

Postmodern Openings

ISSN: 2068-0236 | e-ISSN: 2069-9387

Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2022, Volume 13, Issue 4, pages: 448-471 | <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.4/527>

Submitted: May 15th, 2022 | Accepted for publication: June 21st, 2022

Digital Generation Y and Z in the Field of Tourism: Psychological Dimensions of Morality

Ilia PYSAREVSKYI¹,
Ivan OKHRIMENKO²,
Nataliia BOGDAN³,
Svitlana ZHARIKOVA⁴,
Nataliia VLASHCHENKO⁵,
Iuliia KRASNOKUTSKA⁶,
Olena UHODNIKOVA⁷,
Ihor BLOSHCHYNSKYI⁸

¹ Doctor in Economics, Professor of the Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy, Kharkiv, Ukraine, Ilia.Pisarevskiy@kname.edu.ua, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3999-0860>

² Doctor in Law, Professor of the Department of Legal Psychology, National Academy of Internal Affairs, Kyiv, Ukraine, ivango-07@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8813-5107>

³ Doctor in Economics, Associate Professor of the Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy, Kharkiv, Ukraine, bogdan.nataliya.67@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8176-9721>

⁴ PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor of the Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy, Kharkiv, Ukraine, svetlanazharikova22@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6814-6415>

⁵ PhD in Economics, Associate Professor of the Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy, Kharkiv, Ukraine, wlagenko177@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4163-7185>

Abstract: Significant transformations in postmodern society determine the need to form a space of digital communications and the involvement of information and communication technologies. Such trends make significant demands on various categories of professionals, including managers in the field of tourism. The aim of this research is to study the psychological peculiarities of morality in the representatives of digital Generations Y and Z in the field of tourism. In accordance with the aim, we paid attention to the study of such components of moral regulation as ethics attitude, moral foundations, justice sensitivity and moral disengagement. The research involved 200 participants being represented by volunteers from five regions of Ukraine, including 100 respondents in the age of 25-30 who formed part of the Generation Y group; the other 100 participants in the age of 18-23 formed the Generation Z group. The results show that millennials are more idealistic. The intercrossing of the factors of idealism and relativism allows us to characterize millennials as situationalists, and centennials as subjectivists. It is ascertained that millennials are characterised by such important moral foundations for judgments as “Faithfulness”, “Purity”, which is reflected in the greater importance of “Ethics of community”. At the same time, it was found that centennials place more emphasis on the moral foundations of care and justice, and as a result, they are more committed to the “Ethics of autonomy” and “Progressivism”. The research confirmed the uniqueness and specificity of the moral regulation of different digital generations of representatives of the tourism industry.

Keywords: *digital generations; managers; morality; psychological dimensions; tourism.*

How to cite: Pysarevskiy, I., Okhrimenko, I., Bogdan, N., Zharikova, S., Vlashchenko, N., Krasnokutskaya, I., Uhodnikova, O., & Bloschynskiy, I. (2022). Digital Generation Y and Z in the Field of Tourism: Psychological Dimensions of Morality. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(4), 448-471. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.4/527>

⁶ PhD in Economics, Associate Professor of the Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy, Kharkiv, Ukraine, y0506180284@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7241-1237>

⁷ PhD in Economics, Associate Professor of the Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy, Kharkiv, Ukraine, ugodnikova16@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2218-0041>

⁸ Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Foreign Languages Department, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, i.bloshch@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1925-9621>

1. Introduction

Today's society has changed significantly; technological innovations have brought digital reality into the space of everyday life, which is a specific type of reality called virtual reality, digital space and the space of digital communications. In digital reality, the relationship between people and the world takes a different form, social relations assume a different speed, and the processes taking place in society are accelerating in their continuation. The digital space and the involvement of information and communication technologies give rise to a specifically new type of culture i. e. the so-called "digital" culture. Progressive systems of training specialists in various fields are gradually moving away from traditional forms of work, which can contribute to the digestion of a significant amount of information within the modern information space, and this is a crucial requirement for corporate staff formation and development under the conditions of postmodern society.

Digital culture emerges in the digital space and has its own peculiarities: it is virtual, its information and communication processes are accelerated by times, the time of its information exchange is reduced to minutes. Digital culture implies the transition of a human being to a new level of understanding the world through digital technologies, methods of communication and universal information, which creates a duality of this phenomenon, which connects the human world and the world of technology. All this is becoming relevant in postmodern society.

Digital culture has become an integral part of private life, various spheres of production and business in the leading countries of Europe and the world, in particular in the field of tourism. It is now difficult to imagine planning and carrying out of a journey, selection and booking of a hotel, etc. without the use of digital technologies, which, of course, provide both the comfort of receiving services in these areas of business and their efficiency. Digitization of these processes implies the need for a high level of digital literacy of tourism managers, which often becomes a kind of "age" filter in the selection of personnel for this professional group. In this sense, digitization gives preference to the younger generation.

Wolfe, Phillips and Asperin, studying the experience of developed countries, rightly point out that the potential of employees in this professional field should enhance, productivity and job satisfaction should increase, which is positively correlated with customer loyalty and profitability, and negatively – with staff turnover in the face of growing competition and changing business environment in the field of tourism

(Wolfe, Phillips & Asperin, 2014). Business workers must have the necessary professional knowledge and digital skills, have sufficient life and professional experience, the increase of which usually forms the moral and value principles of professional activities and professional responsibility.

