

Well-Being and Educational Outcomes Among Students with Different University Admission Strategies

Tatiana N. Tikhomirova

Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6748-763X>, e-mail: tikho@mail.ru

Victor S. Basyuk

Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2448-0673>, e-mail: basyuk.victor@raop.ru

Victoria I. Ismatullina

Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5096-4313>, e-mail: victoria2686@gmail.com

Elena V. Zinchenko

Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7262-9583>, e-mail: evzinchenko@sfedu.ru

Natalia V. Matyash

Bryansk State University named after Academician I.G. Petrovsky, Bryansk, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7991-7257>, e-mail: vds-24@yandex.ru

Olga A. Ovsyannikova

Oryol State University named after I.S. Turgenev, Orel, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0885-1297>, e-mail: olenka_letters@mail.ru

Sergei A. Pilipenko

Moscow State Linguistic University, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0303-8410>, e-mail: spilipenko2018@yandex.ru

Irina D. Ponikarova

St. Petersburg University of Civil Aviation named after A.A. Novikov, St. Petersburg, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0588-6700>, e-mail: ira.ponikarova@gmail.com

Tatiana N. Sakharova

Moscow Pedagogical State University, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1380-4812>, e-mail: sakharova@mail.ru

Nina A. Sluch

Russian University of Transport, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3634-7200>, e-mail: sanctus78@mail.ru

Sergey B. Malykh

Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3786-7447>, e-mail: malykhsb@mail.ru

The study presents results of examining the psychological well-being and educational outcomes of first-year students based on their university admission strategies. The study included students who entered universities according to their results from the Unified State Examinations, being winners in school subject competitions, those who came via targeted recruitment or graduated from secondary vocational education institutions, and also those who entered the university via

ing the combination of Unified State Examination results with additional entrance examinations organized by universities. The research focused on indicators of well-being, subjective happiness, and anxiety among first-year students, as well as their performance in the first examination session. 4,920 first-year students from 19 universities across the Russian Federation were recruited for this study, comprising 57.5% girls, with an average age of 18.6 years (standard deviation: 1.6). The findings indicate that first-year students employing different admission strategies exhibit varying levels of well-being, subjective happiness, and anxiety, revealing distinct combinations of these traits. Notably, personal anxiety showed the greatest variability among first-year students based on their admission strategy. The choice of admission strategy is closely linked to students' educational outcomes during their first academic year. Furthermore, the unique combinations of psychological well-being indicators among groups of students with different admission strategies may either strengthen or weaken this correlation. The data highlighting the group-specific manifestations of psychological states based on admission strategies could serve as a scientific foundation for organizing psychological support in higher education.

Keywords: university admission strategies; psychological well-being; subjective happiness; anxiety; educational outcomes; first-year students.

Acknowledgements. The authors express their gratitude to the first-year students of the universities for participating in the study, to the heads and specialists of university psychological services for their organizational support, and to the representatives of university management for their scientific collaboration with researchers from the Russian Academy of Education.

For citation: Tikhomirova T.N., Basyuk V.S., Ismatullina V.I., Zinchenko E.V., Matyash N.V., Ovsyanikova O.A., Pilipenko S.A., Ponikarova I.D., Sakharova T.N., Sluch N.A., Malych S.B. Well-Being and Educational Outcomes Among Student with Different University Admission Strategies. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2024. Vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 35—53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290603> (In Russ.).

Психологическое благополучие и образовательные результаты студентов с различными стратегиями поступления в вуз

Тихомирова Т.Н.

ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»),
г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6748-763X>, e-mail: tikho@mail.ru

Басюк В.С.

ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»),
г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2448-0673>, e-mail: basyuk.victor@raop.ru

Исматуллина В.И.

ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»),
г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5096-4313>, e-mail: victoria2686@gmail.com

Зинченко Е.В.

ФГАОУ ВО «Южный федеральный университет»
(ФГАОУ ВО «ЮФУ»), г. Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7262-9583>, e-mail: evzinchenko@sfedu.ru

Матяш Н.В.

ФГБОУ ВО «Брянский государственный университет
имени академика И.Г. Петровского» (ФГБОУ ВО «БГУ»)
г. Брянск, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7991-7257>, e-mail: vds-24@yandex.ru

Овсянникова О.А.

ФГБОУ ВО «Орловский государственный университет
имени И.С. Тургенева» (ФГБОУ ВО «ОГУ имени И.С. Тургенева»),
г. Орел, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0885-1297>, e-mail: olenka_letters@mail.ru

Пилипенко С.А.

ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный лингвистический
университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГЛУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0303-8410>, e-mail: spilipenko2018@yandex.ru

Поникарова И.Д.

ФГБОУ ВО «Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет
гражданской авиации имени Главного маршала авиации
А.А. Новикова» (ФГБОУ ВО СПбГУ ГА им. А.А. Новикова),
г. Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0588-6700>, e-mail: ira.ponikarova@gmail.com

Сахарова Т.Н.

ФГБОУ ВО «Московский педагогический государственный университет»
(ФГБОУ ВО «МПГУ»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1380-4812>, e-mail: sakharova@mail.ru

Случ Н.А.

ФГАОУ ВО «Российский университет транспорта» (ФГАОУ ВО РУТ (МИИТ)),
г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3634-7200>, e-mail: sanctus78@mail.ru

Малых С.Б.

ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»)
г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3786-7447>, e-mail: malykhsb@mail.ru

Представлены результаты исследования психологического благополучия и образовательных достижений студентов первых курсов в зависимости от стратегии поступления в вуз — по результатам государственных экзаменов, победителей школьных олимпиад, в рамках целевого набора, после окончания колледжей или по объединенным данным экзаменов и дополнительных вступительных испытаний, организованных вузами. В фокусе исследовательского внимания оказываются показатели психологического самочувствия, субъективного счастья, тревожности первокурсников и результаты их первой экзаменационной сессии. В исследовании принимали участие 4920 студентов первых курсов 19 образовательных организаций высшего образования Российской Федерации (57,5% девушек; средний возраст участников — 18,6 года, стандартное отклонение — 1,6). Показано, что первокурсники с разными стратегиями

поступления в вуз различаются по уровню психологического самочувствия, субъективного счастья и тревожности, демонстрируя уникальные сочетания выраженности этих признаков. При этом личностная тревожность выступает тем показателем психологического благополучия, который в наибольшей степени различается у первокурсников в зависимости от стратегии поступления в вуз. Выбор стратегии поступления оказывается взаимосвязанным с образовательными результатами студента на первом учебном году, а уникальное сочетание выраженности признаков психологического благополучия в группах студентов с различными стратегиями поступления может усиливать или ослаблять эту взаимосвязь. Полученные данные о групповой уникальности проявления признаков психологического состояния в зависимости от стратегии поступления могут стать научной основой организации психологического сопровождения высшего образования.

Ключевые слова: стратегия поступления в вуз; психологическое благополучие; самочувствие; счастье; тревожность; образовательные результаты; студенты первых курсов.

