



fundamental changes in lifestyle, including migration, increased academic workload, new life tasks and problems, as well as instability in lifestyle. To achieve success, young people must develop new behavioral strategies and learn to overcome emerging challenges. On the one hand, such conditions can negatively affect the emotional state due to insecurity and fear, but on the other hand, they create conditions for resilience and the formation of new life directions.

Various factors also influence the formation of resilience to life. Among them, meaningful life directions play a special role. Student life is a period when young people rethink their lives, changing their views, life goals, and values. And this, in general, constitutes their life directions. Research indicates that the quality of these content and orientations determines an individual's ability to overcome difficulties and solve problems. The scientific relevance of this study lies in studying the specific characteristics of students' resilience to life within the context of various life directions.

The student period is one of the most important stages in a person's life. During this period, the transition from student life to adult life occurs. This is accompanied by a series of changes: migration, changes in the social environment, the emergence of new tasks and problems, and instability in life.

According to S. Maddi, the formation of life tolerance is influenced by factors such as stressful situations, attitudes, principles, lifestyle, and the availability of social support [9]. During the student years, the activation of the aforementioned factors occurs. K.D. Ushinsky emphasized that student years are a decisive period, as a person's future depends on their successful completion [2]. B.G. Ananyev emphasized that the period from 17 to 25 years is an important foundation for the formation of a personality. L.I. Bozhovich also noted that active development of motivation, consciousness, and self-awareness occurs in young people during the student period [6]. The overall trend of this period contributes to improving the physical and mental health of young people. It also helps overcome age-related crises and in the process of life and professional self-realization.

Thus, under the influence of changing conditions, the personality itself changes. In particular, its meaningful life directions, value, motivational, and spiritual sphere characteristics change. During the student period, initial views on the world and oneself are revised, and a new self-awareness and perceptions of one's own qualities and those of others are formed.

An expansion of factors influencing the formation of the meaning of life occurs. In his research on the search for the meaning of life, W. Frankl emphasized that people who clearly understand the future-oriented meaning have a higher chance of survival [8]. In other words, high life endurance is attributed to those who have specific life goals. Thus, stability and the ability to overcome life difficulties, which are primarily formed during student years, become important qualities for an individual's future self-realization.

Currently, research aimed at studying the relationship between life tolerance and the meaning of life is being actively conducted. It should be noted that the conclusions of some works coincide with the results of others, but there are also significant





contradictions between the studies of different authors. During the theoretical analysis, a trend was identified according to which students with developed life endurance indicators are also characterized by high indicators of life orientation [11].

Currently, most researchers agree that an internal locus of control is characteristic of students with a high level of resilience to life [3]. According to Moshchenko and Drozdova, such young people are characterized by taking responsibility for the events of their lives, believing that it is their conscious decisions and choices that determine the fate of the future. This trend can be explained as follows: if a student feels the power of controlling their life and has a holistic vision of themselves as a strong person capable of solving problems, their chances of overcoming life's difficulties increase significantly. At the same time, it is characteristic for students with low life endurance indicators to have a greater external locus of control [10].

It is easier for such young people to look for the cause of certain phenomena in others than in themselves; they tend to follow social trends and do not actively try to change their situation.

According to an analysis of currently available research, in addition to life orientations, the authors identify the following factors and determinants influencing the formation of life tolerance in students: the presence of difficult life situations, the specifics of interaction with others, as well as self-perception and an emotional attitude toward activities [1].

S. Maddy [9] also puts forward his views on the importance of the presence of stressful events for the successful development of resilience to life's difficulties.

The student period is associated with new difficulties and life problems, and it is precisely their overcoming and coping strategies that have a great influence on what behavioral patterns are formed in an individual to overcome future crises. The absence of any difficulties or the intentional avoidance of them can lead to the failure to develop the necessary skills. This, in turn, leads to an individual's inability to withstand difficulties in achieving set goals and, accordingly, to problems related to self-expression. The availability of social support is also an important determinant in the development of tolerance. The ability to establish contact with others is both a strategy for overcoming life difficulties and a personal resource that positively affects an individual's psycho-emotional state.

During the student period, when an individual is forced to make responsible decisions and be responsible for them, the characteristics of establishing relationships with other people also influence the formation of their life strategies. In a successful situation, an individual can overcome crises more confidently than one who is afraid to communicate with society. It should be noted that this aspect is interconnected with the characteristics of self-perception and the state of the individual's emotional sphere. Self-esteem is no less important than a person's ability to establish relationships with others, as the individual's qualitative aspirations depend on it. A positive assessment of one's skills and abilities allows a person to be more persistent and to be confident of a positive outcome of the situation. This ensures that he becomes more resilient in the





face of life's difficulties. Thus, a person acquires more and more experience in overcoming difficulties and, accordingly, skills. This will allow him to be even more resilient in the future. The influence of the emotional sphere on the formation of life tolerance can be explained in a similar way.

It is known that activities that evoke positive emotions in an individual have an additional stimulating effect on overcoming problem situations. Negative emotions have the opposite effect. Thus, choosing a satisfying and interesting activity during the student period is of particular importance.