In addition, morality and responsibility as a prerequisite for the protection of human rights and an important vector of tourism development are increasingly frequently a major focus of interest of scientists from around the world (Butcher, 2015; Caton, 2015; Cornelisse, 2020; Fennell & Malloy, 1999; Marnburg, 2006; Thomas, 2020). The scientists emphasize that these indicators help to improve skills in the ability to constructively resolve problems related to complaints, maximize positive impressions and satisfaction with the quality of customer services, as well as the ability to share such experiences with colleagues (Huang, Wu, & Zhang, 2019; Kim, & Qu, 2019).

As Dimitriou (2017) points out, the problem of morality in the context of the huge and diverse tourism industry, which is constantly growing and facing the challenges of the modern world, is complex and multidimensional. At the same time, Macbeth (2005) stressed the need in his analysis of the methodological foundations of tourism business theory and practice to change the leading paradigm and adopt a new concept of ethics, which should be based on morality in the strategy of tourism business development and management. Maccannell (2012) is convinced that tourism is a special dimension of the moral sphere, which implies the need to comply with ethical requirements and responsibilities. According to Butcher (2015), modern tourism should become an important component of a moral strategy aimed at positive transformations of the individual and the world as a whole.

In general, the ethics of tourism depends on the degree of development of moral norms of persons engaged in this business at both macro and micro levels. Defects in moral development and lack of ethical norms result in not only moral “distortion” of the tourism business (e. g., dark tourism), but also in the commitment of such illegal acts as corruption, human trafficking, child sex tourism, various forms of fraud, prostitution, flow of illegal migrants, etc.

Under these circumstances, we should pay attention to young people who were born and formed in the era of information revolution and the active development of information and communication technologies. Young people who evolved during the period of widespread influence of information and communication technologies are often called the “digital generation”, whose worldview is formed on the border between the real and

virtual world. Scientists not only denominate the “digital generation” with different names, but also denote its heterogeneity. The new generation born in the era of information technology is called “Digital Generation” by Tapscott (1998), and “Homo sapiens digital” or “Digital natives” by Macbeth (2005). Those who were born in the last decades of the twentieth century are called “Millennials” or “Generation Y”, who were born on the threshold of the twenty-first century and later, and designate it as “Post Millennials” or “Generation Z” (Dolot, 2018; Tsilmak, Okhrimenko, I., Okhrimenko, S., Yusupov, & Hryshchenko, 2020).

The problem of psychological peculiarities of the representatives of digital generations is actively considered in modern science and international practice; however, the views of the scientists are quite contradictory in this regard (Bondarenko, et al., 2020; Caton, 2015; Cornelisse, 2020; Marnburg, 2006; Thomas, 2020). The researchers focus on both the positive and negative characteristics of the digital generation. This suggests that the idea of “difference” and “perfection” of the representatives of digital generation is confirmed not in all empirical studies, in particular, in terms of description of the psychological peculiarities and basic skills of young people born in the digital world (Bennett, Maton, & Kervin, 2008). In addition, the problem of negative psychological characteristics of the individual in view of moral defects is not without interest. Numerous publications present the results of the research on morality as a factor that provokes cyber-bullying and cyber-aggression in adolescents of Generations Y and Z (Lo Cricchio, García-Poole, te Brinke, Bianchi, & Menesini, 2021; Perren, & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, 2012; Runions, & Bak, 2015), which indicates concomitant changes in other components of moral regulation. At the same time, viewpoints in the scientific literature do not provide a detailed answer to the question of what happens to the moral regulation of the representatives of these generations as they are formed and developed.

2. Literature Review

The specificity of Generation Y, or as they are also called “millennial generation”, is determined by the growing influence of the Internet and the processes of globalization of the world. They grew and matured believing that everything was possible under their parental care. Millennials are optimistic, sociable, open to change, have high hopes for themselves and others, enterprising, realistic, have high expectations, they are team-oriented, appreciate peer opinion and are confident in making decisions, hoping to

change the world for the better (Wang, X., Yang, L., Yang, J., Wang, P., & Lei, 2017).

Generation Z (post-millennials or “centennials”) is a shining example of people who emerged in times of great globalization and postmodernism. Their characteristic feature is that they have been experts in all modern technologies since early childhood. Generation Z, unlike millennials, tends to be more individualistic, less goal-oriented, more successful in multitasking, more globally oriented and more entrepreneurial, with higher expectations. They prefer the work they like, they are independent, expect appropriate rewards for their efforts, value individuality, trust and justice, they are ambitious, creative, proactive, have plans for the future, want to learn independently and are focused on autonomous work (Dolot, 2018).

The representatives of digital generations are actually living in a new reality in which virtual platforms have become a “natural social landscape.” Their psychological peculiarities are largely mediated by the virtual environment developing the ability to work efficiently with information, which, however, carries the risk of changing previously accumulated socio-psychological achievements, inevitably changing their specificity (Tapscott, 1998).

The researchers note the manifestations of clip-like thinking, fragmentary knowledge, superficial perception of information, instability of attention processes, reduced self-control, “intelligent surfing” instead of systematic intellectual work, distraction and low stability of attention in a multitasking situation, superficial style of information processing when receiving it through hypertext, rapid switching of attention, memory impairment, which increases the likelihood of impaired logical analysis, reflection and critical thinking, difficulties in providing answers, especially in tasks related to the Internet (Dong, Zhou, & Zhao, 2011). Describing digital generations, some scientists rightly point to declining empathy and social intelligence, the ability to understand the feelings and needs of others as key factors in building social relationships. The reasons for this are aggressive computer games, excess of emotionally charged information resulting in reduced sensitivity, digital multitasking, etc. (Konrath, O’Brien, & Hsing, 2011). This indicates a decline in empathy among young people and highlights its sharp decline since 2000, often linked to the rise in violent crime.