Благодарности. Авторы благодарят студентов первых курсов российских вузов — за участие в исследовании, руководителей и специалистов вузовских психологических служб — за организационное сопровождение исследования, представителей руководства вузов — за научное сотрудничество с учеными Российской академии образования.

Для цитаты: Тихомирова Т.Н., Басюк В.С., Исмагуллина В.И., Зинченко Е.В., Матяш Н.В., Овсянникова О.А., Пилипенко С.А., Поникарова И.Д., Сахарова Т.Н., Случ Н.А., Малых С.Б. Психологическое благополучие и образовательные результаты студентов с различными стратегиями поступления в вуз // Психологическая наука и образование. 2024. Том 29. № 6. С. 35—53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290603>

Introduction

Entering university is a pivotal point in every young man's life, which on the one hand determines their future professional self-realization, and on the other requires the maximum actualization and stable functioning of individual psychological resources [1; 2]. In the Russian Federation there are numerous ways to enter university, each of them implies its own extent of "involvement", the period of active "utilization" and the number of spikes of maximum actualization of individual resources to achieve admission.

According to the Procedure for admission to higher education programs — bachelor's degree programs, specialist programs, master's degree programs, admission to universities is carried out on a

competitive basis based on the results of the Unified State Examinations [9]. Upon completion of school education, exams are taken in compulsory general education disciplines and subjects, which are determined by the university as entrance examinations. As a rule, the most active preparation for passing the state final certification in educational programs of secondary general education in the form of the Unified State Examination (hereinafter — USE) begins one year before the expected date of the exam and continues throughout the 11th grade, often with the help of additional classes with school and / or specially invited teachers, depending on the capabilities of the high school student's family.

Besides that, universities have a right to hold additional entry tests on specialties

or training programs, which require applicants to have a certain degree of artistic skills, fitness, psychological qualities, primarily in such areas as art, architecture, healthcare, physical education, pedagogy, media communication, etc. [11]. Only some highly-rated universities can hold additional entry tests in comprehensive disciplines, regardless of the specialty or the training program specificity. The programs of additional entry tests are posted by such universities in the public domain, and preparation for them can be carried out within the framework of preparatory courses of varying duration and intensity: from two-month intensive training to courses that can span several years, designed to prepare pupils starting in their 9th year. At the same time, preparation for additional entrance examinations at the university does not eliminate the need for consistent, hard work throughout the senior grades of school to achieve maximum success in the Unified State Exam, the results of which must be competitive when entering highly-ranked universities.

At the same time, applicants have an opportunity to be admitted into university without having to take entry tests, particularly by the results of pupils Olympiads (article 71 [14]). Thus, winners and prize winners of school Olympiads have the right to guaranteed admission to universities without entrance examinations or to be equal to persons who have scored the maximum number of points on the Unified State Examination in a specialized general education subject or who have successfully passed additional entrance examinations of a creative or professional nature. The guarantee of admission to a university makes the Olympiads attractive for schoolchildren of different age categories, but targeted work on participation in Olympiad competitions that give the right to admission without entrance examinations begins in grades 7—8,

when it is necessary to begin winning from stage to stage in the Olympiads of the chosen profile and level [10].

Within the framework of a separate competition, universities conduct admission to targeted training for places in a specially allocated target quota, when the customer organization interested in the future employee can support the student with additional social payments, for example, a scholarship, compensation for housing rent, etc., subject to the student's subsequent work for the customer for a period of at least three and no more than five years [8]. If it is possible to conclude an agreement on targeted training, the applicant is effectively guaranteed admission to the university without the need for high scores on the Unified State Exam, and the issue of further employment is also resolved.

In some universities a separate competition is held for the applicants who have completed secondary vocational training only on the basis of internal exams in general education and (or) creative disciplines without the need to pass the Unified State Exam. Moreover, in some universities college graduates' training can be accelerated, giving them a chance to get higher education faster than their peers who enter university upon graduating from comprehensive schools.

Each of these paths eventually leads to university admission on a state-funded place, but the choice of the strategy depends on the capabilities of the applicant's family and on his individual psychological resources, which allow or inhibit the realization of the chosen strategy. Target quota admission is characterized by the minimal amount of time and intensity of psychological resources without any spikes of extreme actualization. Striking a deal with an organization practically guarantees the applicant admission, extra social support

and further employment. By contrast, entering university by the results of the USE and extra entry tests requires applicants to demonstrate prolonged intellectual activity during the preparation phase, serious emotional stress during the examination at school and competitive tests at university, and also frequent actualization of regulatory capabilities and individual traits necessary for achieving the result.

According to the resource approach to the functioning of the psyche, prolonged psychological stress, typical for some enrollment strategies, at a certain stage can lead to substantial inhibition or loss of individual resources in the sphere of intellectual, personal or emotional development [1; 3; 20, etc.]. Inhibition of a certain resource, exacerbated by inability or impossibility to “redistribute”, causes the state of academic stress, which applicants fall into due to various deadlines, constant fear of losing a competitive test, failing to enroll into university, etc. The young man perceives this condition as psychological distress, which negatively affects the realization of relevant life goals in particular, and psychological well-being in general in the long run [1; 12].

The phenomenon of psychological distress, also known as psychological well-being in the terminology of positive psychology, is a multi-tiered structure, which is deeply intertwined with such concepts as happiness, subjective well-being, psychological well-being, anxiety, quality of life (for more details see [4; 5]). Cognation of these terms, from synonymity to generic relations, depends on the approach to the analysis of psychological well-being and theories, formulated within the framework of hedonistic and eudaemonist philosophy [17]. At the same time, when operationalizing concepts that reflect the general state of mental balance, psychological comfort and happiness, predominantly noticeable and high-intensity relationships are observed,

for example, between psychological well-being and happiness, happiness and personal well-being, etc. ($0.47 < r < 0.77$; $p < 0.001$) [7]. And usage of a particular term in empirical researches largely depends on the method of estimating the certain indicator of psychological well-being.

At the same time, among all the indicators or components of psychological well-being that are a more realistic reflection of its manifestation, the current psychological condition, feeling of happiness and frequency of anxieties can be highlighted.[7; 18; 19; 26 etc.]. The current psychological condition is defined through self-estimation of the individual psychological state, mood, serenity and positive energy [26]. It is proven that psychological condition ensures effective operation of the individual, and stressful events that last a long time or are intense can cause frequent mood swings, disruption of sleep patterns, decrease of everyday activity, apathy [22; 24; 27 etc.].

Traditionally, happiness is perceived as a complete synonym to psychological well-being and is defined as a state of maximum manifestation of positive emotions [5]. So, we see that the subjective feeling of happiness not only correlates with psychological well-being, but also directly affects the declared level of well-being and positive socialization [19]. Along with that, the studies only give information on moderate connection between these two indicators, which allows to feel happiness under certain circumstances while having a moderate level of general psychological well-being [e.g., 7].

