Ethnopsychological Specific Qualities of Gifted Students

Zukhra Abdurakhmanova[1], Dildorakhon Yangiboyeva[2]

National University of Uzbekistan named after M. Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
[1]Corresponding author: zuhraabduraxmonova@gmail.com
[2]dildoraxonyangiboyeva@gmail.com

Abstract.   During the last decades, the problem of migration has been one of the most topical research topics in various fields of knowledge. This is due to globalization processes, changes taking place in the world economy and politics, outbreaks of ethnic conflicts and civil wars, the increasing mobility of modern youth, and other social phenomena. Under the conditions of a constantly changing society, the characteristics of migration processes are also changing: migration directions, migration conditions, factors determining successful adaptation, migrants' motivation, socio-demographic characteristics of migrants, and many other characteristics that determine the context of migration processes and, therefore, to some extent, directly affect each individual migrant. Therefore, the range of scientific interests related to the study of migration processes is constantly growing.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the key characteristics of modern society is the increasing complexity and diversity of the world. Against the background of global processes, there is, on the one hand, an intensification of intercultural communication observed in various spheres: from everyday communication, participation in multicultural educational or work communities, to international negotiations. On the other hand, there is an increase in the cultural heterogeneity of the world community, particularly as a result of globalization processes. Thus, differences between races, peoples, cultures, religions, and subcultures are not being leveled out but remain prominent and visible on all continents and in all countries. This situation has created an urgent need to develop strategies for successful interaction in a multicultural environment, which entails intercultural competence. As a result, intercultural competence has become one of the most important skills of the 21st century.

Recently, the number of international students coming to Russia in pursuit of higher education, skills, and experience has considerably grown. As a result, the admittance of students with different cultural backgrounds (citizenship, social class, religion, and ethnicity) has made Russian universities diverse and multicultural. Such diversity demands that foreign students adapt to a new cultural environment and the lifestyle of the host country. This adaptation, known as acculturation, has social [Berry J.W. (2005).] and academic outcomes, as international students encounter distinctive challenges in adjusting to a new cross-cultural environment that might influence their academic achievements and psychological well-being [Andrea A.L. (2014)]. Research shows that in the conditions of a new cultural environment that presupposes having its social norms, customs, and traditions, the majority of international students have to face such a problem as cultural shock.

R.D. Ushkanova in her research subdivides acculturation into the following types: educational,

---

[1] *zuhraabduraxmonova@gmail.com*

[2] *dildoraxonyangiboyeva@gmail.com*

psychological, legal, economic, religious, and several others. She also uses the notion of "acculturation modus," distinguishing under it biculturalism, multiculturalism, transculturalism, etc. The above research conclusions give the author grounds to consider acculturation as a generic concept of intercultural interaction [Ushanova I.A. 2003].

In the context of global culture, so-called flexible acculturation becomes a subject of research interest. Flexible acculturation is characteristic of the modern world in which people actively move between two or more multicultural environments. In the context of multi-ethnicity as a habitual phenomenon, flexible acculturation provides multiple patterns of identification and integration [Ushkanova R.D.].

In the middle of the twentieth century, the term "acculturation" is actualized by researchers at the personal level as well - under the conditions of interaction with another culture, changes in value orientations of individuals, their social attitudes, and changes in the psycho-emotional sphere are studied. Thus, psychological acculturation means changes at the personal level when an individual comes into contact with new cultures, which include different cultural or ethnic groups [Berry D., Purtinga A., Sigall M., Dasen P. 2007.].

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in interest in the comparative study of mental development patterns in different cultures. This is evidenced by the numerous studies conducted in recent decades. Psychologists are interested in questions related to the influence of culture on the development of psychological features of people in different socio-cultural ethnological spaces.

Methodologically important for our study is also the definition of three main directions of adaptation to the new culture given in the so-called ABCs of acculturation by K. Ward. First, it is the affective approach when the stress factor is the interaction with a foreign culture, which can be overcome by mobilizing adaptive resources. Secondly, it is a behavioral (or behavioral) approach (the concept of social learning), in which the individual acquires cross-cultural adaptation through the mastery of appropriate specific skills demanded in the new cultural environment. Third, it is the cognitive approach (social identification theory), within the framework of which the following components of the acculturation process are fundamental for us:

- Social attitudes towards representatives of one's own and another's cultural groups and their formation
- Norms of source and adopted cultures and their perception
- Ethno-cultural identification and its changes.

2. METHODS

The purpose of our ethnopsychological study was to investigate the psychological characteristics of Uzbek and Russian gifted students.