Digital space as a space for modern youth is filled with such antisocial behaviours as cyber-bullying, cyber-violence and cyber-aggression, which is becoming a social problem around the world (Bennett, Maton, &

Kervin, 2008). According to numerous studies, the underdevelopment of moral attitudes and low adherence to moral values, lack of moral judgments and moral self-concept, low level of moral motivation, alienation of moral responsibility, etc. are increasingly active among young people (Falla, Ortega-Ruiz, & Romera, 2021; Gini, 2006; Shahnawaz, Nasir, & Rehman, 2020). It should be emphasized that the field of tourism is no exception, which is filled with the representatives of Generations Y and Z in modern conditions. In the light of the above, the question of the specificity of the components of moral regulation in the representatives of different digital generations in the field of tourism is becoming relevant, which necessitates a study on this issue.

The aim of this research is to study the psychological peculiarities of morality in the representatives of digital Generations Y and Z in the field of tourism.

3. Methodology

The research used a sampling strategy based on the time categorization of the definition of digital generations (McMullen, 2012).

At the same time, we assume that belonging to a generation is determined not only by the year of birth, but also on the basis of common values that have emerged on the basis of certain threats, challenges and achievements. In addition, the pattern of behaviour and the system of values of the individual are defined by historical events, forms of communication, environment, the degree of digitalization of life and its voluntariness or compulsion (as in the case of the COVID-19 pandemic). The sample consisted of 200 volunteers i. e. managers of the tourism business from 5 regions of Ukraine (Kyiv, Kharkiv, Sumy, Khmelnytskyi and Lviv regions). One hundred respondents in the age of 25-30 were included in the group of Generation Y, another 100 participants in the age of 18-23 formed Generation Z group. Women accounted for 50 % of the respondents in each group. All subjects confirmed the active use of information technology for a wide range of virtual classes.

The research was conducted from December 2020 to June 2021 by direct contact (“face to face”). All participants were informed about the main objectives of the research; attention was focused on non-disclosure of their personal data.

The research used a number of methods: “Ethics Position Questionnaire” (EPQ), created by Forsyth (1980), adapted by Fedorov and Badiev (2018); “The Moral Foundations Questionnaire” (MFQ), developed

on the basis of Haidt's moral foundations theory (Graham et al., 2011), adapted by Sychev, Protasova, & Belousov (2018); "The Justice Sensitivity Inventory", by **Schmitt, Baumert, Gollwitzer, & Maes (2010)**, adapted by **Adamyany, Nartova-Bochaver, & Shmitt (2018)**; the questionnaire "Moral Disengagement-24" (MD-24), developed by Moore, Detert, Baker, & Mayer (2012), adapted by Ledovaya, Tikhonov, Bogolyubova, & Kazennaya (2016).

The Ethics Position Questionnaire (EPQ) is designed to measure idealism and relativism and consists of 20 items, 10 on each of the scales (Forsyth, 1980). Idealism is defined as the degree to which an individual believes that "right" actions always result in the desired consequences. Individuals with a high level of idealism have moral judgments based on the consequences of their actions. What is good is moral, and what is bad is immoral. Herewith, the motives for the action are not taken into account; only the consequences are important for making moral judgment. In other words, idealists believe that doing the "right" things is good for everyone. People with a low level of idealism (pragmatism) are convinced that any action brings both benefits and harms, and any action is associated with side effects. Relativism is the individual's attitude to the lack of clear moral principles. When evaluating others, people with a high level of relativism attach more importance to the circumstances than to violated moral foundations. Individuals with a low level of relativism, on the contrary, are convinced of the existence of absolute, unshakable moral norms, ethical precepts, moral imperatives. In the questionnaire, the subjects must rate the degree of agreement with each statement on a 9-point scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (9). The sum of points scored by the respondent on each of the scales is calculated, which makes it possible to assign a person to one of four categories: absolutists, exceptionists, situationists, subjectivists.

Absolutism. Individuals with a high level of idealism and a low level of relativism rely on universal moral principles in making moral judgments. Absolutists believe that adhering to strong ethical principles helps to achieve the best results. Having faced with an ethical dilemma, the absolutist makes decisions based on rules, without making exceptions, regardless of the context of the situation or the consequences.

Exceptionism. Individuals with a low level of relativism and a low level of idealism rely on moral attitudes when making moral judgments, but recognize that "there are exceptions to all rules." Within the framework of exclusivity, morality is assessed in terms of the greatest good for most people. If the consequences of a lie bring the most benefit compared to the truth, then from an ethical point of view a lie is better.

Situationism. Individuals with a high level of relativism and a high level of idealism in making moral judgments believe that each case should be considered individually. Moral judgment is not based on the assessment of an action as “good” or “bad”, but on the basis of its “contextual relevance”. Thus, ethics is determined by usefulness, based on the consequences of the action, without regard to motives and intentions.