Anxiety, personal first of all, which reflects the individual inclination to feeling anxious about certain events and perception of these events as potentially dangerous, is not only connected to the status of psychological well-being, but also affects academic results. [6; 13; 16; 25]. At the

same time there is a non-linear correlation between anxiety and academic achievements. The best academic results require the optimal level of anxiety [21]. Thus, students with low anxiety have lower attention, lack incentives for studying and lack personal responsibility for their academic results [13; 15]. On the contrary, high levels of anxiety will manifest in constant stress, feeling of uneasiness, emotional instability, what ultimately increases the risk of alienation and causes inability to follow your daily routine [16; 25].

First-year students are the most vulnerable category of young people, which on the one hand can retain the negative effects of university admission procedures, and on the other hand face the first year adaptation risks connected with their first examination session, self-studying, competing with their course mates [1; 2]. At the same time it appears to be necessary to focus our attention on various first year students' groups with different enrollment strategies, which, as already shown before, are characterized by different intensity and duration of "application" of individual psychological resources.

The objective of the research is to analyze the peculiarities of psychological well-being of first-year students and their academic achievements depending on their enrollment strategy. The priority of the study is the comparative analysis of the three indicators of psychological well-being among first-year students: general psychological condition, happiness, anxiety, as well as the percentage distribution of excellent and unsatisfactory academic achievements among first-year students depending on their enrollment strategy.

Materials and Methods

Four thousand nine hundred and twenty students from 19 universities from 7 federal regions of the Russian federation partici-

pated on the study. The average age of the participants is 18.6 years (standard deviation = 1.6), 57.5 % are women, 98% are on-campus students, 69.4% are state-funded. No significant statistical difference in all the analyzed indicators of psychological well-being was found in regard to the basis and form of education ($p > 0.05$).

Among the participants: 73.3% were admitted based on their USE results; 2.4% based on school Olympiads; 7% enrolled on a target quota; 7.4% — upon completing secondary vocational education; 9.2% — USE and extra university tests combined. It is worth mentioning that 0.7% are the students who entered university otherwise, e.g. special quotas, etc. The results of these categories were not included in the statistical analysis.

The research was carried out during the second half of the year (February — May) on computers in IT classrooms following the unified protocol, instructional texts and assigning id codes to the participants in strict accordance with Federal Law No. 152-FZ "On Personal Data". Under the supervision of the researcher the participants did test exercises in the same order reviewing the informed consent and obtaining the appropriate consent. Before completing the test tasks, each participant in the study provided information about their strategy for entering university and the results of the first examination session.

The indicators of psychological well-being

Current psychological condition

The level of psychological condition was estimated using the self-assessment questionnaire ("The WHO-5 Well-Being Index", [26]). The questionnaire includes five statements, for example, "I am in a good mood and feel cheerful", "I feel active and energetic", "I wake up and feel fresh and relaxed", etc.

The participants were asked to choose one variant which best fits the evaluation of their condition with the last two weeks: “All of the time”, “Most of the time”, “More than half of the time”, “Less than half of the time”, “Sometimes”, “Never”. The index of psychological condition is counted in points, calculated in accordance with the guidelines, in the range from 0 to 25, with the possibility of converting to percentage.

Happiness

The level of subjective happiness was estimated with the self-assessment questionnaire (“The Subjective Happiness Scale” [23]). The questionnaire consists of four statements with a question, for example: “Some people are usually very happy. They enjoy life no matter what, making the most out of it. How much is it like you?” The participants were to estimate on the scale from 1 to 7 to what extent each statement could reflect their condition. The level of subjective happiness is calculated according to the guidelines and is represented by the sum number from 7 to 28 [7].

Anxiety

The level of personal anxiety was diagnosed with the scale of personal anxiety self-assessment questionnaire “State-Trait Anxiety Inventory” [13]. The scale includes 20 statements, for example: “I feel anxious when I think about my affairs and obligations”, “I take my failures too hard and can’t let go of them for a long time”, “There is a little thought in my head bothering me”, etc. The participants were to choose one the answers: “Almost never”, “Sometimes”, “Often”, “Almost all the time” according to their feelings. The level of personal anxiety is estimated with the sum from 20 to 80 points, which, according to the guidelines can be low (below 30 points), moderate (31-44) or high (45 or more).

Academic achievements

The study records the results of the first examination session. Before completing the tasks each participant was to answer which marks they got at their first session choosing one of the options: only 5; 5 and 4; 5,4,3; all 4; 4 and 3; all 3; failed examinations.

Results

Psychological well-being of students with different enrollment strategies

The study analyzes the indicators of the current psychological condition, happiness and personal anxiety among first-year students depending on their enrollment strategy — based on the results of the USE, school Olympiads, target quotas, upon completing secondary vocational training or USE results plus extra university examinations combined. Table 1 demonstrates the average values and standard deviation of the indicators of psychological well-being of the first-year students with different enrollment strategies.

Table 1 shows the current level of psychological condition as a percentage with minimum and maximum values of 0 and 100 respectively, the level of subjective happiness on a scale from 4 to 28 points and the level of personal anxiety on a scale from 20 to 80 points.

According to the statistics, the highest level of psychological condition was recorded among target-quota first-year students. The average of 66.03 with the standard deviation of 20.6. At the same time, lowered figures were recorded among two groups: those who entered university after completing secondary vocational training and (the average of 59.73 with the standard deviation of 24.5) and based on the results of school Olympiads (the average of 59.46 with the standard deviation of 23.8). At the same time, the Olympiad winners are the happiest group (the average of 18.65 with

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of psychological well-being indicators of students with different university admission strategy

University admission strategy	Mean (Standard Deviation)		
	Psychological Well-being	Subjective Happiness	Anxiety
based on the results of the Unified State Examinations	62,64 (20,9)	18,03 (3,3)	41,27 (11,1)
winners and prize-winners of school Olympic competitions	59,46 (23,8)	18,65 (3,3)	43,97 (8,8)
within the framework of targeted recruitment	66,03 (20,6)	18,42 (3,4)	38,53 (10,0)
after graduating from secondary vocational education institutions	59,73 (24,5)	17,15 (4,0)	42,27 (10,4)
based on the results of the Unified State Examinations and Additional examinations	62,16 (20,6)	18,43 (3,6)	43,86 (10,5)

the standard deviation of 3.3). Significantly less happy are the secondary vocational students (the average of 17.15 with the standard deviation of 4.0).

The highest levels of anxiety are recorded among the Olympiad winners (the average of 43.97 with the standard deviation of 8.8) and USE and extra university exams combined (the average of 43.86 with the standard deviation of 10.5). The minimum value of anxiety was recorded among the target-quota students (the average of 38.53 with the standard deviation of 10.0) Therefore, the average values for all the indicators demonstrate difference between the groups depending on their enrollment strategy.

