

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ETHNIC IDENTITY AND PERSONALITY TRAITS IN ARMENIANS IN THE TITULAR NATION AND THE DIASPORA IN RUSSIA

ASYA BERBERYAN

Russian-Armenian University,
Head of the Department of Psychology,
Doctor of Psychology, Professor
aspsy@inbox.ru

SATENIK TEPANYAN

Russian-Armenian University
Department of Psychology
PhD Student
satenik_tepanyan@mail.ru

DOI: 10.54503/2579-2903-2023.1-63

Abstract

In recent years, the problems of ethnicity and ethnic identity have come to the fore for researchers internationally. Processes of globalization and the ongoing growth of migration predetermine ethnic diversity and accentuate the significance of ethnic identity in both mono- and polyethnic societies. The study is relevant due to the importance of the problem of ethnic identity in the rapidly changing world.

The article presents research on the concept and essence of ethnic identity. The study explores the various definitions of the phenomenon of identity, as well as the types of ethnic identity. The article provides insight into the conditions of the development of ethnic identity and its formation, as well as an analysis of the relationship between the types of ethnic identity and personality traits. It highlights the differences between the types of ethnic identity and the evaluation of feelings related to ethnic identity in different sociocultural environments.

The aim of the given article is to study the types of ethnic identity, the evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity, and the personality traits of Armenians in different sociocultural situations – namely, within the Republic of Armenia and the Russian Federation. To achieve this, a study was conducted with 40 respondents (ethnic Armenians residing in Armenia and in the Russian diaspora).

The results of our study allowed us to identify statistically significant differences in the types of ethnic identity and evaluations of feelings related to ethnic identity in the two groups. Within the titular nation, the significantly prevailing response was “norm or positive ethnic identity”, with “ethnic fanaticism” and “ethnic indifference” following closely. The least represented was “ethnic nihilism”. In the diaspora samples, “norm or positive ethnic identity” prevailed significantly as well, but the second and third most prominent results – “ethnic indifference” and “ethnic fanaticism” – were switched. The least represented results were “ethnic nihilism” and “ethnic egoism”.

According to the assessment of feelings related to ethnic identity, the majority of the representatives of the titular nation noted strong positive feelings related to ethnic identity (pride) and calm confidence in relation to their ethnic identity. Strong positive feelings (pride) and normal evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity (calm confidence) were also noted in the conditions of the diaspora but with lower rates. A higher number of respondents from the diaspora as compared to the participants from the titular nation gave a negative evaluation of their feelings in relation to their ethnic identity.

Correlation analysis of the obtained results revealed a link between the types of ethnic identity and the personality traits in Armenians under different sociocultural conditions. The differences among the representatives of the two studied groups can be explained by the sociocultural situation, i.e. being a part of the titular nation or the diaspora. The influence of the titular nation in whose territory the representatives of the diaspora live causes the duality of their situation.

Keywords and phrases: types of ethnic identity, personality traits, relationship, titular nation Armenians, diasporan Armenians.

**ՀԱՅ ՏԻՏՆՈՍԱՅԻՆ ԷԹՆԻԿ ԽՄԲԻ ՆԵՐՍՈՒՄ ԵՎ ՌՈՒՍԱԿԱՆ
ՍՓՅՈՒՌՔՈՒՄ ԲՆԱԿՎՈՂ ԷԹՆԻԿ ՀԱՅԵՐԻ ԷԹՆԻԿ ԻՆՔՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԵՎ
ԱՆՁՆԱՅԻՆ ԱՌԱՆՁՆԱՀԱՏԿՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ
ՓՈԽԿԱՊԱԿՑՎԱԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ**

ԱՍՅԱ ԲԵՐԲԵՐՅԱՆ

Ռուս-հայկական համալսարանի
հոգեբանության ամբիոնի վարիչ,
հոգեբանական գիտությունների դոկտոր, պրոֆեսոր
aspsy@inbox.ru

ՍԱԹԵՆԻԿ ՏԵՓԱՆՅԱՆ

Հայ-ռուսական համալսարանի
հոգեբանության ամբիոնի
ասպիրանտ
satenik_tepanyan@mail.ru

Համառոտագիր

Վերջին տարիներին էթնիկության և էթնիկ ինքնության խնդիրները բազմաթիվ հետազոտողների ուսումնասիրության կենտրոնում են: Գլոբալիզացիայի գործընթացները և միգրացիայի շարունակական աճը կանխորոշում են էթնիկ բազմազանությունը և ընդգծում էթնիկ ինքնության կարևորությունը ինչպես միազգ, այնպես էլ բազմազգ հասարակություններում: Այս

ուսումնասիրության արդիականությունը պայմանավորված է արագ փոփոխվող աշխարհում էթնիկ ինքնության խնդրի կարևորմամբ:

Հոդվածում ներկայացված է «ինքնություն» հասկացության և դրա էության ուսումնասիրությունը: Դիտարկվել են ինքնություն հասկացության տարբեր սահմանումներ, առանձնացվել են էթնիկ ինքնության տիպերը, բացահայտվել են էթնիկ ինքնության զարգացման և դրա ձևավորման պայմանները, վերլուծվել են էթնիկ ինքնության տիպերի և անձնային առանձնահատկությունների փոխկապակցվածությունը, ինչպես նաև էթնիկ ինքնության տիպերի և էթնիկ ինքնության հետ կապված զգացմունքների գնահատման տարբերությունները տարբեր սոցիալ-մշակութային միջավայրերում:

Սույն հոդվածի նպատակն է ուսումնասիրել էթնիկ ինքնության փոխկապակցվածությունը վերջինիս զգացմունքների գնահատման հետ, ինչպես նաև հայերի անձնային առանձնահատկությունները երկու տարբեր սոցիալ-մշակութային միջավայրերում՝ Հայաստանի Հանրապետությունում և Ռուսաստանի Դաշնությունում: Այդ նպատակով հեղինակները հարցում են իրականացել 40 հայաստանաբնակ և Ռուսաստանի սփյուռքում բնակվող էթնիկ հայերի շրջանում:

Ուսումնասիրության արդյունքները վեր են հանել էթնիկ ինքնության տիպերի և վերջինիս հետ կապված զգացմունքների գնահատման վիճակագրորեն նշանակալի տարբերությունները հարցվողների երկու խմբի՝ հայաստանաբնակ և ՌԴ տարածքում բնակվող էթնիկ հայերի միջև: Տիտղոսային էթնիկ խմբի հարցվածների շրջանում գերակշռում էր «նորմա կամ դրական էթնիկ ինքնություն» սանդղակը: Հաջորդ առավել ընդգծված սանդղակներն են «էթնոֆանատիզմը» և «էթնիկ անտարբերությունը»: Տիտղոսային էթնիկ խմբի հարցվողների մեջ ամենաքիչը արտահայտված է «էթնոնիհիլիզմը»: Սփյուռքի ներկայացուցիչների շրջանում ևս առավել տարածված է «նորմա կամ դրական էթնիկ ինքնություն» սանդղակը, սակայն երկրորդ և երրորդ առավել ընդգծվածները՝ «էթնիկ անտարբերությունը» և «էթնոֆանատիզմը», փոխվել են տեղերով: Սփյուռքի ներկայացուցիչների մեջ ամենաքիչը արտահայտված են «էթնոնիհիլիզմը» և «էթնոէգոիզմը»:

Էթնիկ պատկանելիության հետ կապված զգացմունքների գնահատումը ցույց է տվել, որ տիտղոսային էթնիկ խմբի ներկայացուցիչների մեծ մասն ունի էթնիկ ինքնության ուժեղ դրական հուզական գունավորում (հպարտություն) և նորմալ հուզական գունավորում (հանգիստ վստահություն) սեփական ինքնության նկատմամբ: Սփյուռքի ներկայացուցիչների

շրջանում նույնպես գերակշռում են էթնիկական ինքնության ուժեղ դրական հուզական գունավորումը (հպարտությունը) և էթնիկ ինքնության նորմալ հուզական գունավորումը (հանգիստ վստահություն), բայց ավելի ցածր ցուցանիշներով: Ի տարբերություն տիտղոսային էթնիկ խմբի ներկայացուցիչների՝ սփյուռքահայ ավելի մեծ թվով հարցվածներ հուզական գունավորման բացասական գնահատական են տվել:

Հետազոտության արդյունքների վիճակագրական վերլուծությունը թույլ է տվել բացահայտել հայերի էթնիկ ինքնության տիպերի և անձնային առանձնահատկությունների միջև կապը տարբեր սոցիալ-մշակութային պայմաններում՝ հայ տիտղոսային էթնիկ խմբի ներսում և ռուսական սփյուռքում: Հետազոտված երկու խմբի ներկայացուցիչների տարբերությունները պայմանավորված են սոցիալ-մշակութային միջավայրով: Նրանց դիրքորոշման երկակիությունը պայմանավորված է այն տիտղոսային էթնիկ խմբի ազդեցությամբ, որի կողքին նրանք բնակվում են:

Բանալի բառեր և բառակապակցություններ. էթնիկ ինքնության տիպեր, անձնային առանձնահատկություններ, փոխկապակցվածություն, տիտղոսային էթնիկ խմբի և սփյուռքի հայեր:

ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ ЭТНИЧЕСКОЙ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ И ОСОБЕННОСТЕЙ ЛИЧНОСТИ АРМЯН ВНУТРИ ТИТУЛЬНОГО ЭТНОСА И РОССИЙСКОЙ ДИАСПОРЫ

АСЯ БЕРБЕРЯН

Российско-Армянский университет,
заведующая кафедрой психологии,
доктор психологических наук, профессор
aspsy@inbox.ru