Subjectivism. Individuals with a high level of relativism and a low level of idealism, like situationists, consider moral principles to be relative, so making moral judgments they do not always rely on them. But unlike situationists, they do not rely on consequences in their judgments because they do not believe in the “common good.” And since the common good is unattainable, the individuals must be guided solely by their own interests. Thus, moral judgments are made about the extent to which a person’s actions are in his or her own best interests. In the version of the questionnaire developed by Fedorov and Badiev (2018), on the recommendation of Forsythe, the 9-point scale of answers was replaced by a 5-point one. The practice of using the English version of the EPQ has shown that the 5-point Likert scale has sufficient sensitivity.

The Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) was proposed by J. Graham and colleagues in 2011 to diagnose moral foundations (Graham et al., 2011). The questionnaire consists of two parts of 15 tasks, forming five scales. The first part includes the question to the respondent in the instructions of the following type: “When you decide what is right and what is wrong, what do the following considerations mean to you?” and various evaluation options are offered. Participants rate each of the 15 options on a six-point scale from “Absolutely not important” (0) to “Extremely important” (5), thus indicating their suitability for a moral assessment of an event or action. In the second part, the respondents agree to some extent with statements (on a six-point scale from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”) that embody a certain moral value. The moral basis was primarily “care” (in particular, the prohibition of harm) and “justice”. Three other moral foundations were also determined that go beyond the protection of the interests of the individual and are related to the attitude of the individual to his group: loyalty to the group, respect for authority and purity. These moral foundations are called mandatory because they help unite the group around its values and the leader.

The Justice Sensitivity Inventory, proposed by Schmitt and colleagues, is based on sensitivity to justice as a personality trait that includes a strong individual willingness to accept cases of injustice and the strength of cognitive, emotional and behavioural responses to injustice (Baumert, &

Schmitt, 2016; Schmitt, Baumert, Gollwitzer, & Maes, 2010). The questionnaire contains 40 points and four scales, ten points for each of the positions in the situation of violation of injustice, and statements with the same numbers have almost the same wording, differing only in the specifics of the viewpoint. The respondents are asked to refer to their experience in situations of injustice and to assess the extent to which their responses to these situations correspond to those described in the questionnaire, on a six-point scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The concept of “sensitivity to justice” describes not just the content of ideas or motives that are relevant in the face of injustice, but the actual degree of perception of injustice as a stable characteristic of the individual (Adamyán, Nartova-Bochaver, & Shmitt, 2018).

The questionnaire “Moral Disengagement-24” (MD-24) was developed by Moore, Detert, Baker, & Mayer (2012) based on Bandura’s ideas about the content and structure of the phenomenon of moral disengagement. Bandura (1986) points out that there are mechanisms that determine the selective actualization of the subject at different stages of self-regulation of certain moral prohibitions, which allows you to apply or not apply these moral prohibitions to yourself. Bandura classifies eight mechanisms of alienation of moral responsibility into four groups (loci): the behavioural locus, the personality locus of the actor, the locus of reformulating the consequences of behaviour and the locus of distorting the image of the victim.

The behavioural locus operates through three mechanisms:

1. *Moral justification*: The application of this mechanism is based on the use of justifications of a moral, social or economic nature in order to justify the morality of one’s own actions.

2. *Euphemistic labelling*: The use of specially selected expressions can significantly change the attitude to violence. For example, the phrases “exact hit” or “collateral damage” can reduce the negative nature of the actions they label.

3. *Advantage comparison*: Comparing one’s own actions with those that are much more reprehensible can reduce one’s perception of their harmfulness.

The personality locus of the actor involves shifting or deliberately blurring the guilt of the person responsible for the destructive behaviour. It includes two mechanisms:

1. Shifting of responsibility occurs when the actor explains the reasons for his actions under the influence of a more authoritative person and minimizes his own activity. For example, a hired executioner may say that he carried out orders “from above”.

2. Dissemination of responsibility is a common technique of distribution of guilt, which takes place, for example, among concentration camp officials or prison guards, who present their actions as “just elements of a huge system.”

The locus that allows you to reformulate the consequences of behaviour includes a mechanism for distorting or ignoring the consequences of harmful behaviour (ignoring or distorting the consequences). For example, a person who has committed an immoral action may deny that someone was seriously injured, or may argue that the damage was even beneficial because it was able to “harden” the victim.

The locus that distorts the image of the victim includes two mechanisms:

1. *Dehumanization*. When using this mechanism, the victim is mentally or verbally equated with a representative of the lower stage of evolution, an animal or even an insect, devoid of emotions and its own meanings, the ability to feel pain and so on.

2. *Attribution of guilt*. In using this mechanism, the perpetrator describes himself as a “victim” of the real victim, pointing to “provocation.”

The version of the questionnaire we used contains 24 items (3 statements for each mechanism of moral disengagement). The subjects are asked to express their degree of agreement or disagreement with them on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”).

The research was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Ethics of O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy (protocol No. 8 of April 29, 2020). Informed consent was obtained from all individuals who participated in this research and they could opt out at any time.

4. Results

Ethics Attitude. Table 1 shows the results of the study of the ethics attitudes in the representatives of digital Generations Y and Z in the field of tourism.

Table 1. The indicators of ethics attitude in groups of Generations Y and Z (Mean ± SD)

The scales	Generation Y	Generation Z	p
Idealism	38.12 ± 1.14	26.25 ± 1.47	< 0.001
Relativism	36.08 ± 0.98	34.96 ± 2.03	-

Legend: Mean – arithmetical average; SD – standard deviation; p – the significance of the difference between the indicators of groups of Generations Y and Z due to the Student’s t-criterion

It was found that in the group of Generation Y the indicator on the scale “Idealism” (38.12 ± 1.14) significantly exceeds the indicator on this scale in the group of Generation Z (26.25 ± 1.47), $p < 0.001$. Regarding the scale of “Relativism”, the groups of Generations Y and Z do not show significant differences in indicators.