The authenticity of the group differences in the indicators of psychological well-being and their evaluation was carried out with the single-factor analysis of variance method. The enrollment strategy was used as the categorical factor, and the dependent variable was introduced consecutively by the indicators of psychological well-being, which are the current psychological condition, subjective happiness and anxiety. The evaluation of the distribution of all the dependent variables for the groups in comparison using Levene's

criterion demonstrated the equality of dispersions ($p > 0.05$). Table 2 illustrates the combined results of analysis of variance on the indicators of psychological well-being of the first-year students depending on their enrollment strategy.

According to table 2, statistically noticeable differences between the first-year students with different enrollment strategies were gathered in all the indicators of psychological well-being, with the biggest amount of the enrollment strategy effect for personal anxiety being ($\eta^2 = 0.05$; $p = 0.001$). The groups vary to a lesser extent in such indicators as the subjective happiness and the current psychological condition ($0.02 < \eta^2 < 0.03$; $p < 0.05$).

The analysis of multiple comparisons with Bonferroni adjustment shows that of all the indicators of psychological well-being personal anxiety varies the most between the groups of students with different enrollment strategies. In particular, the difference was registered between all the groups but the Olympiad winners and the students who passed the USE plus extra university tests combined. These groups are characterized by almost identical slightly increased levels of personal anxiety (43.97 and 43.86 respectively). According

Table 2

Differences in indicators of psychological well-being depending on the university admission strategy

	Sum of Squares (SS)	Fisher Criterion (F)	Level of Significance (p)	Effect Size (η^2)
Psychological Well-being	5610,10	3,09	0,029	0,03
Subjective Happiness	143,93	2,11	0,041	0,02
Anxiety	3167,13	5,34	0,001	0,05

to the data, the target quota group with the lowest level of personal anxiety statistically authentically differs from the rest of the groups, which indicate higher levels of personal anxiety ($p = 0.001$).

For the current psychological condition multiple comparisons have shown statistically authentic differences between the target quota group with the best result and the groups of the students, who enrolled based on the results of school Olympiads and after secondary vocational training ($p = 0,029$). For the subjective happiness the only difference can be seen between the Olympiad winners (happier) and the graduates of secondary vocational schools (less happy).

Therefore, the first-year students with different enrollment strategies vary in their level of psychological condition, subjective happiness and anxiety, showing unique combinations of these indicators' manifestation.

Academic performance of students with different enrollment strategies

The study analyzes the results of the first examination session of the first-year students depending on their enrollment strategy — based on USE results, school Olympiads, target quota, secondary vocational training and USE + extra university test results combined. The following grade variants are represented in the study: all 5; 5 and 4; 5, 4, 3; all 4; 4 and 3; all 3; failed examinations. Table 3 illustrates the

percentage distribution of the first session results among the students with different enrollment strategies.

As table 3 suggests, the largest number of first-year students who finished the first examination session with excellent grades are among those students who entered university based on the results of USE + extra university tests combined (24.2%), and the lowest is among the graduates of secondary vocational schools (17%).

The distribution of students who failed one or more exams and, accordingly, have failed examinations after the first session draws attention. Thus, the largest number of first-year students with failed examinations was found in the group of students who graduated from secondary vocational education institutions (9%), while the smallest number was in the group admitted based on combined USE results and additional entrance examinations of the university (2.3%). It has been shown that a relatively high percentage of students with unsatisfactory exam grades (3.4%) is also observed in the group of winners of school Olympiads, which exceeds the number of underperforming students admitted based on USE results (3.0%). A high percentage of students with academic debts was also recorded in the targeted quota group (5.4%).

Consequently, the choice of enrollment strategy for higher education institutions essentially determines the educational outcomes of the first examination session, primarily regarding the distribution

Table 3

Percentage distribution of the first session results among the students with different enrollment strategies

	«5» only	«5» & «4»	«5», «4» & «3»	«4» only	«4» & «3»	«3» only	Debts remain
based on the results of the Unified State Examinations	21,4	37,1	17,6	7,4	10,0	3,5	3,0
winners and prize-winners of school Olympic competitions	23,2	24,5	15,6	6,7	24,4	2,2	3,4
within the framework of targeted recruitment	19,4	30,0	18,0	7,3	16,5	3,4	5,4
after graduating from secondary vocational education institutions	17,0	34,0	14,5	8,5	14,5	2,5	9,0
based on the results of the Unified State Examinations and Additional examinations	24,2	35,3	20,5	7,0	9,8	0,9	2,3

of excellent and unsatisfactory grades. However, it should be noted that in all the analyzed groups of first-year students, regardless of their enrollment strategy, the most common category is those who passed the first session with “excellent” and “good” grades.

Discussion

According to descriptive statistics, first-year students in Russian universities, regardless of their enrollment strategy, report their psychological well-being and happiness as slightly above average, as well as experiencing anxiety, the manifestation of which corresponds to the upper limit of the moderate range.

Along with moderate average values of the analyzed indicators of psychological well-being, there is an extremely wide range of individual differences among first-year students in the manifestation of anxiety, current psychological condition, and self-assessment of happiness. According to the study, extremely low values (for psychological condition and happiness) or high values (for anxiety) are observed in 8.1%, 8.5%, and 5.6% of first-year students, respectively. These results

correspond to the data from the population study of first-year students in Russian universities, which reports that 9% of respondents experience regular emotional difficulties, including increased irritability, a tendency toward anxiety for various reasons, and frequent mood swings [2]. First-year students with extreme values of psychological distress should be closely monitored by specialists in university psychological services.

The results of the variance analysis revealed significant differences in all the analyzed indicators of psychological state among students depending on their enrollment strategy: based on the results of the Unified State Exam (USE), winners and prizewinners of school Olympiads, within targeted admissions, after completing secondary vocational education, or based on combined USE results and additional entrance examinations organized by universities. Notably, the most pronounced differences between student groups were found in personal anxiety, which reflects an individual’s propensity to frequently experience anxiety regarding a wide range of phenomena and events, particularly those related to the assessment of their knowl-

edge, skills, and abilities [13; 16; 25]. It was shown that the least anxious students are those admitted to the university through targeted admissions under a separate competition for specially allocated quotas, which effectively guarantees enrollment, social support during their studies, and subsequent employment. The highest levels of personal anxiety in the sample were recorded in two groups of first-year students who were admitted based on the results of school Olympiads or on the basis of combined USE results and additional entrance examinations. The slightly elevated levels of anxiety among students with these enrollment strategies may be associated with the duration and intensity of psychological tension during the admission process and possibly the already established necessity to maintain a high educational status without the possibility of making mistakes during the first year.

In terms of current psychological condition and subjective happiness, less pronounced differences were observed between the various groups of first-year students. Specifically, the differences pertain to three groups of first-year students: those admitted through targeted admissions (with better condition), those who entered after completing secondary vocational education (with low condition and low self-assessment of happiness), and those who were admitted based on school Olympiad results (with low condition but the highest self-assessment of happiness). It is important to note that regardless of the enrollment strategy, the average values of psychological well-being indicators are in the range of moderate expression of signs. However, even variations within this range are significantly different between groups with specific admission strategies. These results, obtained through analysis of multiple comparisons with Bonferroni correction,

highlighted the uniqueness of the psychological state of first-year students with different admission strategies and allowed for a correlation with the results of the first examination session.

