out, in which the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) and ”Proverbs” of S.M. Petrova were used. Empirical research was conducted in two stages. At stage 1, the researchers used an established questionnaire containing 13 basic ethnopsychological questions. In terms of its organization, the questionnaire contained a set of general demographic information items (gender, age, full name (should the respondent choose to indicate it); city of residence, occupation, field of work); and a set of questions requesting straightforward answers about priorities in values scales.

At stage 2, the same group of respondents was surveyed with the use of two psychometric instruments.

Results
The findings are as follows: “Life for oneself “is the first priority (34.00%), and the following interpretations are given by way of examples: primary life values are health, cheerfulness, opportunity to achieve self-fulfillment, to become great, to achieve some objective and self-improvement. “Life for others” is the second priority (33.00%): examples are procreation, assistance to fellow creatures, family and children. “Process of life” is the third priority (19.00%): living is a value in itself. “Philosophic and religious approach” is the fourth priority (9.00%): examples are decency and conscientiousness in everything, development of a human according to the laws of nature, productive life and honesty.

Finally, a lack of values was stated by 2.00% of the respondents.

The survey of basic life values among the respondents of various religious affiliations are presented in Table 2.

Of interest were the answers to the question of the person who is the one to mostly influence the formation of values. The results are as follows (Table 3).

Considerable distinctions were discovered in the answers to the question of whether values depend on the person's nationality (Table 4).

The data presented in Table 4 show that it is mainly atheists and Muslims who believe in the national origin of value scales. There are much lower percentages of those who hold the same view among people of other denominations, whereas Baptists maintain that “Thorough understanding of true life values does not depend on either the person’s nationality or their gender”.
Table 1. Findings of ethnopsychological empirical research of the respondents (N=625)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Typical associations</th>
<th>Example of interpretation</th>
<th>% of respondents who chose the stated answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Life for oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Biological phenomenon</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Self-improvement</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Opportunity to achieve self-fulfillment, to become great, to achieve some objectives</td>
<td>9.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Life for others</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Sacrifice</td>
<td>Assistance to fellow creatures</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procreation</td>
<td>Producing offspring</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Your own flesh and blood</td>
<td>Your family</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Process of life</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Process of living</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Social role</td>
<td>Change of roles: daughter, wife, mother, grandmother</td>
<td>6.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional experience</td>
<td>Love, happiness</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philosophic and religious approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Religious interpretation</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Philosophic interpretation</td>
<td>Development of a human according to the laws of nature</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Aspiration for ideals</td>
<td>Decency and conscientiousness in everything</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The respondent fails to identify his or her primary life values</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question of whether values depend on a certain religious affiliation was answered in the following way (Table 5).

Buddhists, atheists and Orthodox Christians believe that person’s values are independent of religious creed, whereas Baptists are unanimous in the opposite opinion. Muslims and Catholics, on the other hand, hold the view that it is possible and most probable that your religious affiliation is crucial for your choice of life values.

At stage 2, the Rokeach Value Survey interpretation was used to interpret and define the essential aspect of the person’s orientation; the basis for the person’s attitude towards the world around him or her, other people, and oneself; the basis of the world outlook and the core of activity motivation; and the concept of life. One
Table 2. The survey of basic life values among the respondents of various religious affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of answers</th>
<th>% of respondents who chose the stated answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Orthodox Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for oneself</td>
<td>39.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for others</td>
<td>37.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of life</td>
<td>17.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophic and religious approach</td>
<td>4.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of life values</td>
<td>2.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for oneself</td>
<td>25.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for others</td>
<td>10.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of life</td>
<td>30.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophic and religious approach</td>
<td>35.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of life values</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Catholics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for oneself</td>
<td>30.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for others</td>
<td>20.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of life</td>
<td>30.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophic and religious approach</td>
<td>10.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of life values</td>
<td>10.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Baptists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for oneself</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for others</td>
<td>10.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of life</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophic and religious approach</td>
<td>90 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of life values</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Atheists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for oneself</td>
<td>58.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for others</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of life</td>
<td>42.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophic and religious approach</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of life values</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Buddhists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for oneself</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life for others</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of life</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophic and religious approach</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of life values</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
part of the Rokeach Value Survey focuses on ideals, individual’s values at the level of beliefs and the structure of values, while the other part studies values at the level of behavior; individual priorities that are displayed is the social medium.

Despite the differences in ethnic identity and religious affiliation, the basic life values and priorities were found to be the same for all people. For Orthodox Christians, Catholics, Muslims, Buddhists, Baptists and atheists, a happy family life is of highest value. Mental and physical health is also listed among the top 5 life priorities. Buddhists may be treated as the only exception here, as they treat cognition as the most important value, whereas for other groups of respondents, it is not so valuable.

Age and gender differences were either insignificant or not identified at all.

**Table 3. Parental and life experience influence on formation the values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Parents’ example</th>
<th>Personal life experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Orthodox Christian</td>
<td>57.5 %</td>
<td>42.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>85 %</td>
<td>15.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Catholic</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>40.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Atheist</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>72.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Buddhist</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. The influence of the person’s nationality on the choice of life values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Orthodox Christian</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
<td>89.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>90 %</td>
<td>10.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Catholic</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>70.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Baptist</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Atheist</td>
<td>85 %</td>
<td>15.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Buddhist</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>66.00 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. The choice of life values and its dependence on religious affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Perhaps</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Orthodox Christian</td>
<td>93.50 %</td>
<td>5.50 %</td>
<td>1.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>85.00 %</td>
<td>15.00 %</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Catholic</td>
<td>70.00 %</td>
<td>30.00 %</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Baptist</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Atheist</td>
<td>43.00 %</td>
<td>28.50 %</td>
<td>28.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Buddhist</td>
<td>33.30 %</td>
<td>33.30 %</td>
<td>33.40 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, the data collected by means of the Rokeach Value Survey make it possible to conclude that there are certain universal human values that are important for all people, irrespective of their age, gender, ethnic identity and religious affiliation.

The second part of the psychometric diagnostics employed the “Proverbs” instrument of S.M. Petrova, which measures the morality of the individual and helps to find out the individual features of value judgements concerning life, people and one’s own self. This instrument complements the Rokeach Value Survey and is helpful in interpreting the content of the values viewed by the individual as priorities.

The text of the instrument includes 30 pairs of value judgements concerning life, people, and oneself, which are expressed in Petrova’s proverbs and which contradict one another. The value judgements concerning life, people, and oneself are specified in individual proverbs, and the subsequent analysis of the data arrived at makes it possible to measure the morality of the individual (Petrova, 2003).

Data on the denominational differences which were discovered when applying the above instrument are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. The levels of morality among the respondents of different denominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>High level</th>
<th>Middle level</th>
<th>Low level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Orthodox Christian</td>
<td>67.00 %</td>
<td>22.50 %</td>
<td>10.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>50.00 %</td>
<td>30.00 %</td>
<td>20.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Catholic</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td>20.00 %</td>
<td>20.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Baptist</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td>40.00 %</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Atheist</td>
<td>42.80 %</td>
<td>42.80 %</td>
<td>14.40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Buddhist</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the Buddhist and Baptist respondents have a high level of morality as the average level of morality, whereas respondents from other groups display levels of morality coincident with the all-Russian data, most of them showing a high level of morality. Analysis according to the respondents’ ethnic identity and religious affiliation did not discover any significant differences, with the exception of the Baptist and Buddhist groups.

**Conclusion**

The research in question showed that the interpretation of life values may depend on the individual’s ethnic identity and religious affiliation. Most persistent life values determine the individual's typical behavior and certain aspects of interpersonal communication. Thus, the group of Orthodox Christians expressed the highest preference for two life values (or strategies) — life for oneself and life for others. The philosophic and religious interpretations of what is of high value for the individual are the primary life values for Muslims. Catholics view life for oneself and the process of life as their main life strategies. Most of the Baptists claim that their
life strategy is to serve God and supreme forces. Most of the atheists view life for oneself as their major life strategy. All of the Buddhist respondents believe that the meaning of existence lies in the process of living.