Differences between participants. The group of Generation Y shows greater confidence that “right” actions always lead to the desired consequences. They have a great tendency to make moral judgments according to the consequences of actions, which implies the morality of what is good and the immorality of what is harmful; herewith, the motives of a particular action are not taken into account, only the consequences of moral judgment are important. Generation Z test groups are more pragmatic, which is reflected in their beliefs about both the benefits and harms of any action, and any action is associated with side effects. Hence, it can be argued that to make a moral judgment about the action according to its consequences is impossible for this category of participants, because a person, making a choice, chooses the easiest way. The intercrossing of factors of idealism and relativism allows to expand the characteristics of ethical attitudes in the groups of Generations Y and Z. High levels of relativism and high levels of idealism define the group of Generation Y as situationists who, expressing their own moral judgments, believe that each case should be considered individually. Moral judgment in this case is not based on the assessment of the action as “good” or “bad”, but on the basis of its “contextual relevance”. Thus, ethics is determined by usefulness, based on the consequences of the action, without regard to motives and intentions. High levels of relativism and low levels of idealism define Generation Z group as subjectivists. They, like situationists, believe that moral principles are quite relative, and therefore should not be taken into account when making moral judgments. However, these actors, unlike situationists, do not rely on consequences in their judgments, but are guided solely by their own interests. Thus, subjectivists make moral judgments in accordance with the assessment of how a person’s actions are in his own interests.

Moral Foundations. Table 2 shows the results of the study of moral foundations in the groups of Generations Y and Z in the field of tourism.

Table 2. The indicators of moral foundations in the groups of Generations Y and Z (Mean \pm SD)

The scales	Generation Y	Generation Z	p
Care	3.20 \pm 0.51	3.58 \pm 0.46	< 0.01
Fairness	3.14 \pm 0.47	3.56 \pm 0.48	< 0.01
Loyalty	3.23 \pm 0.43	2.81 \pm 0.39	< 0.01
Respect	2.97 \pm 0.49	2.77 \pm 0.38	-
Purity	3.08 \pm 0.54	2.18 \pm 0.55	< 0.01
Ethics of autonomy	3.17 \pm 0.49	3.57 \pm 0.47	< 0.01
Ethics of community	3.09 \pm 0.49	2.59 \pm 0.66	< 0.01
Progressivism	0.08 \pm 0.01	0.98 \pm 0.20	< 0.01

Legend: Mean – arithmetical average; SD – standard deviation; p – the significance of the difference between the indicators of groups of Generations Y and Z due to the Student’s t-criterion

The results of the research show that on the scales of “Care” and “Fairness” the group of Generation Z (3.58 \pm 0.46 and 3.56 \pm 0.48) differs from the group of Generation Y (3.20 \pm 0.51 and 3.14 \pm 0.47) by much higher indicators ($p < 0.01$). The indicators in the group of Generation Y on the scales of “Loyalty” (3.23 \pm 0.43) and “Purity” (3.08 \pm 0.54) significantly exceed the indicator on these scales in the group of Generation Z (2.81 \pm 0.39 and 2.18 \pm 0.55) ($p < 0.01$). The differences between the groups did not reach the level of significance according to the scale of “Respect”. The obtained differences are reflected in significantly higher indicators on the scales of “Ethics of autonomy” and “Progressivism” in the group of Generation Z (3.57 \pm 0.47 and 0.98 \pm 0.20) compared to the group of Generation Y (3.17 \pm 0.49 and 0.08 \pm 0.01) ($p < 0.01$). In turn, the group of Generation Y shows significantly higher results on the scale of “Ethics of community” (3.09 \pm 0.49 and 2.59 \pm 0.66; $p < 0.01$).

Differences between participants. The group of Generation Z considers moral foundations for value judgments such as care, the prohibition of harm, compassion, the detection of injustice and the preservation of justice to be more important. More important for this group are the individualized moral foundations, united by the scale of “Ethics of autonomy”, as well as the prevalence of moral foundations that characterize the communities of the West. Generation Y gives more importance to loyalty to the group, combined with intolerance of traitors, as well as socio-cultural symbols, norms and prohibitions related to various spheres of life, which reflects the greater importance of social ethics. Community ethics and

greater devotion are traditional conservative moral foundations of value judgments.

Justice sensitivity. Table 3 shows the results of the study of sensitivity to justice in the groups of Generations Y and Z.

Table 3. The indicators of justice sensitivity in the groups of Generations Y and Z (Mean \pm SD)

The scales	Generation Y	Generation Z	p
Victim sensitivity	28.26 \pm 1.32	31.74 \pm 1.53	< 0.05
Observer sensitivity	29.61 \pm 0.97	26.18 \pm 1.09	< 0.01
Beneficiary sensitivity	24.02 \pm 1.22	23.97 \pm 0.88	-
Perpetrator sensitivity	25.13 \pm 0.93	24.85 \pm 1.11	-

Legend: Mean – arithmetical average; SD – standard deviation; p – the significance of the difference between the indicators of groups of Generations Y and Z due to the Student's t-criterion

The indicator in the group of Generation Y according to the scale of “Observer sensitivity” (29.61 \pm 0.97) is significantly higher than in the group of Generation Z (26.18 \pm 1.09; $p < 0.01$). The group of Generation Z, compared to the group of Generation Y, shows a significantly higher indicator on the scale of “Victim sensitivity” (31.74 \pm 1.53 and 28.26 \pm 1.32; $p < 0.05$). Sensitivity to justice from the point of view of the beneficiary and the perpetrator does not reveal significant differences between the groups of different digital generations.