It was shown, in particular, that the largest proportion of students who received excellent grades in all exams of the first university session (24.2%) and the smallest number of students with failed exams (2.3%) are found in the group of first-year students admitted to the university based on combined results from the Unified State Exam (USE) and additional entrance examinations. Students in this group are characterized by an average level of psychological well-being and happiness, while reporting a higher level of personal anxiety compared to their peers in other groups. This combination of characteristics allows for the prediction of their high academic performance, primarily based on data regarding the optimal level of anxiety, which can manifest as a responsible attitude towards studies, increased academic interest, and a constant need for high evaluation of their efforts[6; 13; 21 etc.].

Another group of students that closely follows in educational achievements during the first session are the winners and prizeholders of school Olympiads. 23.2% of first-year students with this admission strategy reported having passed all their exams with excellent marks. At the same time, it is notable that there is an unexpectedly high percentage of students in this group who have failed exams after the first session (3.4%). It is possible that the expression of psychological well-being indicators in this group of first-year students, particularly the lowest psychological condition in the sample and the highest level of personal anxiety, may negatively affect educational achievements in some cases. Specifically, research has shown that elevated levels of

anxiety, particularly concerning the evaluation of performance outcomes, can lead to unstable emotional expressions, excessive worry, unwarranted perfectionism, and in some cases, to avoidance of evaluative situations, which consequently results in an inability to meet academic obligations. Therefore, the increased level of personal anxiety, depending on the characteristics of psychological well-being and the sense of happiness, may either limit or, conversely, facilitate educational achievements in the first year.

The highest incidence of unsatisfactory exam results during the first session is reported by students admitted to the university after completing vocational education institutions (9% of respondents in this group). Additionally, this group of first-year students has the lowest proportion of students receiving excellent grades, at 17%. The psychological well-being of students who come to study at the university after attending colleges can be characterized by the lowest psychological well-being, the lowest self-assessment of happiness, and an average level of anxiety. This combination of characteristics may indicate heightened risks of maladjustment for this category of first-year students and may be associated with the fundamentally new demands of the higher education system compared to the level of vocational education.

Analysis of the percentage distribution of unsatisfactory exam grades has revealed another group with a relatively high number of first-year students having failed exams after the first session—students enrolled through targeted admission programs (5.4%). Among these students, the percentage of those receiving excellent grades is relatively low at 19.4%, which is less than that of students who were admitted based on their Unified State Exam results. However, their psychological well-being is characterized by the best indicators such as the

lowest levels of personal anxiety, optimal psychological well-being, and adequate subjective happiness. It is precisely this reduced level of personal anxiety, along with the possible specificity of targeted education that manifests in a diminished personal interest in studies, limited academic curiosity, and relative indifference to educational outcomes [6; 13; 21 etc.].

The largest group consists of students who were admitted to the university based on their Unified State Exam results, and they are characterized by average levels of psychological well-being. In this group, there is a moderate percentage of excellent students (21.4%) and a relatively low percentage of underperforming students (3.0%). This indicates that, despite certain issues, compared to other groups, students admitted based on USE results demonstrate more stable academic performance and higher indicators of psychological well-being.

The data on the psychological state and academic results of the first semester confirm the existing conclusions about the ambiguity of the relationship between well-being and academic success among students, including those with various admission strategies [16; 21; 22; 24; 27]. At the same time, the obtained data present a relevant research task — to determine the extent to which the relationship between the university admission strategy and academic results is mediated by the current psychological state of first-year students, other psychological traits necessary for university education, and, importantly, the knowledge already acquired during the preparation for university admission.

Conclusions

This is the first study to examine the specifics of psychological well-being and academic results during the first examination session among students of Russian

universities, depending on their admission strategy — whether through Unified State Exam (USE) results, as winners and prize holders of school Olympiads, through targeted admission, after completing secondary vocational education, or through combined data from USE and additional entrance examinations organized by universities. Statistical analysis has allowed us to draw the following conclusions:

1. It has been shown that first-year students with various admission strategies differ in their levels of psychological well-being, subjective happiness, and anxiety, demonstrating unique combinations of these traits. In this context, personal anxiety emerges as the indicator of psychological well-being that varies the most among first-year students depending on their university admission strategy.

2. The choice of admission strategy is found to be interconnected with a student's academic results already in the first year

of study. Furthermore, the unique combination of psychological well-being indicators within groups of students employing different admission strategies may either strengthen or weaken this correlation.

3. First-year students with various admission strategies require specific programs and technologies for psychological support in higher education, which are based on data regarding the group uniqueness of psychological well-being indicators as influenced by their admission strategies.

The results obtained in the research can serve as a scientific basis for organizing psychological support in higher education: by understanding the specifics of the manifestation of psychological well-being or distress indicators among groups of first-year students with different admission strategies, psychologists can more accurately and quickly identify the most effective technologies, programs, and methods of working with students.

References

1. Baeva I.A., Laktionova E.B., Kondakova I.V., Pezhemskaya Y.U.S., Sokolova M.E.-L.S., Savenko Y.S. Resursy psihologicheskoy bezopasnosti studentov v napryazhennoj sociokul'turnoj srede: obzor teoreticheskikh i empiricheskikh issledovanij [Resources of psychological safety of students in a tense sociocultural environment: a review of theoretical and empirical studies]. *Psihologo-pedagogicheskie issledovaniya [Psychological and pedagogical studies]*, 2024. Vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 3—29. (In Russ.).
2. Basyuk V.S., Malykh S.B., Tikhomirova T.N. Federal'naya set' psihologicheskikh sluzhob obrazovatel'nykh organizacij vysshego obrazovaniya: koncepciya, priority i resursy razvitiya [Federal Network of Psychological Services of Educational Institutions of Higher Education: Concept, Priorities and Development Resources]. *Psihologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie [Psychological Science and Education]*, 2022. Vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 4—18. DOI:10.17759/pse.2022270601 (In Russ.).
3. Druzhinin V.N. Kognitivnye sposobnosti: struktura, diagnostika, razvitie [Cognitive abilities: structure, diagnostics, development]. Moscow: Per Se, 2001. 223 p. (In Russ.).
4. Leont'ev D.A. Kachestvo zhizni i blagopoluchie: ob"ektivnye, sub"ektivnye i sub"ektivnye aspekty [Quality of life and well-being: objective, subjective and subjective aspect]. *Psihologicheskij zhurnal [Psychological journal]*, 2020a. Vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 86—95. (In Russ.).
5. Leont'ev D.A. Schast'e i sub"ektivnoe blagopoluchie: k konstruirovaniyu ponyatiynogo polya [Happiness and subjective well-being: towards the construction of a conceptual field]. *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya: Ekonomicheskije i social'nye peremeny [Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes]*, 2020b. Vol. 1, no. 155, pp. 14—37. (In Russ.).
6. Malykh S.B., Tikhomirova T.N. Lichnostnye cherty i intellekt kak faktory obshchej akademicheskoy uspešnosti [Personality traits and intelligence as factors of general academic success]. *Voprosy psihologii [Questions of Psychology]*, 2020. Vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 26—44. (In Russ.).
7. Osin E.N., Leont'ev D.A. Kratkie russkoyazychnye shkaly diagnostiki sub"ektivnogo blagopoluchiya: psihometricheskije harakteristiki i sravnitel'nyj analiz [Brief Russian-Language Instruments to Measure Subjective Well-Being: Psychometric Properties and

Comparative Analysis]. *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya: Ekonomicheskoe i sotsialnye peremeny [Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes]*, 2020. Vol. 1, pp. 117—142. DOI:10.14515/monitoring.2020.1.06 (In Russ.).

8. Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva Rossijskoj Federacii ot 27.04.2024 № 555 «O celevom obuchenii po obrazovatel'nym programmam srednego professional'nogo i vysshego obrazovaniya» [Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation of 27.04.2024 No. 555 "On targeted training in educational programs of secondary vocational and higher education"]. Available at: <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/document/0001202404300002?index=3> (Accessed 07.08.2024). (In Russ.).

9. Prikaz Ministerstva nauki i vysshego obrazovaniya RF ot 21 avgusta 2020 g. N 1076 «Ob utverzhdenii Poryadka priema na obuchenie po obrazovatel'nym programmam vysshego obrazovaniya — programmam bakalavriata, programmam specialiteta, programmam magistratury» s izmeneniyami i dopolneniyami ot 25 yanvarya, 13 avgusta 2021 g., 26 avgusta 2022 g., 10 fevralya, 16 noyabrya 2023 g. [Order of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation of August 21, 2020 N 1076 "On approval of the Procedure for admission to study in higher education educational programs — bachelor's degree programs, specialist degree programs, master's degree programs" with amendments and additions of January 25, August 13, 2021, August 26, 2022, February 10, November 16, 2023]. Available at: <https://base.garant.ru/74541661/> (Accessed 07.08.2024). (In Russ.).

10. Prikaz Ministerstva nauki i vysshego obrazovaniya RF ot 28 avgusta 2023 g. N 823 «Ob utverzhdenii perechnya olimpiad shkol'nikov i ih urovnej na 2023/24 uchebnyj god» [Order of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation dated August 28, 2023 N 823 "On approval of the list of school Olympiads and their levels for the 2023/24 academic year"]. Available at: <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/document/0001202309290072> (Accessed 07.08.2024). (In Russ.).

11. Prikaz Ministerstva obrazovaniya i nauki RF ot 17 yanvarya 2014 g. N 21 «Ob utverzhdenii perechnya special'nostej i (ili) napravlenij podgotovki, po kotorym pri prieme na obuchenie za schet byudzhetnyh assignovanij federal'nogo byudzhet, byudzhetov sub'ektov Rossijskoj Federacii i mestnyh byudzhetov po programmam bakalavriata i programmam specialiteta mogut provodit'sya dopolnitel'nye vstupitel'nye ispytaniya tvorcheskoj i (ili) professional'noj napravlenosti» s izmeneniyami i dopolneniyami ot 30 iyulya 2014 g., 13 oktyabrya 2015 g., 21 avgusta 2019 g., 28 iyunya 2021 g. [Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of January 17, 2014 N 21 "On approval

of the list of specialties and (or) areas of training for which, upon admission to training at the expense of budgetary allocations from the federal budget, budgets of constituent entities of the Russian Federation and local budgets for bachelor's degree programs and specialist's degree programs, additional entrance examinations of a creative and (or) professional focus may be held" with amendments and additions of July 30, 2014, October 13, 2015, August 21, 2019, June 28, 2021]. Available at: <https://base.garant.ru/70600456/> (Accessed 07.08.2024). (In Russ.).

12. Rozanov V.A., Laskaya D.A., Shabolts A.V. Samoubijstva studentov — chto my znaem, i chego my ne znaem (rezul'taty analiza soobshchenij setevyh SMI) [Student suicides — what we know and what we do not know (Results of the analysis of online media reports)]. *Suicidologiya [Suicidology]*, 2021. Vol. 12, no. 3(44), pp. 39—57. DOI:10.32878/suiciderus.21-12-03(44)-39-57 (In Russ.).

13. Spilberger Ch.D., Khanin Yu.L. Shkala ocenki urovnya reaktivnoj i lichnostnoj trevozhnosti [Scale for assessing the level of reactive and personal anxiety]. Psihologicheskie testy [Psychological tests]. Pod red. A.A. Karelina: v 2 t. Vol. 1. Moscow: Gumanit. izd. centr VLADOS, 2003, pp. 39—45. (In Russ.).

14. Federal'nyj zakon ot 29 dekabrya 2012 g. N 273-FZ «Ob obrazovanii v Rossijskoj Federacii» [Federal Law of December 29, 2012 N 273-FZ "On Education in the Russian Federation"]. Available at: <https://ivo.garant.ru/#/document/70291362/paragraph/1:0> (Accessed 07.08.2024). (In Russ.).

15. Al-Qaisy L.M. The relation of depression and anxiety in academic achievement among group of university students. *International journal of psychology and counseling*, 2011. Vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 96—100.

16. Awadalla S., Davies E.B., Glazebrook C. A longitudinal cohort study to explore the relationship between depression, anxiety and academic performance among Emirati university students. *BMC psychiatry*, 2020. Vol. 20, pp. 1—10. DOI:10.1186/s12888-020-02854-z

17. Deci E.L., Ryan R.M. Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction. *Journal of happiness studies*, 2008. Vol. 9, pp. 1—11.