САТЕНИК ТЕПАНЯН

Российско-Армянский университет,
кафедра психологии,
аспирант
satenik_tepanyan@mail.ru

Аннотация

В последние годы проблемы этничности и этнической идентичности активно обсуждаются исследователями во многих странах. Процессы глобализации и непрерывного роста миграции предопределяют этническое разнообразие и подчёркивают значение этнической идентичности как в моно-, так и в полиэтнических обществах. Актуальность исследования обусловлена значимостью проблемы этнической идентичности в стремительно меняющемся мире. В статье представлено исследование понятия и сущности идентичности. Рассмотрены различные определения феномена идентичности, выделены типы этнической идентичности. Раскрыты условия развития этнической идентичности и её формирования. Проанализирована взаимосвязь типов этнической идентичности и особенностей личности, а также различия в типах этнической идентичности и оценке чувств, связанных с этнической идентичностью, в различной социокультурной среде.

Целью данной статьи является исследование взаимосвязи этнической идентичности, оценки чувств, связанных с этнической принадлежностью, а также особенностей личности армян в различной социокультурной среде – в Республике Армения и Российской Федерации. Для данной цели нами было проведено исследование, в котором приняли участие 40 респондентов (этнические армяне, проживающие на территории Армении и в российской диаспоре).

Результаты нашего исследования позволили нам выявить статистически значимые *различия в* типах этнической идентичности и оценке чувств, связанных с этнической принадлежностью, между двумя группами респондентов – этническими армянами, проживающими в Республике Армения и этническими армянами, проживающими на территории РФ. У респондентов титульного этноса преобладающей являлась шкала «норма или позитивная этническая идентич-

ность». Далее по выраженности следовали шкалы «этнофанатизм» и «этническая индифферентность». Наименее представленной у респондентов титульного этноса стала шкала «этнонигилизм». У представителей диаспоры наиболее часто встречаемой также стала шкала «норма или позитивная этническая идентичность», однако вторая и третья по выраженности шкалы «этническая индифферентность» и «этнофанатизм», поменялись местами. Наименее представленной у представителей диаспоры оказались шкалы «этнонигилизм» и «этноэгоизм».

Оценка чувств, связанных с этнической принадлежностью, показала, что у большинства представителей титульного этноса наблюдается гиперпозитивная эмоциональная окрашенность этнической идентичности (гордость) и спокойная уверенность в отношении собственной идентичности. Среди представителей диаспоры также преобладают гиперпозитивная эмоциональная окрашенность этнической идентичности (гордость) и нормальная эмоциональная окрашенность этнической идентичности (спокойная уверенность), но с более низкими показателями. В сравнении с представителями из титульного этноса, большее число респондентов из диаспоры дали негативную оценку эмоциональной окрашенности этнической идентичности.

Статистический анализ полученных результатов исследования позволил выявить взаимосвязь между типами этнической идентичности и особенностями личности армян в различных социокультурных условиях – в титульном армянском этносе и в российской диаспоре. Различия между представителями двух исследованных групп можно объяснить социокультурной средой – проживанием в титульном этносе или в диаспоре. Влияние титульного этноса, на территории которого проживают представители диаспоры, выступает причиной двойственности их положения.

Ключевые слова и словосочетания: типы этнической идентичности, особенности личности, взаимосвязь, армяне титульного этноса и диаспоры.

Introduction

Ethnicity has come to be a primary feature of social structure, self-understanding, everyday interactions, international networks, and political conflicts all over the world. Processes of globalization are drawing people from various places and different backgrounds into close relationships. The ongoing and accelerating flow of migration, the growth of diasporas and the emergence of Internet communities have posed all kinds of new and pressing questions. Many societies in the world are rapidly turning – or have already turned – ethnically and culturally plural. In the context of globalization and the consistent growth of migration, the problems of ethnic identity have become one of the primary inquiries of social sciences.

Ethnic diversity calls into question the existing social hierarchies and exclusionary conceptions of citizenship, thus leading to new tribalism. This diversity

brings forth the problem of ethnic identity in both mono- and polyethnic societies, specifically affecting the perception and evaluation of ethnic identity by ethnic minorities. Therefore, questions of ethnicity, migration, identity and ethnic identity, as well as multiculturalism have become topics of heated discussion in many countries. The increased importance of ethnicity and migration in contemporary public debates stated, it is not unforeseen that these are major topics in academic debates in several different disciplines, including but not limited to philosophy, sociology, political science, anthropology and, of course, psychology [1].

Problems of ethnic identity, its associations with personality traits, as well as personality development have come to the fore for researchers internationally. The relevance of our study is predicated on the necessity of an investigation of diverse samples and systematic cross-cultural differences in the era of multiculturalism and globalisation. The study is relevant due to the significance of the problem of ethnic identity in the rapidly changing world [2]. The relationship between ethnic identity and personality traits has been a topic of interest in previous research. Research on Armenians in the titular nation or the diaspora has been carried out by both Armenian and Russian psychologists.