The value judgements of the groups of Baptists and Buddhists in question differ significantly from those of other ethnic-religious groups surveyed. All of the Baptists and Buddhist respondents have high and average levels of civil identity. A small proportion of Orthodox Christians, among all of the respondents, displayed indifference towards ethnic standards as well as non-acceptance of the culture of their people; all of the Buddhists have a positive ethnic identity; some of the Muslims, Catholics and a few Orthodox Christians recognize the priority of ethnic rights over human rights. The greater proportion of respondents among the groups of different ethnic identities and religious affiliations display positive attitudes regarding their own nation, which goes together with the positive attitude toward other nations. Thus, the empirical research completely confirms the hypotheses put forward.
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This article examines the exposure of Russian public to reports about ethnic groups in current mainstream Russian media by analyzing the amount of such reports today, as well as results of an online survey (n = 1040) aimed at revealing to what extent the public is indeed exposed to them by the respondents’ own estimations. The survey showed that generally users tend to lack information about ethnicities in mainstream media and demonstrate a certain interest in learning more about other ethnic groups in Russia through media channels. We argue thus that the public’s exposure to information about ethnic issues, although relatively high on a quantitative level (i.e., in terms of the actual number of reports), is lower on a qualitative one (i.e., the share of the respondents who actually come across such reports). The paper also reveals a number of tendencies from analyzing users’ age groups and their regions of living. In general, we believe that singling out both specifics of the public’s exposure to information about ethnicities and the connection between this exposure and the public’s attitudes toward ethnicities (which is planned as the second stage of the current research project) may contribute to better understanding of the effects media can have on their audience in terms of agenda-setting and psychological influence. The current research can also be of interest when discussing the role mass media play in building harmonious relationships between representatives of different ethnic groups in a multiethnic society such as the Russian one.
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Introduction

In a multiethnic and multicultural Russian society, the problem of strengthening relationships between representatives of different ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups is becoming extremely important today. As the national census of 2010 showed, there are currently more than 190 ethnic groups speaking over 170 lan-
guages\textsuperscript{1} in the territory of the Russian Federation. It is not surprising that the differences in mentality, culture, traditions, norms, and values of these groups may influence the way people perceive each other and communicate with each other, sometimes making it difficult for representatives of one ethnic group to understand those belonging to another one, and to get along well with them. However, it is quite clear that the differences in mentality, language, and culture are not the only factors affecting intercultural and interethnic communication in such an ethnically diverse society. Numerous studies by ethnologists, psychologists, sociologists, and media and cultural scholars — both domestic and international — have looked into a multitude of other factors that can affect relationships between different ethnic groups in a multicultural Russian society.

If we try to classify these studies roughly into several big thematic blocks, we identify the following clusters:

- studies discussing the role of stereotypes in interethnic conflicts and miscommunication across nations (Verevkin, 2009; Minyar-Belorucheva & Pokrovskaya, 2012; Mishlanova & Sirotkina, 2013; Malkova, 2007; Gladkova, 2013b, 2015; Petrova et al., 2014; Contini, 2013; Elchardus & Spruyt, 2014; Loennqvist et al., 2014; Ivanic, Bates & Somasundaram, 2014, and others)
- studies focusing on issues of in-group and out-group trust and the impact of trust and other psychological phenomena upon interethnic relations (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Abanes, Scheepers & Sterkens, 2014; Gundelach, 2014; Bahry et al., 2005; Allwood, Traum & Jokinen, 2000, and others)
- studies identifying social prerequisites for interethnic confrontation, such as the degree of diversity in the society (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Gladkova, 2013a; Matsaganis, Katz & Ball-Rokeach, 2011; Vartanova, 2005, 2012) and the role of social categorization in provoking conflicts and misunderstanding (Ufkes et al., 2012)
- studies examining personal characteristics and their role in multicultural communication, including respondents’ pride in belonging to a certain ethnic group and its influence upon their tolerance toward other ethnic formations (Ward et al., 2006), as well as individuals’ level of education, income, and gender and age characteristics, etc.;
- studies discussing issues of migration and the lack of sense of belonging among migrants as a potential risk factor in a multiethnic society (Osin & Konstantinov, 2014; Bazhenova et al., 2015);
- studies analyzing the role of language and linguistic means, including hate speech, in affecting attitudes toward ethnic groups (Shulumba, 2013; Malkova, 2007).

This list is certainly missing other factors that can possibly influence relationships between different ethnic groups too, since listing all of them would be a lengthy process and require a separate study.

\textsuperscript{1} http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm
What we consider to be important to discuss, and what is not always mentioned when it comes to examining interethnic relationships, is the role of mass media in interethnic communication. An interesting question to discuss in this respect is whether mass media have any impact upon people’s attitude to ethnic groups different from their own, and if so, how this attitude is created. In our view, this question becomes particularly important in a multiethnic and multicultural society, such as the Russian one, where peaceful co-existence between people belonging to different ethnic groups is not always the case.

As statistical data show, the number of conflicts on ethnic grounds in modern Russia is high: according to the Center for National Conflict Studies, in the period of September, 2013 through March, 2014, there arose 570 conflicts between representatives of different ethnic groups, including both open clashes, such as disturbances in Pugachevo (July 2013) or in Western Birulevo in Moscow (October, 2013), and so-called “distant way” conflicts, which did not necessarily involve actual confrontation in reality but could start in online environments (social media, forums, online chats, etc.) and later on turn into clashes in offline space too. This makes the discussion about factors affecting interethnic relations in Russia (mentality, language, the level of in-group and out-group trust, personal characteristics, social prerequisites, and other aforementioned factors, as well as possibly mass media) particularly up to date.

Previous researchers in this field showed that mass media tend to play a significant role in forming people’s attitude toward other ethnicities, conveying values and messages that people may absorb unintentionally (Robert & Lichter, 1988). Situations when ethnic minorities are underrepresented in media or portrayed in a biased and stereotypical way (Williamson & DeSouza, 2006; Asamen et al., 2008; Schemer, 2014) may contribute to creating a negative attitude toward other ethnicities too.

These suggestions are supported by fundamental theories, namely agenda-setting and framing ones. According to the agenda-setting theory elaborated in the late 1960s and early 1970s by Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L. Shaw (McCombs & Shaw, 1972), there exists a link between what is regularly reported by the media and what people, as consumers of such information, consider important and worth paying attention to. As was later discussed, the media are able to set the agenda, not only in relation to a variety of processes happening at some point (ranking them in order of importance) but also with regard to a specific event or person (in our case, ethnic groups). Obviously, while informing the public of certain facts or phenomena, media cannot provide the public with all the information available (because of limitations in the amount of space in newspapers, or TV and radio time). Instead, they tend to focus the public’s attention only on specific aspects or attributes of the material that are most important, in the media’s opinion (Weaver, McCombs & Shaw. 2004; Kazakov, 2014). As a result, a kind of agenda — but in relation to the characteristics of a single object — is built.

Another theory in many ways similar to agenda-setting is framing. It is widely believed now that framing is the process of selecting which aspects of reality jour-
nalists display, making them more salient in order to formulate certain causal connections, moral interpretations, and recommendations on how to act in relation to a particular situation (Entman, 1993; Scheufele, 2004). Thus it is believed that by drawing the public’s attention to specific aspects of the event or the phenomenon, i.e., creating so-called frames, the media significantly determine how readers, viewers, or listeners treat it.