18. Dias Lopes L.F., Chaves B.M., Fabricio A., Porto A., Machado de Almeida D., Obregon S.L., ... & Flores Costa V.M. Analysis of well-being and anxiety among university students. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 2020. Vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 3874. DOI:10.3390/ijerph17113874

19. Giannetti B.F., Velazquez L., Perkins K.M., Trillas-Ortiz M., Anaya-Eredias C., Agostinho F., ... & Munguia N. Individual-level characteristics of environmental sustainability among students in a higher education institution: The role of happiness and academic performance. *International journal of sustainability in higher education*, 2021. Vol. 22, no. 7,

pp. 1664—1690. DOI:10.1108/IJSHE-10-2020-0368
20. Hobfoll S.E., Halbesleben J., Neveu J.P., Westman M. Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 2018. Vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 103—128. DOI:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640
21. Högberg B. Academic performance, performance culture, and mental health: an exploration of non-linear relationships using Swedish PISA data. *Scandinavian journal of educational research*, 2024. Vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 919—934. DOI:10.1080/00313831.2023.2192752
22. Kawase E., Hashimoto K., Sakamoto H., Ino H., Katsuki N., Iida Y., ... & Sasaki T. Variables associated with the need for support in mental health check up of new undergraduate students. *Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences*, 2008. Vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 98—102. DOI:10.1111/j.1440-1819.2007.01781.x
23. Lyubomirsky S., Lepper H.S. A Measure of Subjective Happiness: Preliminary Reliability and Construct Validation. *Social Indicators*

Research, 1999. Vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 137—155. DOI:10.1023/a:1006824100041
24. Mofatteh M. Risk factors associated with stress, anxiety, and depression among university undergraduate students. *AIMS public health*, 2021. Vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 36. DOI:10.3934/publichealth.2021004
25. Tang Y., He W. Meta-analysis of the relationship between university students' anxiety and academic performance during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2023. Vol. 14, pp. 1018558. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1018558
26. Topp C.W., Østergaard S.D., Søndergaard S., Bech P. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*, 2015. Vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 167—176. DOI:10.1159/000376585
27. Zhang C., Dong F., Zheng X., Xue Y., Xiao S., Shi L., ... & Ou W. The impact of sleep quality on subjective wellbeing among older adults with multimorbidity: a moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2022. Vol. 13, pp. 813775. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.813775

Литература

1. Баева И.А. и др. Ресурсы психологической безопасности студентов в напряженной социокультурной среде: обзор теоретических и эмпирических исследований / Баева И.А., Лактионова Е.Б., Кондакова И.В., Пежемская Ю.С., Соколова М.-Е.-Л.С., Савенко Ю.С. // Психолого-педагогические исследования. 2024. Том 16. № 2. С. 3—29. DOI:10.17759/psyedu.2024160201
2. Басюк В.С., Малых С.Б., Тихомирова Т.Н. Федеральная сеть психологических служб образовательных организаций высшего образования: концепция, приоритеты и ресурсы развития // Психологическая наука и образования. 2022. Том 27. № 6. С. 4—18. DOI:10.17759/pse.2022270601
3. Дружинин В.Н. Когнитивные способности: структура, диагностика, развитие. М.: Per Se, 2001. 223 с.
4. Леонтьев Д.А. Качество жизни и благополучие: объективные, субъективные и субъектные аспекты // Психологический журнал. 2020а. Том 41. № 6. С. 86—95.
5. Леонтьев Д.А. Счастье и субъективное благополучие: к конструированию понятийного поля // Мониторинг общественного мнения: Экономические и социальные перемены. 2020б. № 1(155). С. 14—37.
6. Малых С.Б., Тихомирова Т.Н. Личностные черты и интеллект как факторы общей академической успешности // Вопросы психологии. 2020. Том 66. № 3. С. 26—44.
7. Осин Е.Н., Леонтьев Д.А. Краткие русскоязычные шкалы диагностики субъективного благополучия: психометрические характеристики

и сравнительный анализ // Мониторинг общественного мнения: Экономические и социальные перемены. 2020. № 1. С. 117—142. DOI:10.14515/monitoring.2020.1.06
8. Постановление Правительства Российской Федерации от 27.04.2024 № 555 «О целевом обучении по образовательным программам среднего профессионального и высшего образования». URL: <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/document/0001202404300002?index=3> (дата обращения: 07.08.2024).
9. Приказ Министерства науки и высшего образования Российской Федерации от 21 августа 2020 г. № 1076 «Об утверждении Порядка приема на обучение по образовательным программам высшего образования — программам бакалавриата, программам специалитета, программам магистратуры» с изменениями и дополнениями от 25 января, 13 августа 2021 г., 26 августа 2022 г., 10 февраля, 16 ноября 2023 г. URL: <https://base.garant.ru/74541661/> (дата обращения: 07.08.2024).
10. Приказ Министерства науки и высшего образования Российской Федерации от 28 августа 2023 г. № 823 «Об утверждении перечня олимпиад школьников и их уровней на 2023/24 учебный год». URL: <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/document/0001202309290072> (дата обращения: 07.08.2024).
11. Приказ Министерства образования и науки Российской Федерации от 17 января 2014 г. № 21 «Об утверждении перечня специальностей и (или) направлений подготовки, по которым при приеме на обучение за счет бюджетных ассигнований федерального бюджета, бюджетов субъектов

- Российской Федерации и местных бюджетов по программам бакалавриата и программам специалитета могут проводиться дополнительные вступительные испытания творческой и (или) профессиональной направленности» с изменениями и дополнениями от 30 июля 2014 г., 13 октября 2015 г., 21 августа 2019 г., 28 июня 2021 г. URL: <https://base.garant.ru/70600456/> (дата обращения: 07.08.2024).
12. Розанов В.А., Лаская Д.А., Шаболтас А.В. Самоубийства студентов — что мы знаем, и чего мы не знаем (результаты анализа сообщений сетевых СМИ) // Суицидология. 2021. Том 12. № 3(44). С. 39—57. DOI:10.32878/suicidus.21-12-03(44)-39-57
13. Спилбергер Ч.Д., Ханин Ю.Л. Шкала оценки уровня реактивной и личностной тревожности // Психологические тесты / Под ред. А.А. Карелина: В 2 т. Т. 1. М.: Гуманит. изд. центр ВЛАДОС, 2003. С. 39—45.
14. Федеральный закон от 29 декабря 2012 г. № 273-ФЗ «Об образовании в Российской Федерации». URL: <https://ivo.garant.ru/#/document/70291362/paragraph/1:0> (дата обращения: 07.08.2024).
15. Al-Qaisy L.M. The relation of depression and anxiety in academic achievement among group of university students // International journal of psychology and counselling. 2011. Vol. 3. № 5. P. 96—100.
16. Awadalla S., Davies E.B., Glazebrook C. A longitudinal cohort study to explore the relationship between depression, anxiety and academic performance among Emirati university students // BMC psychiatry. 2020. Vol. 20. P. 1—10. DOI:10.1186/s12888-020-02854-z
17. Deci E.L., Ryan R.M. Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction // Journal of happiness studies. 2008. Vol. 9. P. 1—11.
18. Dias Lopes L.F. et al. Analysis of well-being and anxiety among university students / Dias Lopes L.F., Chaves B.M., Fabrício A., Porto A., Machado de Almeida D., Obregon S.L., ... & Flores Costa V.M. // International journal of environmental research and public health. 2020. Vol. 17. № 11. P. 3874. DOI:10.3390/ijerph17113874
19. Giannetti B.F. et al. Individual-level characteristics of environmental sustainability among students in a higher education institution: The role of happiness and academic performance / Giannetti B.F., Velazquez L., Perkins K.M., Trillas-Ortiz M., Anaya-Eredias C., Agostinho F., ... & Munguia N. // International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education. 2021. Vol. 22. № 7. P. 1664—1690. DOI:10.1108/IJSHE-10-2020-0368
20. Hobfoll S.E. et al. Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences / Hobfoll S.E., Halbesleben J., Neveu J.P., Westman M. // Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior. 2018. Vol. 5. № 1. P. 103—128. DOI:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640
21. Högberg B. Academic performance, performance culture, and mental health: an exploration of non-linear relationships using Swedish PISA data // Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research. 2024. Vol. 68. № 5. P. 919—934. DOI:10.1080/00313831.2023.2192752
22. Kawase E. et al. Variables associated with the need for support in mental health check-up of new undergraduate students / Kawase E., Hashimoto K., Sakamoto H., Ino H., Katsuki N., Iida Y., ... & Sasaki T. // Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences. 2008. Vol. 62. № 1. P. 98—102. DOI:10.1111/j.1440-1819.2007.01781.x
23. Lyubomirsky S., Lepper H.S. A Measure of Subjective Happiness: Preliminary Reliability and Construct Validation // Social Indicators Research. 1999. Vol. 46. № 2. P. 137—155. DOI:10.1023/a:1006824100041
24. Mofatteh M. Risk factors associated with stress, anxiety, and depression among university undergraduate students // AIMS public health. 2021. Vol. 8. № 1. P. 36. DOI:10.3934/publichealth.2021004
25. Tang Y., He W. Meta-analysis of the relationship between university students' anxiety and academic performance during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic // Frontiers in Psychology. 2023. Vol. 14. P. 1018558. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1018558
26. Topp C.W. et al. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a systematic review of the literature / Topp C.W., Østergaard S.D., Søndergaard S., Bech P. // Psychotherapy and psychosomatics. 2015. Vol. 84. № 3. P. 167—176. DOI:10.1159/000376585
27. Zhang C. et al. The impact of sleep quality on subjective wellbeing among older adults with multimorbidity: a moderated mediation model / Zhang C., Dong F., Zheng X., Xue Y., Xiao S., Shi L., ... & Ou W. // Frontiers in psychology. 2022. Vol. 13. P. 813775. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.813775