The theoretical significance of our study lies in our theoretical analysis of the concept of ethnic identity in the works of Armenian, Russian and foreign psychologists. The practical significance of our study lies in the possibility of implementation of the results of our research.

The object of our research was to investigate the relationship between ethnic identity and personality traits among Armenians in different sociocultural environments. The subject of the research is the relationship between ethnic identity and personality traits in a sample of Armenians in the titular nation and the Armenian diaspora in Russia.

Our aim was to study the types of ethnic identity, the evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity as well as the personality traits of Armenians in the Republic of Armenia and the Russian Federation.

The hypotheses of our study were the following:

- 1) a relationship exists between the types of ethnic identity and the personality traits;
- 2) the types of ethnic identity and the evaluation of feelings related to ethnic identity are different in Armenians residing in the titular nation as compared to Armenians in the diaspora.

Our research is based on works by different scientists, among them E. Erikson, J.E. Marcia, G.H. Mead, and A.S. Waterman.

Theoretical and methodological framework

There are multiple theories and definitions of the concept of identity. The problem of identity has always been a cause for concern for many philosophers. Although, David Lewis argued that “we should not suppose that we have here any

problem about identity. We never have. Identity is utterly simple and unproblematic. Everything is identical to itself; nothing is ever identical to anything except itself. There is never any problem about what makes something identical to itself; nothing can ever fail to be” [3].

John Locke considers personal identity a matter of psychological continuity. He claims that personal identity (or the self) is to be founded on consciousness and is continuous over time [4]. Prominent American psychologist and philosopher William James defined personal identity as sameness and consistency of personality [5].

In the Dictionary of the American Psychological Association, identity is defined as “a sense of self, that is defined by a set of characteristics that is not wholly shared with any other individual, as well as a range of affiliations, such as ethnicity and social roles. Identity involves a sense of continuity or the feeling that one is the same person today that one was yesterday.” The Oxford English Dictionary defines identity as “the sameness of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances; the condition or fact that a person or thing is itself and not something else.” Identity thus reflects interrelation that presupposes the existence of others [6]. This concept defines the relationship between two or more entities, determining them as equal or the same [7].

According to Fromm, “identity of ‘I’ or self refers to the category of being and not having. I am ‘I’ only to the extent to which I am alive, interested, related, active, and to which I have achieved an integration between my appearance – to others and/or to myself – and the core of my personality” [8, p. 83].

Erikson’s impact on the formation of the concept of identity in psychology is of exceptional significance. According to him, identity is a “fundamental organizing principal” which constantly develops throughout the lifespan of a person. Identity is a complex construct that has three interconnected levels of human nature analysis: individual, personal and social. On the individual level identity includes the sense of continuity, while on the personal level identity represents the uniqueness of one’s life experience and singularity. On the social level identity acts as a construct of personality that reflects the internal solidarity of a person with social and group ideals and standards. Identity provides a sense of continuity within one's self and in interaction with others (“self-sameness”), as well as a frame to differentiate between self and others (“uniqueness”) which allows the individual to function autonomously from others [9].

According to Cooley, the concept of self of an individual is developed as a result of observing how they are perceived by others. Cooley referred to this concept as the “looking-glass self” [10]. Personality is formed as a result of multiple interactions with different people. Of significant importance are the interactions with the primary group, i.e. family, friends and peers, classmates, workplace and other groups. In this context, identity is a part of the self-concept and is linked with the group identification of the person.

Building on Erikson’s theory, Marcia defines identity formation as a process that involves decision points and commitments with respect to ideologies, such as religion

and politics, as well as occupations. Foreclosure ensues when an individual commits to an identity without exploring other options. Identity confusion/diffusion happens when adolescents don't explore or commit to any identities. A state in which an individual is actively exploring the options yet still has not made commitments to any identity is referred to as a moratorium. Individuals who have explored a variety of options and discovered their purpose, subsequently making commitments to the chosen identity appear to be in a state of identity achievement [11]. Decisions and commitment to choices contribute to the development of identity. The limited options or confined social situations highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the personality. Marcia acknowledged the fact that identity development may include a variety of other aspects, but based his identity model on the aspect of decision-making [12]. Berberyan and Tuchina consider that this statement by Marcia allows the assumption that a relationship exists between the problems of self-development and ethnic identity [13].

Waterman defines identity development as “movement from adolescence to adulthood which involves a preponderance of changes in identity status which can be characterized as progressive developmental shifts” [14, p. 343]. According to Waterman, identity is closely linked to the degree of self-acceptance and the commitment to goals, values and beliefs. Goals, values and beliefs are formed during identity crises as a result of choices made by the person. These three elements are crucial to identity development [14, 15].