Differences between participants. In both groups of Generations Y and Z, the sensitivity to justice from the point of view of the victim and the sensitivity to justice from the point of view of the observer was found to be the most pronounced. Less pronounced are prosocial types of sensitivity to justice, namely the sensitivity of the beneficiaries and the sensitivity of perpetrators. Generation Z has a more pronounced experience of being a victim of injustice, which results in feelings of anger. The group of generation Y is more likely to be an observer of injustice to others, which can lead to moral outrage. To a lesser extent, the subjects of both groups tend to feel guilty and ashamed of taking advantage of the injustice being in the role of a beneficiary when the circumstances are in favour of the subject but against the attitude of the others. Our data coincide with the results obtained by the authors of the adaptation of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory

method, which showed that the sensitivity to justice from the victim’s attitude decreases as the number of respondents increases (Adamyany, Nartova-Bochaver, & Shmitt, 2018). Sensitivity from the point of view of the perpetrator of social norms increases with age, but this pattern was not confirmed in our research.

Moral disengagement. Table 4 shows the results of the study of moral disengagement in the groups of Generations Y and Z.

Table 4. The indicators of moral disengagement in the groups of Generations Y and Z (Mean ± SD)

The scales	Y generation	Z generation	p
Moral Justification	13.88 ± 1.62	14.54 ± 1.27	-
Euphemistic labelling	13.47 ± 1.37	14.63 ± 1.42	-
Advantageous comparison	10.09 ± 0.44	12.76 ± 0.73	< 0.05
Displacement of responsibility	9.15 ± 0.84	11.69 ± 0.66	< 0.05
Diffusion of responsibility	12.17 ± 1.43	13.38 ± 1.19	-
Disregard or distortion consequences	16.21 ± 1.25	13.03 ± 1.11	< 0.01
Dehumanization	13.22 ± 1.13	16.75 ± 0.76	< 0.01
Attribution of blame	14.08 ± 0.86	16.68 ± 1.03	< 0.05

Legend: Mean – arithmetical average; SD – standard deviation; p – the significance of the difference between the indicators of groups of Generations Y and Z due to the Student’s t-criterion

It was found that no significantly higher indicators on the scale of “Advantageous comparison” were recorded among the components of the behavioural locus of moral disengagement in the group of Generation Z, in contrast to the group of Generation Y (12.76 ± 0.73 and 10.09 ± 0.44; p < 0.05). Significantly higher indicators were set on the scale of “Displacement of responsibility” also in the group of Generation Z among the components of the personal locus of moral disengagement (11.69 ± 0.66 and 9.15 ± 0.84; p < 0.05). In addition, in the locus of distortion of the victim’s image, significantly higher indicators were recorded in the group of Generation Z on the scales of “Dehumanization” (16.75 ± 0.76) and “Attribution of blame” (16.68 ± 1.03), compared with the group of Generation Y (13.22 ± 1.13 and 14.08 ± 0.86; p < 0.01; p < 0.05). Regarding the locus of reformulation of behavioural consequences, it was found that the indicator on the scale of “Disregard or distortion consequences” in the group of Generation Y significantly exceeds the indicator on this scale in the

group of Generation Z (16.21 ± 1.25) (13.03 ± 1.11 ; $p < 0.01$). According to the scales of “Moral Justification”, “Euphemistic labelling” (behavioural locus of moral disengagement) and “Diffusion of responsibility” (personal locus of moral disengagement) the different digital generations do not differ significantly.

Differences between participants. Generation Z is more convinced that unethical actions can be useful or altruistic in nature, preventing greater human suffering. These actors are more likely to find explanations for their behaviour in the social environment of tourism on the part of powerful or more authoritative individuals, which allows such a subject to minimize his / her own initiative in committing unethical actions. Generation Z is also characterized by a more pronounced focus on the perception of objects of their unethical behaviour as having lost positive human qualities, which allows them to go beyond the subjective dimension of humanity and the correctness of service delivery. In addition, this group is more prone to unethical actions in order to point to a “provocative” situation in which, due to circumstances beyond their control, these actors have been forced to behave in a certain way in response to the “provocation” of the transmitter of unethical behaviour.

5. Limits and Discussion

According to Caton (2015), the study of the problem of morality in general, and in the field of tourism in particular, is a complex research task that requires an integrated approach using scientific developments presented in various fields of science, which, in our opinion, should include not only the achievements of scientists and practitioners in a purely professional field of this problems, but also the contribution of psychologists to its solution. McMullen (2012) points out to the growing attention of modern scientists to morality in the field of tourism and notes that it is the interdisciplinary approach that unlocks the potential and outlines ways for new research in this field, which, according to Thomas (2020), will enrich research to improve practical training of managers in the field of tourism. Fennell and Malloy (1999) empirically found significant differences in the content and stability of the ethical attitudes of managers of different types of tourism using a multidimensional ethical scale. A study of the perceptions of students i. e. future tourism managers about moral difficulties in professional activities, conducted by Marnburg (2006), showed that, at first glance, respondents are able to critically and maturely assess possible professional problems of moral content. At the same time, when moral dilemmas arise,

they are sceptical of managerial decisions, are short-sighted about the consequences of unethical decisions, and critical of organizational requirements for ethical values that should govern professional activities. Marnburg draws attention to the need for support of students and beginners by leaders, which allows to productively analyse their ethical views and moral dilemmas, develop an understanding of ethical issues, professional values and norms, and the ability to make moral decisions (Marnburg, 2006). Consensus is expressed by Caton (2015) and Thomas (2020), who propose to introduce a system of moral development as an important component of the practice of training tourism managers.