If we assume that media play a significant role in creating people’s attitudes toward multiple phenomena in real life through setting agendas and creating frames, an interesting question to discuss would be whether regular exposure to particular phenomena in media would influence the public’s attitude toward these phenomena. According to the contact theory elaborated by Gordon W. Allport (1979), regular exposure to people of different backgrounds and ethnicities can lead to less prejudice. Keeping in mind an important role played by the media, we believe that regular exposure to people with different backgrounds and belonging to different ethnic and cultural groupings through media channels (TV and radio programs, publications in newspapers and magazines, as well as the Internet) is likely not only to create the public’s agenda in general but also to influence this agenda in a positive or negative way (Malkova, 2007; Makeenko, 2007; Dunas, 2011; Obraztsova, 2014; Gureeva, 2015).

It should be noted that the idea of correlation between media exposure and the public’s attitudes and even patterns of behavior has received extensive coverage in the academic literature so far, particularly in multiple studies by psychologists analyzing the correlation between media violence and aggressive behavior (Séguin & Klimek, 2015; Krahé & Busching, 2015, and others). In this research project, which we started in 2015, we would like to elaborate on this idea, looking into correlation of the public’s exposure to ethnic groups through media channels and the public’s attitudes toward these groups (if any). The first thing that we will focus on is an examination of the level of exposure to reports about ethnic groups in mainstream Russian media. In this paper we are going to test the hypothesis that the public’s exposure to reports about ethnic groups in mainstream Russian media is relatively high today. While doing that, we will focus on the following key research questions:

(a) whether the public’s exposure to such reports is higher on a quantitative or qualitative level, or whether it remains the same on both levels (quantitative level meaning the number of ethnic media and reports on this topic in mainstream Russian media1, and qualitative level meaning real exposure of the public to such reports, according to the respondents’ own estimations); and

(b) whether the public’s exposure to such reports depends on their age groups and regions of living.

As mentioned earlier, this paper focuses mainly on the primary stage of the research we conducted and examines whether Russians are currently exposed to reports about ethnic groups in mainstream media in general or not. During the

1 http://club-rf.ru/thegrapesofwrath/01/
second stage of this research project, which is still underway, we will look into the
nature of these reports more specifically and will try to define in what way media
can influence one's attitude toward ethnic groups; we will discuss the following:

(a) the particular characteristics of the reports, including their tone (positive,
negative, neutral), themes, genres, choice of words (including hate speech),
style, illustrations (if any), choice of heroes, length, etc.;
(b) the impact reports of different kinds have on the public, as estimated by the
public itself (for example, whether interviews with representatives of ethnic
groups are likely to have bigger effect on the public than a journalistic es-
say; whether the use of hate speech and words with negative connotations
can create a negative feeling toward the people described, etc.).

When both stages are complete, we expect to find out the following:

(a) whether Russians are generally exposed to reports about ethnic groups in
mainstream media today, and how great this exposure is; and
(b) whether the public's attitudes (positive, mostly positive, neutral, mostly
negative, negative) toward particular ethnicities depend on the media they
are exposed to, as well as the periodicity and nature of this exposure.

The current paper, as outlined earlier, focuses on research objective (a) mainly,
while (b) will be discussed in further studies. All in all, we believe that the analysis
of the dependency of the public's attitudes toward phenomena covered by the me-
dia on the level of their exposure to media can contribute to further understanding
of the agenda-setting, framing, and contact theories, as well as the analysis of psy-
chological effects media can have on the public.

Method

The key methods we used at this stage of the research was the analysis of the number
of reports about ethnic issues in Russian mainstream media today, and the online
survey\(^1\) aimed at revealing the public's exposure to reports about ethnic groups in
the media, as estimated by the public itself. The chosen methods were expected
to help us measure media exposure using the measurement factors suggested by
Paul Freedman and Ken Goldstein (1999): the frequency with which information
is aired in a particular media market and the quantity of information consuming
by a particular respondent.

To start with, we looked into the number of reports about ethnic issues in vari-
ous Russian-language mainstream media in the spring and summer of 2015; the
data are freely available in governmental reports (see, for example, Informatsionno-
analiticheskie materialy k sovmestnomu zasedaniu Soveta pri Prezidente Rossiiskoi
Federatsii po mezhnatsionalnym otnosheniyam i Soveta pri Prezidente Rossiiskoi
Federatsii po russkomu yazyku, 2015) or previous quantitative studies conducted by
domestic scholars (see, for example, Malkova, 2007; Gladkova, 2015). We believe
that these data would allow us to first draw very sketchy conclusions about the

\(^1\) The advantages and disadvantages of this method will be discussed in the Limitations section
accessibility of information about interethnic relations on a broad scale, and consequently the public's exposure to this information. A simple guess would be the following: the bigger amount of such media, the higher the public's exposure to it. However, we think that the raw number of media outlets, reports outlining ethnic problems, or circulation of media outlets cannot fully reflect the public's exposure to media content, since often people do not consume particular information, even when they have free access to it (because of a lack of interest in this topic, for instance, or other reasons).

That is why we conducted an online survey aimed at revealing how many people are in fact exposed to reports about ethnic issues in current Russian media, by their own estimations. The key criteria for analysis were as follows:

(a) the frequency with which readers or viewers come across information about ethnic groups in mainstream Russian media (very often, often, from time to time, seldom, never, not sure);
(b) the quantity of information received there (i.e., if persons would prefer to see much more information, the same amount, less, or much less (or not sure) on this topic in media);
(c) their basic interest in learning more about ethnic groups through mainstream media (i.e., if persons come across these reports in the media, they will most be likely, probably likely, probably not likely, or unlikely (or not sure) to study them);
(d) the specification of the public's interests (on what topic(s) reports would most likely attract the public's attention: ethnic groups' customs and traditions, history, language, religious faiths, values, and moral codes, or other);
(e) the primary sources of information about ethnic groups (print media, TV and radio programs, the Internet, friends, educational institutions (school, university), etc.), as well as some other factors.

The survey was placed on an open-access platform with daily announcements on two websites of Mail.ru Group company: News@Mail.ru (a news website) and Afisha@Mail.ru (an entertainment website) in the spring and summer of 2015. It should be noted that Mail.ru is one of the biggest portals of Runet (the Russian Internet). The users of this portal constitute 56.1% of the total number of Runet users, and the portal itself takes the first place among the top 20 desktop Internet websites, according to TNS. It is also the biggest portal (30.1 million persons and 28.5%) by number of average daily visitors.

The total number of respondents we examined was 1040. The sampling is representative for both key groups under analysis: age groups (under 24: 250 persons, 25–44: 470, 45–64: 280, and over 65: 40) and groups according to their region of living (Moscow: 100 persons, St. Petersburg: 40, cities with a population over 1 million: 110, those with populations of 500,000–1 million: 80, those between 250,000 and 500,000: 230, those under 250,000, including villages: 480). We chose stratified sampling while conducting the research, using data on the so-

1 http://screencast.com/t/ZkQb7DqP
Sociodemographic characteristics of Russian Internet users provided by the Public Opinion Fund\(^1\) and TNS\(^2\). Let us note that the sample is limited to two criteria (age and region of living) only due to the availability of data about Internet users’ sociodemographic characteristics and the attempt to find out whether there exists any connection between respondents’ age, their region of living, and media exposure. When making a statistical analysis of the results, Pearson’s chi-square test with Yates’s correction was used. Differences were considered significant when \(P < 0.05\).