Erikson's psychosocial theory of identity development proposes that human development happens in eight successive stages from infancy to adulthood. According to Erikson, the process of identity development presupposes the integration and differentiation of various interconnected elements (identifications). The resolution of each stage affects the succeeding stages [16]. Marcia shared Erikson's views on the lifespan model of identity development [17]. Waterman had similar views but summarized identity development as a series of interconnected choices as opposed to a single act [18].

According to Mead's theory, the concept of self is developed through interactions with others in a process of role-taking. The concept of self is not set at birth but develops during childhood. There are two phases of identity development: the play phase and the game phase [19]. Thus, identity is perceived as a phenomenon that develops through external social interactions [20].

Many researchers have suggested models of ethnic development [21]. Phinney's model focuses on the process of ethnic identity formation – a model that incorporates the theoretical concepts of Erikson and Marcia. The model consists of three stages in which ethnic identity is formed through adolescence to adulthood. According to Lebedeva and Tatarko, ethnic identity is a psychological category which reflects the awareness of belonging to a specific ethnic community, as well as the meaning and significance of belonging to that particular group [22]. Ethnic identity is a dynamic phenomenon and is influenced by the social group, as well as by personality traits and sociocultural conditions: mono- and polyethnic environments [23].

The concepts of identity and self-image are closely linked. According to Berberyan, “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” [24, p. 114]. A positive ethnic identity includes a positive attitude not only towards own people, but also towards other people.

Ethnic identity is a multidimensional concept. It refers to the awareness of belonging to a particular ethnic group, self-categorisation in which an individual identifies with an ethnic community. Ethnic identity denotes the significance and meaning given by the individual to their ethnic background, to the characteristics that connect and differentiate them from their social group [25, 26, 27]. The concept of ethnic identity is closely tied to such concepts as ethnicity, ethnic identification and self-identification, as well as personality traits.

Personality traits of Armenians have been studied by different scientists. Armenians are characterized as people with strong family values and respect for customs and traditions. Armenians are smart, witty and hardworking. They are hospitable, friendly and kind and have respect for everyone around them, especially the elderly. Armenians are intolerant of rude and disrespectful behaviour. They are able to control their feelings and are not aggressive, which helps them be good at communicating with representatives of different nationalities [28, 29].

Methods

Participants. Data collection was realized using an online platform. Participant recruitment was achieved following a snowball approach. A total of 40 respondents participated in the current study. The subjects represented two groups: ethnic Armenians residing in Armenia and ethnic Armenians residing in the Russian Federation. *The subject provided information on their age, gender, nationality, country of residence, level of education, professional field, as well as the duration of their residence in the country.* Descriptive statistics of the samples are presented in

Table 1

Descriptive statistics

Respondents	N
Sex:	
Male	5
Female	35
Age:	
Average age	34.7
Country of Residence:	
Ethnic Armenians in Armenia	22
Ethnic Armenians in Russia	18
Total	40

Methods. *We conducted the study of the respondents’ ethnic identity and personality traits by employing the following assessment techniques:*

1. The “Types of ethnic identity” technique by Soldatova and Ryzhova

This technique aims to investigate ethnic identity and its transformation. The questionnaire includes six scales which correspond to the six types of ethnic identity: ethnic nihilism, ethnic indifference, norm or positive ethnic identity, ethnic egoism, ethnic isolation and ethnic fanaticism. The questionnaire consists of 30 statements that indicate certain attitudes towards one’s own and other ethnic groups in different contexts of cross-ethnic relations.

2. The scale of express evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity by Lebedeva

This scale is utilized for evaluating the emotional colouring or valency of ethnic identity. It assesses the degree of positivity of feelings related to ethnic identity and is designed as a Likert-type scale.

3. The Big Five Inventory by Costa and McCrae

The BFI is a self-report inventory that measures personality traits using the Big Five Factor Markers. The version we chose for this study consists of 75 pairs of opposite characteristic statements, which are rated on a five-point Likert-type scale. The scale is designed to measure the big five personality traits: extraversion vs. introversion, agreeableness vs. antagonism, conscientiousness vs. lack of direction, emotional stability vs. neuroticism, and openness to experience vs. closedness to experience.