Within the framework of this research, we were interested in:
a) cultural values dominating in Russia and Uzbekistan;
b) features of the value-semantic sphere of personality of gifted students of different countries, connected with attitudes towards self, society, and the future;
c) the structure of value orientations of gifted students;
d) personal features of gifted students through the analysis of their life path and the features of the social situation of their development.

The identification of students as gifted was based on the criterion of real intellectual achievements and their evaluation by teachers. About two hundred students under the age of 23, studying in Russia and Uzbekistan, took part in the study, with 40% being girls and 60% being boys.

In Uzbekistan, the study was conducted at the National University, and in Russia, at the Tyumen Medical University.

Two hypotheses were formulated:
1) there are differences in some indicators of giftedness of young people located in different socio-cultural environments (at the level of the compared countries), because human existence is a polyprocess, and his belonging to many different-order systems is somehow manifested in psychological qualities;
2) adhering to an axiological view of culture and taking into account the fact that spirituality is manifested differently in different cultures, we can assume that the value and meaning sphere of gifted youth in different countries will have a different structure.

To identify value orientations, the study used a well-known test developed by the American psychologist M. Rokeach, adapted and standardized in Russia.

Measurement of cultural values was carried out with the help of the test "Cultural Value Differential" (CVD) developed by G.U. Soldatova [Soldatova G.U. 1998]. The purpose of this technique is to measure group value orientations: to the group, to power, to each other, and to social change within the psychological universalism "individualism-collectivism". The methodology allows cultural values to be considered in a space defined by bipolar axes: Orientation to the group - Orientation to oneself, Openness to change - Resistance to change, Orientation to each other - Orientation to oneself, Respect for authority - Distrust of authority, etc.

The reliability of differences between the studied samples according to the results of the questionnaire survey and the "Culture-value differential" was established using Student's t-criterion. Data processing using the M. Rokeach test was done in two stages: the first stage involved calculating Spearman's rank correlation coefficient to determine similarities and differences in the structures of value orientations of Russian and Uzbek students. At the second stage, the Kruskall-Wallis criterion was calculated to assess multiple comparisons of value orientations.

Table 1 presents the results of the Cultural Value Differential (CVD) test. As can be seen from the table, there are differences in the profile of values in different cultural contexts.

TABLE 1. Survey data of Uzbek and Russian students using the Cultural Value Differential methodology

Values	Uzbekistan	Russia	Values	Uzbekistan	Russia
Mutual aid	74,9	69,6	Separateness	32,9	34,4
Insularity	40,9	50,5	Openness	70,8	60,5
Discipline	29,4	30,6	Self-discipline	70,6	63,4
Aggression	33,3	37,8	Peacefulness	64,7	52,2
Loyalty to traditions	75,2	68,9	Disruption of traditions traditions	24,8	36,1
Caution	36,6	40,8	Risk-taking	63,4	50,2
Respect for authority	33,3	44,9	Distrust of authority	66,7	55,1
Warm-heartedness	88,4	62,1	Coldness	11,6	26,9
Obedience	47,9	38	Autonomy	52,1	62
Aspiration	58,7	55,1	Future orientation	41,3	44,9
Rule of law	36,4	39,4	Anarchy	26,6	60,6
Complacency	48,8	37,4	Resistance	51,2	62,6

According to many psychologists, the world's cultures and ethnic subcultures seem to differ in terms of collectivism and individualism. In collectivist societies, intragroup norms and intragroup role relations are the motivating force that drives an individual to act and a distinctive factor that determines the direction of their actions [Dzhidaryan I.A. 1997].

On the Group Orientation - Self-Orientation axis in Russian and Uzbek cultures, responses are clustered at the pole of Collectivism. The scale Orientation towards each other is of interest in connection with the category of "spirituality," as it assesses parameters such as cordiality - coldness, pliability - rivalry, aggressiveness - peacefulness. The data on

the value of cordiality shows that Uzbeks express spirituality (cordiality) to a greater extent - 88.4% (among Russians - 62%). The same is true for mutual help, compassion, and peacefulness, but aggressiveness and rivalry are more pronounced among Russians. Interesting results were obtained in the Cautiousness - Risk appetite criterion. The quality of caution has different levels of expression in all cultures studied. Russians believe that this quality is expressed in them by 40.8%, Uzbeks - by 36.6%. The inclination to risk is more pronounced among Uzbeks - 63.4%, and to an average degree among Russians - 50.2%.

Of interest are the values Openness to Change - Resistance to Change (Openness to Change -

Conservatism). Let us consider the criterion Loyalty to traditions - Destruction of traditions: among Russians, the tendency to destroy traditions is weak (36.1%), among Uzbeks even to a lesser extent (24.8%), but Loyalty to traditions was demonstrated to a greater extent by Uzbeks - 75.2% and to a lesser extent by Russians - 63.9%, (differences are statistically significant at p≤0.05). A similar picture was revealed for the Law-abidingness - Anarchy criterion.