Information about the authors

Tatiana N. Tikhomirova, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Sc.D. (Psychology), Scientific Supervisor of the Federal Resource Center for Psychological Service for the Higher Education, Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6748-763X>, e-mail: tikho@mail.ru

Victor S. Basyuk, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Sc.D. (Psychology), Vice President, Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2448-0673>, e-mail: basyuk.victor@raop.ru

Victoria I. Ismatullina, PhD in Psychology, Senior Analyst of the Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Educational Sciences, Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5096-4313>, e-mail: victoria2686@gmail.com

Elena V. Zinchenko, PhD in Psychology, Supervisor of the Psychological Service, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7262-9583>, e-mail: evzinchenko@sfnu.ru

Natalia V. Matyash, Sc.D. (Psychology), Professor, Director of the Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology, Bryansk State University named after Academician I.G. Petrovsky, Bryansk, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7991-7257>, e-mail: vds-24@yandex.ru

Olga A. Ovsyannikova, PhD in Pedagogy, Supervisor of the University Social and Psychological Support Service, Oryol State University named after I.S. Turgenev, Orel, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0885-1297>, e-mail: olenka_letters@mail.ru

Sergei A. Piliipenko, PhD in Psychology, Vice Rector for Strategic Development and Digital Transformation, Moscow State Linguistic University, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0303-8410>, e-mail: spilipenko2018@yandex.ru

Irina D. Ponikarova, Psychologist of the Psychological Support Service, St. Petersburg University of Civil Aviation named after A.A. Novikov, St. Petersburg, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0588-6700>, e-mail: ira.ponikarova@gmail.com

Tatiana N. Sakharova, PhD in Psychology, Director of the Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology, Moscow Pedagogical State University, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1380-4812>, e-mail: sakharova@mail.ru

Nina A. Sluch, Supervisor of the Psychological Service, Russian University of Transport, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3634-7200>, e-mail: sanctus78@mail.ru

Sergey B. Malykh, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Sc.D. (Psychology), Professor, Academician-Secretary of the Department of Psychology and Developmental Physiology, Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3786-7447>, e-mail: malykhsb@mail.ru

Информация об авторах

Тихомирова Татьяна Николаевна, академик РАО, доктор психологических наук, научный руководитель Федерального ресурсного центра психологической службы в системе высшего образования, ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6748-763X>, e-mail: tikho@mail.ru

Басюк Виктор Стефанович, академик РАО, доктор психологических наук, и.о. вице-президента, ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2448-0673>, e-mail: basyuk.victor@raop.ru

Исмагуллина Виктория Игоревна, кандидат психологических наук, главный аналитик Центра междисциплинарных исследований в сфере наук об образовании, ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5096-4313>, e-mail: victoria2686@gmail.com

Зинченко Елена Валерьевна, кандидат психологических наук, руководитель Психологической службы, ФГАОУ ВО «Южный федеральный университет» (ФГАОУ ВО «ЮФУ»), г. Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7262-9583>, e-mail: evzinchenko@sfnu.ru

Матяш Наталья Викторовна, доктор психологических наук, профессор, директор института педагогики и психологии, ФГБОУ ВО «Брянский государственный университет имени академика И.Г. Петровского» (ФГБОУ ВО «БГУ»), г. Брянск, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7991-7257>, e-mail: vds-24@yandex.ru

Овсянникова Ольга Александровна, кандидат педагогических наук, начальник службы социально-психологической поддержки университета, ФГБОУ ВО «Орловский государственный университет имени И.С. Тургенева» (ФГБОУ ВО «ОГУ имени И.С. Тургенева»), г. Орел, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0885-1297>, e-mail: olenka_letters@mail.ru

Пилипенко Сергей Александрович, кандидат психологических наук, доцент, проректор по развитию и цифровизации, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный лингвистический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГЛУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0303-8410>, e-mail: spilipenko2018@yandex.ru

Поникарова Ирина Дмитриевна, психолог службы психологической поддержки, ФГБОУ ВО «Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет гражданской авиации имени Главного маршала авиации А.А. Новикова» (ФГБОУ ВО СПбГУ ГА им. А.А. Новикова), г. Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0588-6700>, e-mail: ira.ponikarova@gmail.com

Сахарова Татьяна Николаевна, кандидат психологических наук, директор Института педагогики и психологии, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский педагогический государственный университет» (ФГБОУ ВО «МПГУ»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1380-4812>, e-mail: sakharova@mail.ru

Случ Нина Александровна, руководитель психологической службы, ФГАОУ ВО «Российский университет транспорта» (ФГАОУ ВО РУТ (МИИТ)), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3634-7200>, e-mail: sanctus78@mail.ru

Малых Сергей Борисович, академик РАО, доктор психологических наук, профессор, академик-секретарь Отделения психологии и возрастной физиологии, ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ «РАО»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3786-7447>, e-mail: malykhsb@mail.ru

Получена 16.08.2024

Received 16.08.2024

Принята в печать 30.12.2024

Accepted 30.12.2024