Results

The analysis of the types of ethnic identity according to the “Types of ethnic identity” technique (Soldatova, Ryzhova) (see Table 2) revealed a high tendency towards the scales “norm or positive ethnic identity” (30% of all respondents), “ethnic isolation” (2.5%) and “ethnic fanaticism” (5%). High scores are observed toward the following scales: “norm or positive ethnic identity” (57.5% of all respondents), “ethnic fanaticism” (35%), as well as the scales “ethnic indifference” (10%), “ethnic isolations” (10%) and “ethnic egoism” (5%). Average scores are revealed towards “ethnic indifference” (42.5% of participants) and “ethnic isolation” (32.5%). 30% of the respondents had average results on the scales “ethnic egoism” and “ethnic fanaticism.” Apart from that, it was observed that 20% and 10% of the subjects had average scores on the scales of “ethnic nihilism” and “norm or positive ethnic identity” respectively. Lowered results are revealed toward the scales “ethnic indifference” in 42.4% of the respondents, “ethnic nihilism” in 40%, as well as the scales “ethnic egoism” (30%), “ethnic isolation” (25%), “ethnic fanaticism” (15%), and “norm or positive identity” in just 2.5%. 32.5% of participants scored low in “ethnic nihilism”, while 30% scored low in “ethnic egoism”, followed by a low score in “ethnic isolation” by 27.5%, as well in “ethnic fanaticism” by 15% and “ethnic indifference” by 5%. In some of the subjects we revealed no tendency towards the scales “ethnic nihilism”, “ethnic egoism” and “ethnic isolation.”

Table 2

***Types of ethnic identity among the respondents (n=40) according to the
“Types of ethnic identity” scale (by G.U. Soldatova, S.V. Ryzhova)***

Types of ethnic identity	No tendency		Low scores		Lowered scores		Average scores		High scores		High tendency	
	abs. Value	%	abs. Value	%	abs. Value	%	abs. Value	%	abs. value	%	abs. value	%
Ethnic nihilism	3	7.5	13	32.5	16	40	8	20	0	0	0	0
Ethnic indifference	0	0	2	5	17	42.5	17	42.5	4	10	0	0
Norm (positive identity)	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	4	10	23	57.5	12	30
Ethnic egoism	2	5	12	30	12	30	12	30	2	5	0	0
Ethnic isolationism	1	2.5	11	27.5	10	25	13	32.5	4	10	1	2.5
Ethnic fanaticism	0	0	6	15	6	15	12	30	14	35	2	5

As can be seen in Table 2, “norm or positive ethnic identity” prevails in the majority of the respondents (87.5%). “Ethnic fanaticism”, “ethnic isolation” and “ethnic indifference” are also significantly manifested. The least manifested types of ethnic identity are “ethnic nihilism” and “ethnic egoism.”

The assessment of feelings related to ethnic identity revealed that the majority of the respondents (47.5%) noted strong positive feelings related to ethnic identity (pride). 30% of the respondents experience calm confidence in relation to their ethnicity, while 10% have no feelings at all. 12.5% of the respondents noted negative feelings related to their ethnic identity, of which 7.5% feel infringement and humiliation, while 5% noted resentment in relation to their ethnic identity.

The analysis of the results of the Big Five Inventory (Costa and McCrae) showed the big five factors or personality traits of the respondents (see Table 3). In the titular Armenian nation, 36.4% of the respondents had a high score in extraversion, while another 36.4% had an average score. The remaining 27.2% of the subjects scored low. The majority of the respondents in the titular nation (77.3%) had a high score in agreeableness, the second factor of personality. 18.2% and 4.5% of the samples in the titular nation scored average and low respectively. A high score in conscientiousness was revealed in the majority of the titular nation respondents (81.8%), while 4.5% of the respondents had an average score and 13.6% scored low. 54.5% of respondents of the titular nation scored high in emotional stability vs. neuroticism, the fourth factor of personality. 31.8% had an average score, while 13.6% scored low. A high score in openness to experience was observed in 72.7% of the respondents. An average score was revealed in 18.2%, the remaining 9% scored low.

In the conditions of the diaspora, the majority of the subjects scored high in extraversion, while 27.7% had an average score and 11.1% had a low score. 66.6% of the respondents in the diaspora setting had a high score, 22.2% has an average score and 11.1% scored low in agreeableness. The majority of the respondents in the conditions of the diaspora (77.8%) had a high score in conscientiousness vs. lack of direction. 16.7% had an average score and 5.5% scored low. A high score in emotional stability vs. neuroticism is observed in 83.3% of the representatives of the diaspora, while 16.7% had an average score. No low score in emotional stability vs. neuroticism was determined in the diaspora samples. 77.8% of the respondents in the diaspora setting had a high score in openness to experience, while 16.7% and 5.5% of the subjects scored average and low respectively. No statistically significant differences were observed between the two groups.