Analysis of modern psychological research indicates that the meaningful aspects of life and life tolerance are truly interconnected. This is especially observed in student years, which is a sensitive period for the formation of new value orientations and the ability to overcome difficulties that increase during student years.

Examining foreign research on this issue, the following trends can be noted. Most researchers agree that high life resilience indicators are often associated with high or moderate values of life meaning, such as the internal locus of control, the presence of life goals, and productivity. Young people with low resilience often lack clear life goals and face uncertainty and difficulties in controlling events in their lives. In other words, having clear and specific plans for the future, a willingness to take responsibility for what is happening, and a tendency to evaluate any experience as necessary for productive and personal growth have a positive impact on students' ability to overcome life's difficulties.

The results obtained can be explained by the fact that during the student period, which is often accompanied by a sense of uncertainty and insecurity, a person with clear goals and a desired future image is more motivated to overcome obstacles on the way to achieving what they want than a person without this image. Also, students who tend to believe in themselves and control what is happening are more resilient to potential difficulties, as they are characterized by the belief that their future depends on their conscious choices and decisions. Therefore, they strive to work harder, achieve more, and, accordingly, overcome life's difficulties.

In turn, such people tend to view any result as a source of personal growth. This allows you to ignore failures and not despair for a long time before failing to achieve what you want. Students with low resilience tend to rely more on others, evaluate achieved results negatively, and lack clear goals and plans. Such people have reduced resilience to life's hardships because they are accustomed to waiting for help from the outside and lack the necessary resources and skills to overcome situations that arise in difficult situations. The lack of plans and clear aspirations also negatively affects the formation of resilience, as a person lacks the motivation to act and tends to retreat at critical moments.

It is also characteristic of this group of students to devalue achievements and cling to past failures. As a result, a person may develop a sense of insecurity in their own strength. This also negatively affects the ability to overcome difficulties. It should be noted that the ability to take risks is more pronounced in students with a low level of resilience. This can be explained by the fact that such individuals are more prone to





a sense of uncertainty, which exerts psychological and emotional pressure on them. Furthermore, people with high resilience to life generally have clear plans and goals for the future. Therefore, they take a more balanced and rational approach to planning their actions.

Foreign researchers have formed a vague idea of material well-being as one of the values influencing the formation of life tolerance. A.D. Belova and co-authors concluded that the pursuit of financial security negatively affects the formation of resilience to life, as it triggers a consumerist attitude toward life and thereby reduces engagement in life [1]. D.A. Tuvishva and G.I. Atamonova, on the contrary, viewed this factor from a positive perspective, as they identified the pursuit of material well-being with the pursuit of convenience and practicality [11]. According to M.V. Loginov, modern students are characterized by social "impotence," which is expressed in consumer behavior; that is, young people strive to satisfy their needs with minimal effort. This inevitably leads to internal personal conflict [7]. The reason for this trend may be the lack of a clear value system and a decline in the physical and psychophysiological quality of health [5]. Thus, it can be assumed that the presence of a value orientation toward achieving financial well-being positively affects the formation of resilience to life only if, in addition to this orientation, the individual has developed other values that motivate them to achieve more.

Foreign researchers also agree that students with a high level of life tolerance tend to set clear goals, lead a meaningful life, be satisfied with the path traveled, and take control of their lives. Young people with low resilience often lack clear life goals and face uncertainty and difficulties in controlling events in their lives. However, the influence of the socio-cultural context should also be noted.

Thus, according to some researchers, the results of high life tolerance, in addition to the characteristics described above, are also associated with the desire to achieve social well-being [12]. Other researchers have linked resilience to life to the achievement of personal comfort, self-actualization, and material well-being [13].

It is well known that the student period is represented as an important, unique period in the development of the individual. The role of resilience to life is particularly important in the process of acquiring theoretical and practical knowledge related to academic and professional activities. At the same time, it is important to study the influence of life content orientation on the formation of resilience to life during the student period. For this purpose, the subjects' groups were subjected to the "Life Endurance" test developed by S. Maddi and adapted by D.A. Leontiev, as well as D.A. Leontiev's "Targeting the Meaning of Life" methodology. The collected empirical data were analyzed in quantitative and qualitative terms and reflected in tables.

Table 1
Intercorrelation between life tolerance and life meaning orientation in 1st-3rd year students

Components of targeting life content		Chair Criteria for resilience to life		
EngagementControl		Risk		
Purpose	1st year	0,31**	0,28**	0,26**





3rd year	0,19*	0,22**	0,23**		
Process	1st year	0,32**	0,26**	0,22**	
3rd year	0,14	0,08	0,15		
Result	1st year	0,35**	0,23**	0,23**	
3rd year	0,16*	0,07	0,15		
I control the locus	1st year	0,25**	0,19*	0,16*	
3rd year	0,11	0,06	0,09		
Life locus control	1st year	0,34**	0,26**	0,19*	
3rd year	0,20*	0,16*	0,12		