**Results**

To start with, we found that the number of media outlets devoted to the life of Russian ethnic groups is rather large: there are 692 ethnic media outlets officially registered in the territory of the Russian Federation today; they cover various aspects of the culture, traditions, history, etc. of these groups (Informatsionno-analiticheskie materialy k sovmestnomu zasedaniu Soveta pri Prezidente Rossiiskoi Federatsii po mezhnatsionalnym otnosheniyam i Soveta pri Prezidente Rossiiskoi Federatsii po russkomu yazyku, 2015). The majority of these media are in the languages of the largest ethnic groups\(^3\): Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash, and others. As previous studies show, though, many of these media — particularly print and audiovisual — are produced in several languages, often in the language of the particular ethnic group and in the Russian language (Gilmanova, 2013), which makes them available to both ethnic communities and a broad Russian-speaking audience. Many of them are also distributed on a federal level and/or have online versions, which also contributes to their broad availability to readers (Gladkova, 2015). The number of reports devoted to ethnic issues and interethnic relations in federal Russian-language media is quite high too. As a content analysis carried out by Malkova (2007) and other scholars proves, all-Russian newspapers, for example, Moskovsky Komsomolets, Komsomolskaya Pravda, and Rossiiskaya Gazeta, as well as many federal TV and radio stations (Perviy Kanal, Rossiya 1, Radio Rossi, etc.) aimed at a broad audience pay a good deal of attention to ethnic issues, coverage of ethnic conflicts, stereotypes regarding various ethnicities, etc.

It should be added that the Russian government has undertaken a number of successful steps to make media about ethnic communities and in languages other than Russian available to a broad audience, as well as developing a sensible attitude toward coverage of ethnicities in the media. In this respect, it should be mentioned that it signed the European Charter for Regional or Minorities Languages in 2001; started a joint program of the Council of Europe, the Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, and the European Commission’s “Minorities in Russia: Developing Languages, Culture, Media and Civil Society” in 2009; and opened various institutions, such as the Moscow House of Nationalities, Guild of Interethnic Journalism, Presidential Council for Interethnic Relations in Russia,
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and others (Gladkova, 2015). The significant impact mass media can have upon setting an agenda regarding interethnic relations for media consumers was also emphasized in the code of ethics for Russian journalists covering ethnic issues1, promulgated in 2013. The code draws attention to journalists’ responsibility for transmitting incorrect and stereotypical images of ethnicities, as well as provoking ethnic conflicts through reports the public is exposed to.

The aforementioned data, although presented very briefly, show that Russian public generally has a wide access to a variety of reports about ethnic issues in current media. An interesting question to discuss in this respect would be whether Russian public is indeed exposed to these reports, judging by their own estimations.

Let us try to answer this question using the data collected during the survey. First, the majority of the respondents stated that they come across information about ethnic groups in Russian mainstream media from time to time (58.08%), while the second biggest group is those who declared that they see such reports seldom (23.06%). The answers to this question did not depend at all on respondents’ age ($X^2 = 12.18$, degrees of freedom $= 6$, $P = 0.07$), but rather on the regions they live in ($X^2 = 38.52$, degrees of freedom $= 9$, $P < 0.01$); in general, users living in big cities, including Moscow, St. Petersburg, those with a population over 1 million, and those between 500,000 and 1 million tended to come across this information more often than those living in smaller cities.

Second, the analysis showed that the majority of respondents would prefer to receive more information about ethnic groups through mainstream media than they currently do. In total, 590 persons (56.35%) chose “more” or “much more” for this question, while 252 persons (24.07%) would rather receive less information on this topic than they do now. Having analyzed answers according to the criteria “region of living” and “age,” we found similarity in all subgroups under discussion. Basically, regardless the region of living and age group, the number of respondents who would prefer to receive more information on ethnic groups is, on average, one or two times higher than the number of those who would rather receive less information on this topic. We failed to find any dependency of respondents’ answers to this question on their region of living ($X^2 = 13.05$, degrees of freedom $= 10$, $P = 0.22$) or age ($X^2 = 11.84$, degrees of freedom $= 6$, $P = 0.06$).

Third, respondents’ basic interest in learning more about ethnic communities through media channels does not depend at all on the regions of living ($X^2 = 7.77$, degrees of freedom $= 15$, $P = 0.93$). In each region, the number of respondents who would most likely or likely study this information was six or seven times bigger than those who would be unlikely do that, and three times bigger than the number of those who answered “probably.” At the same time, the answers to this question depended on respondents’ age ($X^2 = 36.53$, degrees of freedom $= 9$, $P < 0.01$). Thus, users belonging to the 25–44 and 45–64 age groups showed greater interest in reports about ethnic formations (62% and 71% of respondents, respectively), while in the under-24 and over-65 groups, the number of those who were interested in receiving such news was lower: 45% and 57%, respectively.

1 http://nazaccent.ru/about/eticheskij-kodeks/
Fourth, we tried to find out what kind of information about ethnic groups would most likely attract the public’s attention. We found out that the majority of survey participants are interested in more than one aspect of other ethnic groups’ lives: the total number of such respondents was 571 persons (54.54%), while the number of those who chose only one aspect was considerably lower: 341 (32.57%). Among those who chose only one, the majority showed interest in the history of ethnic groups (171 persons; 16.33%). The second most popular answer turned out to be customs and traditions (80 persons; 7.64%), and the third was values and moral codes (57 persons; 5.44%). The respondents’ interest in the history of Russian peoples is stably high regardless their region of living and age. Examining all possible answer combinations to this question is hardly possible in a short article like this one, but the history of Russian peoples was the most popular answer among those who chose several aspects too.

Lastly, we looked into the sources of information about ethnic groups that are most often used by survey participants. Suggested answers included print media, TV and radio programs, the Internet, friends, educational institutions (school, university), and “other.” One can easily notice that the first three answers reflected the main spectrum of mass media (print, audiovisual, online), while the others were predominantly based on communication with other people (friends, colleagues, teachers, etc.). In such a way, the analysis of obtained results was meant to determine the main sources of information (mass media or external contacts with other people) that the survey participants used when receiving information about ethnic groups. As we found out, in most cases respondents preferred to get information about ethnic groups from the Internet (450 persons; 42.98%). TV and radio programs was the second most popular answer (404 persons; 38.59%). We did not find any dependency of the answers to the question on the respondents’ region of living ($X^2 = 24.70$, degrees of freedom $= 25$, $P = 0.48$). At the same time, it should be noted that respondents under 45 years old more often get this information from the Internet, while respondents over 45 years old choose audiovisual mass media (TV and radio programs) for this purpose. Print media are also more often used by respondents of older age: 33 persons (3.15%) in the 45–64 age group received information about ethnic groups from print media, while in the 25–44 age group this type of media was chosen by 18 persons (1.72%) only. Therefore, we can conclude that survey participants’ belonging to a certain age group influenced their answers to this question ($X^2 = 26.18$, degrees of freedom $= 15$, $P = 0.03$).

**Conclusion**

The study revealed that although the number of ethnic media, as well as the number of reports devoted to ethnic issues in mainstream media in modern Russia, is considerably high\(^1\), the public claims that it does not come across such information in media outlets often. The majority of survey participants showed interest in learning

---

\(^1\) When stating this, we rely on the statistical data retrieved from open online and offline sources, as well as empirical analyses previously carried out by other domestic and international scholars, and not the current research.
more about ethnic groups through media channels, often choosing more than one aspects of their life they would be potentially interested in (with the history of ethnic groups being the most popular answer). If we look at the dependency of respondents’ answers to the questionnaire on their age, region of living, we notice the following — generally quite predictable — trends: (a) respondents belonging to the 25–44 and 45–64 age groups showed greater interest in reports about ethnic issues than those who are considerably younger or older; (b) respondents under 45 years old more often get information on this topic from the Internet, while the respondents over 45 years old usually choose audiovisual mass media (TV and radio programs) for this purpose; (c) print media as a source of information about ethnic groups are more often used by older people. All in all, though, we failed to find any outstanding dependency trends between the aforementioned criteria and respondents’ answers.