Table 3

Personality traits of the respondents according to the Big Five Inventory (P. Costa and R. McCrae)

Factors of personality	Respondents from title ethnos (n=22)			Respondents from diaspora (n=18)		
	High	Average	Low	High	Average	Low
Extraversion vs. Introversion	36.4%	36.4%	27.2%	61.1%	27.7%	11.1%
Agreeableness vs. Antagonism	77.3%	18.2%	4.5%	66.6%	22.2%	11.1%
Conscientiousness vs. Lack of direction	81.8%	4.5%	13.6%	77.8%	16.7%	5.5%
Emotional stability vs. Neuroticism	54.5%	31.8%	13.6%	83.3%	16.7%	0%
Openness to experience vs. Closedness to experience	72.7%	18.2%	9%	77.8%	16.7%	5.5%

Statistics

Correlation analysis of the obtained results revealed a link between the types of ethnic identity and the personality traits of the respondents. According to our first hypothesis, we observed a weak positive correlation between the scale “norm or positive ethnic identity” and three of the factors of personality: extraversion vs. introversion ($r = 0.2737$), conscientiousness vs. lack of direction ($r = 0.2024$), emotional stability vs. neuroticism ($r = 0.2779$). A weak positive correlation is observed between “ethnic isolation” and two factors of personality, namely agreeableness vs. antagonism ($r = 0.319$) and emotional stability vs. neuroticism ($r = 0.2229$). A relationship is observed between the scale “ethnic nihilism” and the factor emotional stability vs. neuroticism ($r = 0.2807$), as well as between “ethnic egoism” and the factors extraversion vs. introversion ($r = 0.2147$) and agreeableness vs. antagonism ($r = 0.255$). Additionally, a weak positive correlation is observed between “ethnic fanaticism” and the factor of agreeableness vs. antagonism ($r = 0.2672$). Furthermore, a weak negative correlation is observed between “ethnic indifference” and two factors of personality, those being agreeableness vs. antagonism ($r = -0.2498$) and conscientiousness vs. lack of direction ($r = -0.2005$).

According to our second hypothesis, we identified statistically significant differences in the types of ethnic identity and the evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity in Armenians in different socio-cultural environments (in the titular nation and the diaspora in Russia). In the conditions of the titular nation, the scale “norm or positive ethnic identity” (arith. mean – 14.8) prevailed significantly, “ethnic fanaticism” (arith. mean – 10.9) and “ethnic indifference” (arith. mean – 8.6) followed closely. The least represented was the scale “ethnic nihilism.” In the diaspora samples “norm or positive ethnic identity” (arith. mean – 15.7) prevailed significantly as well, however, the second and third most prominent results – “ethnic indifference” (arith. mean – 10) and “ethnic fanaticism” (arith. mean – 8.8) – were switched. The least represented scales were “ethnic nihilism” and “ethnic egoism.”

The assessment of feelings related to ethnic identity is presented in Table 4. According to this evaluation, the majority of the representatives of the titular nation (54.5%) noted strong positive feelings related to ethnic identity (pride). 27.3% of the respondents in the titular nation felt calm confidence in relation to their ethnic identity, 9% had no feelings, while another 9% gave a negative evaluation (infringement/humiliation). There were no subjects in the titular nation that experienced resentment towards their ethnic identity. Strong positive feelings (pride) were also noted in the conditions of the diaspora (38.9%). 33.3% of the diaspora samples gave a normal evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity (calm confidence). A negative assessment of their feelings in relation to their ethnic identity was noted by 16.6% of the respondents in the diaspora, of which 11.1% felt resentment, while 5.5% mentioned infringement and humiliation. 11.1% of the subjects in the diaspora setting had no feelings related to their ethnicity.

Table 4

Assessment of the valence of the ethnic identity of the respondents according to the scale “Express evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity” (N.M. Lebedeva)

Evaluation of feelings related to ethnicity	Respondents from title ethnos (n=22)		Respondents from diaspora (n=18)	
	abs. value	%	abs. value	%
Pride	12	54.5	7	38.9
calm confidence	6	27.3	6	33.3
no feelings	2	9	2	11.1
resentment	0	0	2	11.1
infringement/ humiliation	2	9	1	5.6

Conclusions

The obtained results allow us to partially confirm our hypotheses. Based on the analysis of the results of our study, we have come to the following conclusions:

1. Identity is a structure that consists of different elements and is subjectively perceived as sameness and continuity of personality. The concept of identity reflects interrelation and presupposes the existence of others that recognize

their sameness and continuity. The sameness of a person at all times and under all circumstances is identity. Ethnic identity is a multidimensional concept that refers to the awareness of belonging to a particular ethnic community. It is self-categorisation in which an individual identifies with an ethnic group. Ethnic identity denotes the significance and meaning given by the individual to their ethnic background, to the characteristics that connect and differentiate them from their social group.

2. *The data allowed us to identify statistically significant differences in the types of ethnic identity and evaluations of feelings related to ethnic identity in the two groups – ethnic Armenians residing in the Republic of Armenia and ethnic Armenians residing in the Russian Federation. The study revealed a weak correlation between several types of ethnic identity and the personality traits in Armenians under the two aforementioned differing sociocultural conditions. The differences among the representatives of the two studied groups are influenced by the sociocultural situation. The influence of the titular nation in whose territory the representatives of the diaspora live causes the duality of their situation.*

The studied problem was relevant because investigations of the relationship between ethnic identity and personality traits in different sociocultural contexts are necessary in the era of multiculturalism and globalisation.