In support of these viewpoints, our research revealed the standpoint according to which the moral judgments of millennials in the field of tourism services are based on the consequences of actions in terms of their “contextual relevance”, and a measure of its ethics is the usefulness of the action. They are more likely to play the prosocial role of witnessing injustice to others, which is a source of moral outrage, and are more committed to the traditional principles to perceive moral judgment, such as loyalty to a particular group and the importance of social norms. Justification of their unethical behaviour towards clients, in particular, is provided by the mechanism of ignoring the consequences, which allows to subjectively reduce the degree of unethical behaviour and minimize its consequences in their perception.

According to the centennials, moral assessment of actions seems impossible, because any action causes harm, and moral principles are relative and can not be the basis for moral judgment, which they form in accordance with their own interests. At the same time, the individual moral foundations that reflect the ethics of autonomy (care, prohibition of harm, compassion, detection of injustice and preservation of justice) inherent in Western culture are quite significant. Sensitivity to justice is realized in this group through the experience of being the object of injustice, which generates feelings of anger. Justification of one’s own unethical behaviour is due to its rethinking as useful, altruistic, preventing the intensification of human suffering. They tend to minimize the degree of their initiative in the implementation of unethical behaviour, referring to the social influence of powerful or authoritative individuals in this field of services.

The specificity of Generation Z (post-millennials) is currently not studied in detail in comparison with Generation Y (centennials), but, according to some researchers, the new environment in which they develop, determines their new characteristics (Bennett, Maton, & Kervin, 2008;

Prontenko, et al., 2019; Tsilmak, Okhrimenko, Barko, Protsenko, & Gerashchenko, 2020; Zhamardiy, et al., 2019).

At the same time, Dolot (2018) notes that representatives of Generation Y in the field of tourism are quite dependent on the media; they are interested in cultural content, accept the values of their parents, such as social activities, want to achieve their goals as soon as possible and often want to fulfil their desires. For Generation Z, which can also be called “online generation”, social networks are the main platform for communication.

At the same time, scientists emphasize the parasocial nature of virtual relationships and empirically show that users change their perceptions of themselves and others to match the pseudo-reality of the game, social network, and edit their online persona to create positive experiences and develop desired relationships in different areas (McMullen, 2012). As Baumert and Schmitt (2016) point out, as virtual time increases, face-to-face communication and cognitive structures that control human contact and weaken social interaction in service delivery decrease.

An important difference between virtual communication and face-to-face communication in the field of service provision (including tourism) is that communicators in the digital space can be removed from those affected by their communication. This protects them from direct observation of the results of virtual interaction and largely determines the situation when moral foundations and principles give way to personal interests and pragmatism, ignorance of moral issues and conflicting trends in taking on moral responsibility.

6. Conclusions

The specifics of the tourism business often determines the degree of development of moral norms in its representatives, which is reflected at both the macro and micro levels. The emergence of defects in moral development in this field often leads not only to moral “distortion” of tourist services (so-called dark tourism), but also to the commitment of criminal acts such as corruption, human trafficking, child sex tourism, various forms of fraud, prostitution, flow of illegal migrants, etc.

The specificity of the studied components of moral regulation shows not only its qualitative differences in the representatives of groups Y and Z, but also reflects the lack of harmony of moral regulation in the subjects of different generations in the field of tourism, which is accompanied by some inconsistencies.

The results show that moral regulation works uniquely in the representatives of digital Generations Y and Z in the tourism business. The research from the ethical point of view has shown that millennials are more idealistic. The intercrossing of factors of idealism and relativism allows to characterize millennials as situationalists, and centennials as subjectivists.

The research of the moral foundations of the individual revealed their peculiarities in the representatives of different digital generations in the field of tourism. For representatives of Generation Z (millennials), the moral basis for further judgments, such as “Loyalty”, “Purity”, is important, which is reflected in the importance of “Ethics of community”. The representatives of Generation Y (centennials), on the other hand, pay more attention to the moral foundations of “Care” and “Fairness” and, as a result, are more committed to “Ethics of autonomy” and “Progressivism”.

The research results also show that millennials are more likely to subjectively neutralize their own unethical actions through ignorance or distortion. At the same time, centennials are more characterized by favourable comparisons, displacement of responsibility, dehumanization and attribution of guilt, which indicates a more active mechanisms of moral disengagement.

We assume that the results of our research reflect not only the peculiarities of personal development in the degree of his / her inclusion in the digital environment of tourism, but also the impact of modern realities of European and world society, characterized by social transformations in various spheres of social activity.

This research presents the advantages and limitations of moral dimensions in the tourism business. One of the strengths is that the research confirmed the uniqueness of the moral regulation of these digital generations in the psychological dimension. The results revealed significant differences in ethical attitudes, sensitivity to justice and such a negative pole of morality as moral disengagement, which were characteristic of Generations Y and Z. This primarily distinguishes our conclusions from most studies on this issue.