We may conclude that the public’s exposure to reports about ethnic issues in mainstream media is currently rather high on a quantitative level (if we mean by quantitative level the number of ethnic media and reports on this topic in current mainstream media¹), but it is lower on a qualitative one (by qualitative level we mean actual exposure to such reports, according to the respondents’ own estimations). This fact makes the second stage of our research — revealing and discussing the impact such reports can and probably do have — on Russian public more interesting and acute.

In general, we believe that singling out both specifics of the public’s exposure to information about ethnicities and the connection between this exposure and the public’s attitudes toward ethnicities may be of interest when forming a strategy for the development and promotion of ethnic media in the Russian media market, as well as when considering a general strategy for building harmonious relationships between representatives of different ethnic groups of Russia and discussing the role mass media can play in these relationships.

Moreover, studies of the public’s exposure to reports on ethnic topics can contribute to further elaboration of the agenda-setting, framing, and contact theories, revealing the positive and negative effects media can have on people, depending on the regularity of such exposure and the type of reports people are exposed to; the possible connection between personal characteristics such as age and region of living and the degree of the media’s impact; the role of the media in creating attitudes toward other ethnicities in a multicultural society; and much more. As previous studies of both psychologists and media scholars (Robert & Lichter, 1988; Williamson & DeSouza, 2006; Asamen et al., 2008; Schemer, 2014, etc.) showed, people — especially young people — often consider mass media to be a reliable source of information and an accurate reflection of real life (Robert & Lichter, 1988). In this case, the responsibility of mass media for transmitting unbiased images of different ethnicities, particularly in a multiethnic society such as the Russian one, grows significantly — both in terms of building harmonious interethnic

¹ When stating this, we rely on the statistical data retrieved from open online and offline sources, as well as empirical analyses previously carried out by other domestic and international scholars, and not the current research.
relations in the country in general and preventing conflicts happening on ethnic
grounds. This said, the analysis of the public’s access to reports about ethnic groups
in mainstream media can help not only evaluate the general accessibility of such
information for broad audiences using quantitative and qualitative parameters sug-
gested in the current research (which can be of value, for instance, when discussing
the popularity of such media and ways to develop them in the future) but also to
understand the effects (psychological, cultural, moral, etc.) of reports about ethnic
topics on people in a multiethnic society.

Limitations
When considering the results of this study, one should keep in mind that an online
survey, although an easy, fast, and cost-efficient method of collecting data, has cer-
tain drawbacks, including, for example, a limited sampling and the remote way of
conducting the survey. It is clear that certain groups of people are less likely to have
Internet access and to respond to online questionnaires, which limits the sampling
to those people who have Internet access and the digital skills to use it. A lack of a
trained interviewer to clarify questions if needed can also possibly lead to less reli-
able data. Last but not least is that respondents may not feel encouraged to provide
accurate, honest answers, and they may not feel comfortable providing answers
that present themselves in an unfavorable manner either.
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This article is devoted to current issues of labor migrants’ adaptation. The research is based on questioning 210 labor migrants from Uzbekistan aged 17 to 49, at present living in Saint Petersburg. It should be mentioned that Uzbekistan labor migrants constitute a considerable part of the entire labor-migrant flow to Russia, Saint Petersburg, in particular.

The research targets the analysis of personal characteristics contributing to effective adaptation by labor migrants. The research contains an analysis of the system of personality “T”-structures interrelation, their constructive, destructive, and deficient components as well as the analysis of life-meaning guidelines and the system of migrants’ family and interpersonal relationships. The outcomes obtained make it possible to examine labor migrants’ unique personality characteristics, depending on their attitude toward whether to stay in Russia or return to Uzbekistan, as well as to provide an analysis of migrants’ mental health or psychological well-being and to forecast the effectiveness of migrants’ adaptation. Two groups of labor migrants — those intending to stay in Russia and those wishing to return to Uzbekistan — differ in a number of indicators. The forecast of mental health or psychological well-being of labor migrants intending to stay in Russia is more favorable. A rather high personal level of mental health and adaptation resources are based on a strong potential of activity, ability to achieve definite goals, and capacity to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships. The outcomes of migrants wishing to return to Uzbekistan give us grounds to assume that there exist both threats to their psychological well-being and emergence of psychopathological symptoms. Thus, the forecast of this group’s adaptation appears less favorable. Following up, it is reasonable to sort out some groups at risk among migrants wishing to return to Uzbekistan and develop relevant programs of mental-disorder prevention.

Nonetheless, we consider the status of both groups to be marginal, that, in its turn, undoubtedly affects the process of their adaptation. The latter is an extremely complex process because, even under quite favorable conditions, it includes many attendant factors.

Keywords: labor migrants, adaptation, potential for adaptation, mental health, psychological well-being, attitude, constructiveness, destructiveness, efficiency, life-meaning guidelines
Introduction
The psychology of migration is a long-running essential issue concerning both theoretical and practical matters. Labor migration has recently become quite troublesome for Russia (Dmitriev & Dmitriev, 2006; Krasinets, Kubishin, & Tyuryukanova, 2000; Modenov & Nosov, 2004). Any migration has its own advantages and disadvantages. It concerns the life of society entirely, including political, economic, and social spheres. That is why the tasks of searching for and choosing proper approaches to interrelations with labor migrants and seeking effective strategies that keep the society system balanced are quite urgent.

Failure to focus on the psychological problems of labor migrants in Russia is caused by acute economic, social, and legal issues of labor migration as is. From our point of view, it is the psychological approach that largely can help reveal labor migration issues well and develop adequate methods of psychological assistance, permitting a person to adapt to a new sociocultural environment painlessly. Public and state institution heads and staff feel a pressing need to develop sociopsychological assistance programs for labor migrants. Thus, seeking new forms of interrelation with labor migrants is a significant task for the government not only to help these migrants adapt to common local everyday rules and apply new labor resources efficiently but also to direct local society toward tolerant interrelations with them.

The issue of migration psychology is widely addressed by Russian and foreign studies. There are descriptions of migration kinds and various theoretic and methodological approaches to its study (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis, & Sam, 2011; Khotinets, 2001; Khrustaleva & Novikov, 1995; Pochebut, 2012; Zayonchkovskaya, Molodikova, & Mukomel’, 2007). Intercultural attitudes, relationships, and communication as well as intercultural cooperation strategies are being viewed. Factors and psychological principles of various migrant groups’ adaptation are being described (Khrustaleva & Novikov, 1995; Pochebut, 2012; Soldatova, 2001; Stefanenko, 2007; Triandis, 2010). Different ways of assisting migrants, as individuals and in groups, are presented (Soldatova, 2001; Stefanenko, 2007). Refugee migrants and forced migrants should be dealt with individually, and authors pay attention to such conditions (Soldatova, 2001; Soldatova, 2002).

Nevertheless, it is labor migrants’ issues research that lacks psychological follow-up. They are mainly sociological ones (Dmitriev & Pyadukhov, 2006; Gritsenko, Kobzeva, & Maslova, 2007; Inozemtsev, 2003; Rybakovskiy, 1995).

Russia is confronted with issues that are not unique in the rise of the number of labor migrants. The experience of Europe is sure to be considerable, because it faced this problem some decades ago (Bonifazi, Schoorl, Okólski, & Simon, 2008; Oguz, 2012; Silj, 2010). We can say that the migration policy of hosting countries is aimed at including migrants in a new social system that sustains their ethnic identity as well as adaptation to a new cultural environment with its own guidelines and rules. However, American and European experience proves that this aim is extremely tough.

A widespread model of acculturation, offered by J. Berry, is suitable for the analysis of various models of migrant adaptation. Acculturation means changes that appear as a result of contact between different ethnic groups. The author con-
siders the interethnic contact itself and the process of a migrant’s psychological adaptation to depend mainly on the type of a person’s acculturation strategy. Four acculturation strategies are offered: assimilation, integration, marginalization, and separation (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis, & Sam, 2011).