Acknowledgements

Our study was conducted with the financial support of the State Science Committee of the RA MoESCS within the framework of project № 10-2/217-03.

REFERENCES

1. Verkuyten, M. The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity (European Monographs in Social Psychology). Psychology Press, 2004. — 256 p.
2. Hakobyan N., Khachatryan A., Marginality and Ethno-Cultural Environment // *Paradigmata poznani*, 2018, 3, pp. 44-51.
3. Lewis 1986, Lewis, David K. (1986) *On the Plurality of Worlds* Oxford: Blackwell, 280 pages - 192–193
4. Локк Д. Сочинения: В 3 т. М., 1985. — 668 с.
5. Джемс У. Психология / Под ред. Л.А. Петровской. М., 1991. — 368 с.
6. Бернс Р. Развитие Я-концепции и воспитание / Р. Бернс. М.: Прогресс, 1986. — 420 с.
7. Ricoeur P. Narrative Identity / P. Ricoeur // *Philosophy Today*. — 1991. — Vol. 35, № 1. — P. 73–81.
8. Fromm, E. *The Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1968. — 162 p.
9. Erikson, E. H. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. W. W. Norton & Company, 1994. — 336 p.

10. Cooley, C.H. Social Process. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918. — P. 19–21.
11. Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(5), P. 551–558.
12. Антонова Н.В. Проблема личностной идентичности в интерпретации современного психоанализа, интеракционизма и когнитивной психологии // *Вопросы психологии*. 1996. № 1. — С. 131–143.
13. Berberyan, A. S., & Tuchina, O. R. Issledovanie osobennostei samointerpretatsii lichnosti v raznykh etnicheskikh obshnostyakh [Study of self-interpretation features of personality in different ethnic communities]. *Chelovek. Soobshchestvo. Uravlenie* [Personality. Community. Management]. 2014. — P. 86–100.
14. Waterman A.S. Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review // *Devel. Psychol.* 1982. V. 18. N 3. — P. 341–358.
15. Identity in adolescence: Processes and contents / Waterman A.S. (ed.) San Francisco L.: Jossey-Bass, 1985. — 105 p.
16. Erikson E.H. The problem of ego identity // Stein M.R. et al. (eds.) *Identity and anxiety: Survival of the person in mass society*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960. — 658 p.
17. Marcia J.E. Identity in adolescence // Adelson J. (ed.) *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. N.Y.: John Wiley, 1980. — p.109-137.
18. Waterman A.S. Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review // *Devel. Psychol.* 1982. V. 18. N 3. — P. 341–358.
19. Matteson, D.R. Adolescence today // D.R. Matteson. *Sex roles and the search for identity*. Homewood (Ill), 1975. — 250 p.
20. Mead G.H. *Mind, self and Society*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1946. — 437 p.
21. Hakobyan N., Khachatryan A., *Socio-Cultural Interpretation of Person's Psychological Resources in Emergency Situations // Main Issues of Pedagogy and Psychology*, 2020, vol. 17, issue 1, pp. 65-82.
22. Лебедева Н. М., Татарко А.Н. Методы этнической и кросс-культурной психологии: учебно-методическое пособие. М.: Изд-во ВШЭ. 2011. — 240 р.
23. Берберян А. С., Найденов В. Г., Исследование взаимосвязи этнической идентичности и толерантности студентов. *Человек. Сообщество. Управление*, 2016. Том 17. №3. — С. 25- 34.
24. Берберян А. С. Этнопсихологические аспекты смысло-жизненных и ценностных ориентаций студенческой молодежи / А. С. Берберян, Э. С. Берберян // *Вопр. психологии*. — 2017. № 1. — С. 103–116.
25. Аклаев А.Р. *Этнополитическая конфликтология. Анализ и менеджмент*. — М., 2008. — С.58.

26. Бакланов И.С., Душина Т.В., Микеева О.А. Человек этнический: проблема этнической идентичности // Вопросы социальной теории. 2010. Том IV. — С. 396-408.
27. Hakobyan N., Khachatryan A., Methodological Approaches to the Study of Person's Identity // Katchar Scientific Periodical, 2020, 2, 60-67.
28. Крысько В. Г. Этническая психология. 4-е издание. Учебное пособие. — М.: Академия, 2008. — 320 с.
29. Hakobyan N., Khachatryan A., Person's Marginalization Process and the Forms of Social Interactions // Проблемы развития личности в условиях глобализации: психологопедагогические аспекты. 2020, pp. 25-37.

The article has been submitted for publication: 17.01.2023
Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է տպագրության. 17.01.2023
Статья представлена к публикации: 17.01.2023

The article is sent for review: 23.02.2023
Հոդվածն ուղարկվել է գրախոսության. 23.02.2023
Статья отправлена на рецензию: 23.02.2023

The article is accepted for publication: 15.05.2023
Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության. 15.05.2023
Статья принята к печати: 15.05.2023