According to the results of Table 1, it was noted that among first-year students, the goal has a high degree of correlation with engagement ($r=0,31$; $p\leq 0,01$), control ($r=0,28$; $p\leq 0,01$), and risk ($r=0,26$; $p\leq 0,01$). At the same time, it was observed that among 3rd-year students, the goal has a high degree of significant correlation with control ($r=0,22$; $p\leq 0,01$), risk ($r=0,23$; $p\leq 0,01$), and engagement ($r=0,19$; $p\leq 0,05$). According to the results of the methodology, it was established that the process in first-year students has a high degree of correlation with engagement ($r=0,32$; $p\leq 0,01$), control ($r=0,26$; $p\leq 0,01$), and risk ($r=0,22$; $p\leq 0,01$). In turn, it turned out that in 3rd-year students, the process is an independent component without interconnection with the criteria of life endurance.

Empirically, it was noted that among first-year students, the result has a high degree of correlation with engagement ($r=0,35$; $p\leq 0,01$), control ($r=0,23$; $p\leq 0,01$), and risk ($r=0,23$; $p\leq 0,01$). Especially in 3rd-year students, it was observed that the result is a separate phenomenon without interconnection between the criteria of life endurance.

According to the research results, it was observed that in first-year students, the "I" locus has a high degree of correlation with control engagement ($r=0,25$; $p\leq 0,01$), control ($r=0,19$; $p\leq 0,05$), and risk ($r=0,16$; $p\leq 0,05$). At the same time, it turned out that in 3rd-year students, the "I" locus is a separate phenomenon that does not have a correlation with the control criteria for life tolerance.

According to the experimental results, it was established that the locus of life in first-year students has a high degree of correlation with control involvement ($r=0,34$; $p\leq 0,01$), control ($r=0,26$; $p\leq 0,05$), and risk ($r=0,19$; $p\leq 0,05$). In turn, it was established that in 3rd-year students, the locus of life has a significant correlation with the involvement of the control ($r=0,20$; $p\leq 0,05$) and with the control ($r=0,16$; $p\leq 0,05$).

Based on the analysis of the conducted empirical research, we have the opportunity to form the following conclusions:

1. The student period is a sensitive period for the formation of resilience to life and orientation toward the meaning of life. It is this age period of life that is characterized by rapidly changing conditions. Therefore, an acute need for adaptation arises in the individual for the purpose of self-expression. As a result, a change in personality occurs. As a result, new views and values are formed in him. The ability to withstand life's hardships is also formed.





2. Factors such as stressful situations, the presence of social support, self-perception, the characteristics of the emotional sphere, and the orientation of life's content influence the formation of resilience to life during student years.

References

1. Белова А. Д., Герасименко К. О., Ермолаев В. В. К вопросу преемственности поколений Z и X: особенности смысложизненных ориентаций и жизнестойкости // Межпоколенческие отношения: современный дискурс и стратегические выборы в психолого-педагогической науке и практике. 2020. № 1. С. 133-138.
2. Вяземский Е. Е. Вклад великого российского педагога К. Д. Ушинского в отечественную педагогику и образование // Вестник Государственного университета просвещения. Серия: История и политические науки. 2023. № 2. С. 18-25.
3. Гурьянова Т. А., Скорлупина Е. А. Смысложизненные ориентации как предиктор жизнестойкости у студентов // Вестник Алтайского государственного педагогического университета. 2021. № 3 (48). С. 52-57.
4. Куликова Т. И. Взаимосвязь жизнестойкости и экзистенциальной исполненности у студентов разного возраста психолого-педагогического направления подготовки // Концепт. 2024. № 6.
5. Куликова Т. И. Особенности смысложизненных ориентаций у студентов-девушек разного возраста // Концепт. 2023. № 7.
6. Леонтьев Д. А. Новые горизонты проблемы смысла в психологии // Проблема смысла в науках о человеке (к 100-летию Виктора Франкла): материалы международной конференции / Под ред. Д. А. Леонтьева. М.: Смысл, 2005. С. 36-49.
7. Логинова М. В. Жизнестойкость личности студента как фактор ее успешной адаптации к условиям обучения в ВУЗе // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. 2009. № 6 (49). С. 70-73.
8. Лыиков И. А. Логотерапия Виктора Франкла: между психотерапией и теологией // Молодой исследователь Дона. 2022. № 2(35). С. 83-87.
9. Мадди С. Смыслообразование в процессе принятия решений // Психологический журнал. 2005. Т. 26, № 6. С. 87-101.
10. Мощенко Л. С., Дроздова Н. В. Смысложизненные ориентации студентов с разным уровнем жизнестойкости (на примере студентов-психологов) // Научно-методический электронный журнал «Концепт». 2016. № 50. С. 133-140.
11. Тувышева Д. А., Атаманова Г. И. Эмпирическое исследование взаимосвязи качеств жизнестойкости и ценностно-смысловых ориентиров личности // Ярославский педагогический вестник. 2020. №1(112). С. 156-164.
12. Guo L., Yan D., Yan J., et al. Correlation of Academic Emotion and Hardiness Personality of Undergraduate Nursing Students // BMC Nursing. 2024. № 23.