As shown in Table 1, Uzbeks have 58.7 percent of ambition for the past, and Russians have 55.1 percent. Future orientation for Russians is 44.9 percent, and for Uzbeks, it is 41.3 percent, both falling within the medium range. The scale Power Orientation (Strong Social Control - Weak Social Control) is associated with submission to prohibitive and regulated social standards. Its indicators are Discipline - Willfulness. According to the survey, students placed Russia and Uzbekistan on the Willfulness pole (corresponding figures for the Discipline criterion: Uzbekistan - 29.4%, Russia - 30.6%).

As the analysis of the results shows, Uzbek culture is dominated by the values of collectivist culture, while Russian culture is close to Uzbek culture in this respect. The data on the bipolar axis Openness to Change - Conservatism (Tradition) indicate that the values of Russian and Uzbek culture are at the pole of Conservatism. The data on the scale Orientation towards each other indicates that spirituality (cordiality, peacefulness, mutual support) is highly expressed in the Russian and Uzbek cultures. It is interesting that the self-esteem of the representatives of different cultures is comparable in most scales (there are no marked differences). Our results are confirmed by the data of other authors. Thus, according to N.M. Lebedeva [Lebedeva N.M. 2000,], Russian culture is collectivist. N.M. Lebedeva considers such values as family protection, health, true friendship, loyalty, intellect, meaning of life, inner harmony, associated with communication and spirituality of a person, as basic values of Russian culture. Tables 2 and 3 present the results of the study of value orientations of Russian and Uzbek students. The analysis of the terminal values presented in Table 2 has shown that such universal values as love, health, and friends, regardless of culture, occupy the first places on the scale of values in both Uzbek and Russian samples. In relation to the value of "pleasure," this value ranks fifteenth in the Uzbek sample and eighteenth in the Russian sample.

TABLE 2. Results of a study of the terminal value orientations of young men in Uzbekistan and Russia (mean value, secondary ranks)

Terminal VO	Uzbekistan		Russia		Pairwise comparisons
	Ranks	Mean	Ranks	Mean	Statistically significant at the level of p ≤ 0,05
Active life	10	9,78	8	8,49	*
Life wisdom	4	7,33	14	11,19	*
Health	1	5,25	1	4,06	*
Interesting Work	5	8,03	11	10,38	
The beauty of nature and art	17	12,10	16	12,62	
Love	3	6,42	3	6,04	
Materially secure	11,5	10,31	4	7,45	
Life	2	6,06	5	7,57	*
Friends	14	11,44	6,5	8,40	
Good life in the country	13	11,02	13	10,47	
Public recognition	8	9,00	12	10,47	
Knowledge	18	14,22	9	9,94	*
Equality	9	9,12	17	13,32	*
Autonomy	7	8,67	10	10,28	*
Freedom	11,5	10,31	2	5,60	
Happy family life	16	11,77	15	12,02	
Creativity	6	8,44	6,5	8,40	
Self-confidence	15	11,47	18	14,04	

As can be seen from Table 2, Uzbek students differ from Russian students in 7 terminal values (differences are statistically reliable). More significant for Uzbek students, in comparison with Russian students, are such terminal values as wisdom of life, friends, independence, and freedom. Less significant are active life, health, and equality.

As we can see from Table 3, Uzbek students differ from Russian students in 4 instrumental values (for Uzbek students, the values of independence, broad-mindedness, and honesty are more significant, and for Russian students, the values of high demands).

Based on the received data, we can state that in terms of terminal values, Uzbek students differ from Russian students to a greater extent, whereas in terms of instrumental values - the means of achieving the goal - they are closer to Russian students.

A comparative analysis of the structure of value orientations of girls and boys in different cultures showed the following: in Uzbekistan, there is a difference in two terminal values, with the value of love being more important for girls and the value of pleasure being more significant for boys. Seven instrumental values differed between boys and girls.