This model is available not only for the analysis of acculturation strategies migrants choose, whether consciously or not, but also for the analysis of migration policy in countries hosting a considerable number of migrants.

America has been and remains a leader in migrant hosting. Most of these migrants are staying in the country illegally. America, called a melting pot, has chosen assimilation as the goal of its migration model. However, this strategy has resulted in ghettoization of various ethnic groups not only in the first but also in the second and third generations.

European countries such as Germany and France prefer an integration strategy. The model of these countries is also called multiculturalism. The goal is not to dissolve migrants in new cultures but to keep their national identity, being at the same time loyal to the hosting culture and active when entering new social systems. However, some authors concluded after some time that the model of multiculturalism actually had not achieved the necessary goals or implemented this model adaptation’s potential (Bonifazi, Schoorl, Okólski, & Simon, 2008; Sam, Vedder, Leibkind, Neto, & Virta, 2008; Silj, 2010). The paradox was that social securities, including social allowances issued to migrants, instead of stimulating them to active integration, promoted the first generation’s passive position and marginalization. The hosting societies may not have been ready for reforms that, in their turn, influenced the second-generation migrants’ adaptation.

Labor migration essentially differs from the classic one by its temporary nature. A justified question is whether labor migrants need to adapt, because labor migration, unlike classic immigration, implies temporary residence in a hosting country. However, rather often, labor migrants who initially intended just to earn a living, arrive later at a decision to become permanent residents of the Russian Federation. Europe faced the same situation. Thus, an adaptation issue turns out to be vital.

The term “adaptation” itself, involving multiple systems and levels, is reviewed in various aspects. The term involves a wide range of regularities: biological, psychological, social, economic, and so on. Adaptation is looked at as both a process and an outcome; its levels and strategies are described; personal adaptation potential and adaptation criteria are considered (Dikaya & Zhuravlev, 2007; Larionova, 2002, Posokhova, 2001; Rean, Kudashev, & Baranov, 2002). The labor-migrant adaptation issue may be approached in turn by considering different points of view. Most modern adaptation definitions include active intention, not only perception of something new but also adjustment, change, co-change, aspiration, movement, inclusion, resistance, and so on (Dikaya & Zhuravlev, 2007; Meshcheryakov & Zinchenko, 2003; Rean, Kudashev, & Baranov, 2002).

As we see it, two approaches, depending on which labor migrant group, may be reasonable. When we speak about labor migrants who are temporary residents of Russia, those intending to return to Uzbekistan, we should think of assistance (backing), not adaptation. The former (assistance) may be administrative, legal,
health and safety, insurance, and so on. When we speak of labor migrants intending to become permanent residents of Russia and undertaking relevant steps to do so, the issues of assistance and adaptation arise.

Labor migrants from Uzbekistan took part in our research. They constitute a considerable part of the entire flow of labor migrants to Russia and Saint Petersburg in particular. Studies devoted to inner and outer migration in Uzbekistan also reveal the urgency to consider the issues of assistance and adaptation of these migrants (Abdullaev, 2008).

**Method**

The research target was to analyze psychological characteristics that facilitate successful adaptation of migrants from Uzbekistan.

The hypothesis of the research was that migrants intending to become Russian permanent residents have a more favorable forecast of psychological well-being than those who are going to return to their native country.

**Participants’ group characteristics**

A total of 210 men — Uzbekistan labor migrants aged 17 to 49, at present living in Saint Petersburg — took part in the research. On the whole, the flow of labor migrants from Uzbekistan to Russia constitutes a considerable part of the entire labor immigration flow to Russia and Saint Petersburg in particular. Our participants were divided into two groups:

- Group 1 includes 62 men (29.5%) whose intention is to return to their native country as soon as possible.
- Group 2 contains 148 men (70.5%), who intend to become permanent residents of the Russian Federation.

**Method descriptions**

The participants were examined with a single purpose–design questionnaire containing 27 questions concerning such social aspects as education level, living and working conditions, family status, personal contacts, and so on.

The following psychological methods or techniques were chosen.

- The “I”-Structural test by G. Ammon (ISTA).

The questionnaire deals with well-being, emotional experience, peculiarities, and actions in various life lines. It consists of 18 scales, which are combined into six blocs. Each of these blocs characterizes one of the six personality parameters, or a person’s “I”-functions, such as aggression, fear or disturbance, outside “I”-restriction (bordering), inside “I”-restriction (bordering), narcissism, and sexuality. Every psychological component is assessed by three scales to determine the degree of constructive, destructive, and deficiency severity. According to G. Ammon’s theory of personality structure (on which the questionnaire is based), psychic processes are grounded in attitudes. A personality structure reflects these attitudes. A psychic structure is determined by revealing separate “I”-functions, altogether constituting the core function, namely “I”-identity. Central “I”-functions (aggression, fear or
disturbance, outside “I”-restriction [bordering], inside “I”-restriction [bordering], narcissism and sexuality) appear to be complex, integrated, constantly interacting elements of a psychological structure. All central “I”-functions perform fundamental tasks of both “I”-structure control or regulation and interpersonal interaction processes. The questionnaire contains 220 statements.

- The technique of mental health assessment on the basis of G. Ammon’s test.

The technique of mental health assessment based on G. Ammon’s “I”-structure test has been used for primary information collection. Within the technique of mental health estimation, the integrated grouping (blocs) of “I”-structure test indicators has been applied. Accordingly, three blocks have been determined.

- The constructiveness bloc estimates a person’s adaptation resources, his or her ability to cope with unfavorable circumstances and protect personal life lines along with valuable interpersonal relationships.
- The destructiveness bloc represents psychopathological symptoms.
- The deficiency bloc exposes failure of self-actualization as well as intention to live using a minimum of one’s own abilities.

In addition, two purposely designed indices are employed in the technique. They are based on integral scales and enable correlation of the extent of abilities to adapt, the severity of psychopathological stigmatization, and the level of a person’s psychological self-actualization.

- The index of psychic activity (the index of a person’s potential psychic implementation) reflects correlation between the potential adaptation dimension and his or her level of psychic activity.
- The index of psychic compensation level (the index of psychopathology compensation) correlates available adaptation resources dimension and psychopathological display severity.

Unlike other techniques, the technique of mental health assessment applies the procedure of a psycho-diagnostic test based on the concept of level of mental health as the correlation of two psychic activity components, that is, constructive (adaptation) and destructively deficient (psychopathologically altered and under-developed) ones.

Thus, the technique enables integral estimation of the current psychological state such as constructive adaptation resource levels, psychopathological symptomatology degrees, and their correlation in derivative indices.

- The scale of family environment (adapted by S. Koupriyanov).

The Family environment scale estimates the social climate in whatever family type. It is based on the Family Environment Scale (FES) technique developed by R. H. Moos in 1974. It focuses on the measurement and description of:

(i) a family member’s relationships (relationships indices).
(ii) the directions of personal development, which are particularly valued by family members (personal development indices).
(iii) a family’s basic organizational structure (indices of a family system).

The questionnaire contains 90 statements.
• The test of life-meaning guidelines (orientations) (by D. Leontyev).

The technique contains 20 points, each one describing a certain action, emotion, or state of the person being examined. There are two opposite statements in each of the points. A respondent’s task is to define which of these opposite statements is closer to him or her, and to what extent by choosing one out of seven gradations. The index of general life meaningfulness is obtained after the test interpretation by calculating the average number of all points’ marks. The larger the number, the higher the life comprehension level. Besides these, five other subgrades can be obtained and analyzed in addition to a general life comprehension level. They reflect certain aspects of a man’s life-meaning guidelines (orientations): life targets; life process or interest in and emotional wealth of life; life outcomes or satisfaction of self-actualization; locus of control — “I”; locus of control — “life.”

• The questionnaire titled “A personality adaptation to a new sociocultural environment” (by L. Yankovskiy).

The test contains 96 statements. The respondent points out ones either agreeable or disagreeable. The questionnaire is designed to define migrants’ adaptation level and type to a new sociocultural environment. It indicates six scales corresponding to different adaptation types: ability to adapt; conformity; interaction; depression; nostalgia; rejection.

Statistical analysis of the research results was performed using an SPSS statistical package.

Results

Table 1 provides average indicators and statistically essential differences of the test of life-meaning guidelines (orientations). In both groups, average scores on the “index of general life meaningfulness” exceed regular average ones. Along with that, the second group results on this scale are statistically above those of the first group.

Table 1. Indicators of the test of life-meaning guidelines (orientations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Title</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Reliable Differences p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life targets</td>
<td>35.15 ± 6.617</td>
<td>37.99 ± 3.831</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life process or interest in and emotional wealth of life</td>
<td>31.62 ± 4.745</td>
<td>31.46 ± 4.533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life outcomes or satisfaction of self-actualization</td>
<td>28.22 ± 4.618</td>
<td>29.57 ± 4.086</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control — “I”</td>
<td>22.72 ± 3.627</td>
<td>22.92 ± 3.321</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control — “Life”</td>
<td>29.48 ± 5.503</td>
<td>31.27 ± 5.055</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of general life meaningfulness (life comprehension)</td>
<td>147.18 ± 19.304</td>
<td>153.21 ± 16.328</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High scores on both “life targets” and “life outcomes” scales in each group on the one hand prove life efficiency and comprehension and, on the other hand, reveal further targets that make life oriented and perspective. These scales’ outcomes prove to be higher in the second group, thus making the adaptation forecast for this group more favorable.

Financial shortfall is the key reason for labor migrants’ arrival in Saint Petersburg (85.7% of those interviewed). Labor migrants are seeking earnings to provide adequate living conditions for themselves and their families. This need dictates all of the labor migrant’s activity. Meeting this need makes life reasonable. Nearly all migrants interviewed were employed and paid at that moment; therefore, they met the leading need and support their families.

Table 2 provides average indicators and statistically essential differences in the “A personality adaptation to a new sociocultural environment” questionnaire. Average scores in the first group of labor migrants, those intending to return to Uzbekistan, are within general parameters except the index of “rejection,” which is a bit lower than the general standard. Average scores in the second group of labor migrants, those intending to become residents in Russia, on “ability to adapt” and “conformity” scales, are over the standard ones, but “depression” and “rejection” scales reveal indicators lower than standard. Besides, the levels of both “ability to adapt” and “conformity” are statistically reliably higher in the second group compared with the first group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Title (adaptation kind)</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Reliable Differences p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to adapt</td>
<td>10.42 ± 1.850</td>
<td>13.63 ± 2.094</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>8.58 ± 1.714</td>
<td>10.43 ± 2.230</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>9.37 ± 1.893</td>
<td>9.46 ± 0.878</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>4.22 ± 2.723</td>
<td>3.64 ± 1.894</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>6.83 ± 1.533</td>
<td>6.14 ± 1.586</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>5.31 ± 2.380</td>
<td>5.57 ± 1.409</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 provides average indicators and statistically essential differences in the “The scale of family environment” method.

In both groups, high indicators on such scales as “solidarity,” “control,” “moral and ethical issues,” and “organizational ability” are worth paying attention to. They all characterize explicit feelings of belonging to a family, gradation and hierarchy in a family arrangement, clarity and certainty, rigidity of family rules and obligations, and common esteem for ethical and moral values and provisions.
Table 3. Indicators of the “The scale of family environment” method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Title</th>
<th>Group 1 (M ± σ)</th>
<th>Group 2 (M ± σ)</th>
<th>Reliable Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>7.12 ± 1.378</td>
<td>7.61 ± 0.806</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>6.22 ± 1.219</td>
<td>5.29 ± 1.165</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>6.73 ± 0.944</td>
<td>6.99 ± 1.156</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>5.51 ± 1.165</td>
<td>6.36 ± 1.424</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude aimed at achievements</td>
<td>5.56 ± 0.952</td>
<td>6.84 ± 0.582</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude aimed at intellectual–cultural development</td>
<td>5.88 ± 1.620</td>
<td>6.46 ± 1.267</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude aimed at intense rest</td>
<td>5.92 ± 1.236</td>
<td>5.80 ± 1.000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and ethical issues</td>
<td>6.71 ± 1.661</td>
<td>7.25 ± 0.971</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational ability</td>
<td>8.19 ± 1.167</td>
<td>8.30 ± 0.831</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5.61 ± 1.462</td>
<td>6.69 ± 0.718</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second group of labor migrants (intending to stay in Russia) presents higher indicators on the “control” scale that are statistically reliable. If we look at Table 2, we can see that indicators on the “conformity” scale of this group exceed the ones of the first group. It signifies the second group seeking for interrelation with people, being a group, their rules and values. Meanwhile, the first group shows a higher indicator on the “expressiveness” scale that defines the level of a family encouragement to act and express its members feelings explicitly.

Table 4 provides average indicators and statistically essential differences in the “I”-structural test.

In our research, we have focused on the assumption that labor migrants’ adaptation peculiarities and forecast will be connected with personality “I”-structure distinctions, in particular with their explicitly constructive components. One of our research hypotheses is the assumption that constructive components of a personality’s “I”-structures will be predominant with respect to labor migrants intending to stay in Russia, which may favor their successful adaptation.

On the whole, both groups have a normal range of indicators regarding the level of explicit constructive components except the “outside ‘I’-restriction” scale, where the indicators are insignificantly lower.

At the same time, the second group shows the level of explicitly constructive components on the aggression, inside “I”-restriction, narcissism, and sexuality scales that is reliably over the first group’s indicators. Such high indicators reveal the second group’s representatives’ ability to be openhearted, targeted, capable to establish and maintain relationships with various people, and interested in new experiences and impressions. These all provide dynamic development of one’s life. We can also speak about a pronounced ability to forward one’s powers to dynamic inner process regulation, thus controlling borders between different “I” aspects as well as between various psychic processes and contents.
Table 4. Indicators of the “I”-structural test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale title</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Reliable Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score (M ± σ)</td>
<td>Score (M ± σ)</td>
<td>p &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive aggression</td>
<td>9.96 ± 1.572</td>
<td>11.15 ± 0.931</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive aggression</td>
<td>3.11 ± 3.013</td>
<td>1.96 ± 1.950</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression deficiency</td>
<td>3.27 ± 2.220</td>
<td>2.90 ± 1.525</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive fear</td>
<td>7.75 ± 1.909</td>
<td>8.33 ± 0.939</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive fear</td>
<td>2.68 ± 2.046</td>
<td>2.06 ± 1.334</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear deficiency</td>
<td>4.29 ± 1.826</td>
<td>2.70 ± 1.025</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive outside “I”-restriction (bordering)</td>
<td>7.61 ± 1.448</td>
<td>7.01 ± 0.828</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive outside “I”-restriction (bordering)</td>
<td>3.84 ± 1.547</td>
<td>2.62 ± 1.439</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside “I”-restriction (bordering) deficiency</td>
<td>4.38 ± 1.912</td>
<td>4.22 ± 1.346</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive inside “I”-restriction (bordering)</td>
<td>9.70 ± 1.476</td>
<td>11.01 ± 0.748</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive inside “I”-restriction (bordering)</td>
<td>3.86 ± 2.284</td>
<td>3.27 ± 1.230</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside “I”-restriction (bordering) deficiency</td>
<td>4.00 ± 2.420</td>
<td>3.14 ± 1.475</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive narcissism</td>
<td>9.96 ± 2.366</td>
<td>10.42 ± 1.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive narcissism</td>
<td>4.29 ± 1.659</td>
<td>2.04 ± 1.555</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism deficiency</td>
<td>1.54 ± 2.215</td>
<td>1.27 ± 1.997</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive sexuality</td>
<td>9.50 ± 3.406</td>
<td>11.85 ± 1.379</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive sexuality</td>
<td>6.82 ± 2.784</td>
<td>7.03 ± 1.826</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality deficiency</td>
<td>2.64 ± 1.823</td>
<td>1.27 ± 1.130</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both groups, the constructive “narcissism” component is within normal ranges. This scale determines how a person treats him- or herself. It provides both a positive self-image and a feeling of satisfactory self-significance, thoughts, and ideas. This indicator also ensures the possibility to apply the complex of “I”-structures to maintain interrelations with people, allowing them to take part in one’s own life.