TABLE 3. Results of a study of instrumental value orientations among young men in Uzbekistan and Russia

Instrumental VO	Uzbekistan		Russia		Pairwise comparisons
	Ranks	Mean	Ranks	Mean	Statistically significant at the level of $p \leq 0,05$
Neatness	14	10,54	6	8,45	
Politeness	11	9,80	4	8,13	
High expectations	17	14,39	8	9,09	*
Vitality	4	7,35	3	7,34	
Independence	3	7,20	14	11,26	*
Irreconcilability	18	14,80	18	14,15	
Dutiful	16	11,61	15	11,38	
Educated	1	6,60	1	5,23	
Responsibility	9	8,76	13	10,23	
Rationality	7	8,00	11	9,68	
Self-control	6	7,81	5	8,34	
Courage	10	9,03	10	9,45	
Determined will	2	7,00	2	6,68	
Tolerance	13	10,30	9	9,11	
Broad-mindedness	8	8,10	17	11,77	*
Integrity	5	7,80	7	8,89	*
Effectiveness in deeds	12	10,00	12	10,17	
Sensivity	15	11,23	16	11,47	

Rationality, self-control, and irreconcilability to shortcomings were more important for the boys; for the girls, politeness, sensitivity, honesty, and tolerance were more important. In Russia, differences are observed in three terminal values (health, interesting work is more important for girls, freedom - for boys) and three instrumental values. We can conclude that in the Uzbek sample, predominantly "male" and predominantly "female" instrumental value orientations stand out to a greater extent than in others. Soviet psychologists wrote about this [Yadov. L1979]. Among the "masculine" ones, such orientations as intransigence, rationalism, and self-

control were noted; among the "feminine" ones, it was mentioned that they were well-mannered, tolerant of others' shortcomings, and empathetic.

3. CONCLUSION

Many authors discuss the strategies of struggling with acculturation stress in students from different regions and the connection of using certain strategies with successful cross-cultural adaptation. According to the

author, constructive coping strategies contribute to successful adaptation; they help to overcome adaptation problems and negative emotional states. We absolutely agree with the author and, developing her idea, add that individuals facing acculturative stress have to cope with it to different extents. Thus, its degree may vary from the lowest to the highest one. Some students perceive acculturative experience as something negative, namely as a source of stress and depression, whereas others take it as something positive, a challenge, and new opportunities for self-development and self-perfection. That is why it becomes important to work out individual strategies in addition to general ones.

An important indicator of adaptation to society, culture, and the current social situation is life satisfaction, which can be assessed by answering the question "Are you happy?" According to I.A. Dzhidaryan [Dzhidaryan I.A. 1997.], life satisfaction is part of a person's activity structure. There are indications [Dzhidaryan I.A. 2001.] of high positive correlations between life satisfaction (happiness) and such personal characteristics as self-esteem, sociality, self-regulation, etc.

According to our data, the majority of gifted students, regardless of gender and the country in which they live, are happy. This was reported by 73% of Uzbek and 85% of Russian male students. A similar picture emerges for girls. I.A. Dzhidaryan [12] cites high rates of dissatisfaction with life among our compatriots, averaging up to 75 percent.

The results allow us to conclude that gifted students living in different cultures (Uzbekistan and Russia) have both general and specific characteristics related to culture. The general characteristics of gifted students, regardless of culture, include the phenomenon of incomplete "culturality" that we have identified. This manifests itself in the fact that gifted students in different cultures are similar to gifted students in other cultures. Specific characteristics include differences in worldview, in the sphere of values and meanings, and in the peculiarities of the social situation of development.

REFERENCES

Berry J.W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29, 697-712.

Andrea A.L. (2014) Sources of Acculturative Stress among International students. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/11591978.

Ushanova I.A. 2003 Prospects for the development of the theory of acculturation in a globalized world // Bulletin of the Novgorod University. No. 24. P.65-70.

Ushkanova R.D. 2010 Logical-semantic analysis of acculturation // Bulletin of the Yakut State University. V.7. No. 1. P.152.

Berry D., Purtinga A., Sigall M., Dasen P. 2007. Cross-cultural psychology: trans. from English. Kharkov: Humanitarian Center, 560 p.

Soldatova G.U. 1998 Psychology of interethnic tension. M.: Smysl,. 389 p.

Dzhidaryan I.A. 1997 Happiness and satisfaction with life in Russian society // Russian mentality: Issues of psychological theory and practice / ed. K.A. Abulkhanova and others. M.: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences,. S. 187–223.

Lebedeva N.M. 2000, Basic values of Russians at the turn of the XXI century // Psychological journal. vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 73–87.

Self-regulation and prediction of social behavior of the individual / ed. V.A. Yadov. L1979..: The science, 264 p.

Dzhidaryan I.A. 1997. Happiness and satisfaction with life in Russian society // Russian mentality: Issues of psychological theory and practice / ed. K.A. Abulkhanova and others. M.: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, S. 187–223.Diener E. Subjective Well-Being // Psycol. Bullet. 1984. Vol. 95, № 3. P. 542–575.

Dzhidaryan I.A. 2001. The concept of happiness in the Russian mentality. SPb.: Aletheyya, 242.