Although the first group of labor migrants provides us with a normal constructive component of narcissism, its destructive component is a bit higher than a normal one, and its level is statistically reliably higher in comparison with the second group. It indicates the tendency of the first group’s members to fail in perceiving the criticism of others properly and reveal their own weakness. It also demonstrates their need for recognition and attention.
Table 5. Indicators of the technique of mental health assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Title</th>
<th>Group 1 Score (M ± σ)</th>
<th>Group 2 Score (M ± σ)</th>
<th>Reliable Differences p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructiveness</td>
<td>54.48 ± 9.258</td>
<td>59.78 ± 3.644</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructiveness</td>
<td>24.59 ± 9.507</td>
<td>18.99 ± 6.162</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>20.11 ± 10.59</td>
<td>15.51 ± 7.089</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The indication of the psychic (mental) compensation level</td>
<td>−7.36 ± 13.27</td>
<td>2.86 ± 6.47</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The indication of psychic (mental) activity level</td>
<td>−6.09 ± 13.49</td>
<td>2.37 ± 6.99</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 provides average indicators and statistically essential differences according to the technique of mental health assessment that allows for estimating psychological well-being, considering relevant indicators.

The fact that reliable differences were found between groups on a quite significant level of all integral scales and indicators is worth paying attention to. The indicators on the integral “constructiveness” scale are over general ones and statistically reliably higher in the second group in comparison with the first group. The second group is also characterized by indicators of “psychic (mental) compensation level” and “psychic (mental) activity level,” which correspond to established normal ones. It enables us to consider that the second group has a high adaptation potential, good ability to set targets and stand up for lifelong values, and the ability to establish and maintain interrelations with others. Thus, many fewer threats exist against the psychological well-being of the participants in the second group.

The first group indicators on the “constructiveness” scale are normal, but the “destructiveness” scale indicators exceed normal ones, and their level is statistically reliably higher in comparison with the second group, and the “indication of the psychic (mental) compensation level” is close to border range. Thus, the forecast for the first group members’ psychological well-being is less favorable, and the threat of psychopathological symptoms escalation is rather severe.

**Conclusion**

The outcomes of this research revealed a high level of life meaning in both groups of migrants that, in its turn, may be a considerable resource for further adjustments and adaptation to new environment conditions.

Through obtained outcomes analysis, it has become apparent that these two groups of labor migrants — those intending to stay in Russia and those wishing to return to Uzbekistan — differ in a number of indicators.

The forecast of mental health for migrants intending to become Russian residents is more favorable. A rather high personal level of mental health and adapta-
tion resources are based on a strong potential of activity, ability to establish definite aims, and capacity to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships.

The outcomes for migrants wishing to return to Uzbekistan give us grounds to assume that threats exist for their psychological well-being and emergence of psychopathological symptoms. Thus, the forecast for this group's adaptation is considered less favorable.

In our opinion, it is reasonable to sort out some groups of risk among migrants wishing to return to Uzbekistan and develop relevant programs of psychological assistance.
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Michael D. Matthews is Professor of Engineering Psychology at the United States Military Academy at West Point. From 2007 to 2008 he headed the American Psychological Association’s (19th Division of Military Psychology). Collectively, his research interests center on soldier performance in combat.

Matthews is one of those scholars and practitioners who started what was in effect “a military psychological revolution” in the US military in 2008 under the leadership of General George W. Casey, Jr., Chief of Staff of the US army, by fundamentally transforming its mission, orientation and methods of military psychology. In 2012, in collaboration with Janice H. Laurence, an associate professor at Temple University in Philadelphia, he edited the 1496-page 4-volume Military Psychology Reference Collection.

The book Head Strong is a kind of manifesto proclaiming the psychological nature and character of war. The author believes war to be an act of will, a test of will and will, he maintains, is a psychological category. War can exist in the human dimension only. Psychology plays a pivotal role in winning a war. A more profound understanding of the human element is needed more than ever before owing to intensity and lethality of modern weapons, impact of real-time communication systems and revolutionary development of science, technology, engineering, revolutionary changes in the world’s political structure. Hence he arrives at the conclusion that nations and armies that will realize this notion and will be able to “ride the wave of cutting-edge science” will have strategic advantages in the 21st century. Success is no longer guaranteed by using sheer force and purely kinetic energy in
combat (superior firepower). To illustrate his point the author mentions the failure by the powerful military groupings of the Soviet Union and the United States to win a victory in Afghanistan.

The book under review is what virtually amounts to a manifesto reflecting revolutionary change now underway in American military psychology. This change stems from the awareness of the fact that the disease–treatment paradigm which is at the core of the US Army system of psychological aid has proved to be inadequate. Enormous efforts and means involved in this area, have failed to yield the results expected. The level of combat-stress related disorders, including PTSD among US soldiers who took part in the fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan is extremely high.

The author proposes to reframe the current situation. He argues that instead of concentrating on 15–25% of combatants suffering from psychological problems we should focus on the fact that 75–85% of the troops keep their fighting ability, successfully overcoming stress factors of a combat situation. He proves it necessary to shift the emphasis from development of psychological help to optimization of psychological training of military personnel. In this regard, the author proposes the following:

1. To further improve psychological selection of servicemen through increased implementation of non-cognitive techniques in selection practices enabling to assess, first of all, such qualities as psychological resilience — an ability to overcome the effect of combat stressors while maintaining the necessary level of combat capability. Secondly, enhanced quality of military personnel selection is dependent on a wide application of modern simulators that imitate actual types of military activity. This will make it possible to study soldiers’ psychological characteristics in conditions close to those in combat.

2. The author proposes to base psychological preparation on the key ideas of positive psychology elaborated by Martin Seligman. This approach can be summed up in the following words, “right thoughts about events generate right emotions.”

Matthews is one of the ideologists and developers of the comprehensive soldier fitness program and what is essentially the all-Army psychological resilience training of soldiers. The program was conceived as a proactive training-based approach to form soldiers’ healthy psychological and emotional skills before their exposure to combat stress. It aims to prevent psychological traumas instead of treating them. The book provides a theoretical basis and technological content of the program.

3. Revolutionary ideas are to be also found in the approach towards psychological aid. It is proposed to focus on the positive effects of an injury instead of its pathological ones (PTSD). The author believes a psychological trauma involves not only dramatic changes but it also creates opportunities for further post-traumatic growth. It is this aspect of the post-traumatic crisis that should, in the author’s opinion, become the object of psychological help.
Even a moderate improvement in a soldier’s awareness of his self-efficacy, confidence, coping skills can translate into a dramatic enhancement of the quality of soldiers’ lives. It will also have a positive impact on the armed forces in terms of raising their morale, combat readiness, mission accomplishment and self-preservation.

Reflecting the picture of modern American military psychology, Michael Matthews’s book *Head Strong* is highly insightful and beneficial to Russian military psychologists who are building the Armed Forces’ psychological service.
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