Our research among managers in the field of tourism showed that the region is not a determinant of the success and competitiveness of staff in this field. The representatives of both digital generations must have the necessary knowledge and skills, have sufficient life and professional experience, the growth of which forms personal moral and value principles and orientations. As for the system of moral attitudes, the moral basis for further professional judgments is a more important factor of formation and development for the representatives of Generation Z (millennials). They are

more flexible and balanced in professional and personal contacts. Generation Y (centennials), on the other hand, is quite caring about clients and prone to manifestations of emotionality and empathy. These indicators demonstrate the need for organized psychological support for professionals in the field of tourism at different stages of their training, especially in the context of the formation and development of their morality. This, in our opinion, is a defining requirement for the formation of staff of service provision organizations under the conditions of a postmodern society.

The results of our research are implemented in the educational process of O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy for the training of future professionals in the field of tourism.

We did not consider other components of moral regulation, such as moral identity, prosocial motivation, empathy, and so on in the process of the scientific research. These components outline the prospects for further research that will provide a better understanding of the psychological dimensions of morality in representatives of different digital generations of the tourism business.

Acknowledgement

Illia Pysarevskiy and Ivan Okhrimenko were involved in study concept and experimental design. Nataliia Bogdan, Svitlana Zharikova and Nataliia Vlashchenko were involved in data collection, analysis and article writing. Iuliia Krasnokutskaya, Olena Uhodnikova and Ihor Bloshchynskiy were involved in statistical analysis and data interpretation. All authors were involved in critical review and final approval of the article.

References

- Adamyana, A. A., Nartova-Bochavera, S. K., & Shmitt, M. (2018). Oprosnik "Chuvstvitel'nost' k spravedlivosti": validizatsiya na russkoyazychnoi vyborke [Justice Sensitivity Questionnaire: Validation on a Russian-Speaking Sample]. *Psikhologicheskii zhurnal*, 39(4), 105-116.
<https://doi.org/10.31857/S020595920000075-8>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Prentice-Hall series in social learning theory. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Baumert, A., & Schmitt, M. (2016). Justice Sensitivity, In: Sabbagh, C., Schmitt, M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Justice Theory and Research*. Springer, New York.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3216-0_9

- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The “Digital Natives” Debate: A Critical Review of the Evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 775-786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x>
- Bondarenko, V., Okhrimenko, I., Yevdokimova, O., Sydorchuk, N., Dzhezhyk, O., Boichuk, I., Kalashnik, N., Kozlovets, M., Slyusar, V., Pavlenko, V., Biruk, N., Verbovskiy, I., & Bloshchynskiy, I. (2020). Professional skills and competencies of the future police officers. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology*, 9(5), 35-43. <http://www.ijaep.com/index.php/IJAE/article/view/975>
- Butcher, J. (2015). Ethical tourism and development: the personal and the political. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 40(1), 71-80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2015.1010360>
- Caton, K. (2015). Growing on the go? Moral development and tourism. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 18(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2015.1004253>
- Cornelisse, M. (2020) Moral Claims in Sustainable Tourism Development. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 17(4), 404-422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1622591>
- Dimitriou, C. K. (2017). The quest for a practical approach to morality and the tourism industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 45-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.08.001>
- Dolot, A. (2018). The Characteristics of Generation Z. *E-Mentor*, 2, 44-50. <https://doi.org/10.15219/em74.1351>
- Dong, G., Zhou, H., & Zhao, X. (2011). Male Internet addicts show impaired executive control ability: evidence from a color-word Stroop task. *Neuroscience letters*, 499(2), 114-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2011.05.047>
- Falla, D., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Romera, E. M. (2021). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the transition from cybergossip to cyberaggression: a longitudinal study. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(3), e1000. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031000>
- Fedorov, A. A., & Badiev, I. V. (2018). Validizatsiya russkoyazychnoi versii oprosnika eticheskikh pozitsii [Validation of the Russian-language version of the ethical positions questionnaire]. *Psikbologiya. Zhurnal Vyshei shkoly ekonomiki*, 15(3), 491-509. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1813-8918-2018-3-491-509>
- Fennell, D. A., & Malloy, D. C. (1999). Measuring the ethical nature of tourism operators. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 928-943. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00032-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00032-8)
- Forsyth, D. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 175-184. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.39.1.175>

- Gini, G. (2006). Social Cognition and Moral Cognition in Bullying: What's Wrong? *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(6), 528-539. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20153>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366-385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a002184>
- Huang, C., Wu, K., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Understanding precedents for frontline employee turnover in luxury hotels: Emotional intelligence as a unifying factor. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 18(1), 26-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2019.1526504>
- Kim, H., & Qu, H. (2019). Employees' burnout and emotional intelligence as mediator and moderator in the negative spiral of incivility. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(3), 1412-1431. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2017-0794>
- Konrath, S. H., O'Brien, E. H., & Hsing, C. (2011). Changes in dispositional empathy in American college students over time: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(2), 180-198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310377395>
- Ledovaya, Ya. A., Tikhonov, R. V., Bogolyubova, O. N., & Kazennaya, E. V. (2016). Otchuzhdenie moral'noi otvetstvennosti: psikhologicheskii konstrukt i metody ego izmereniya [Moral Disengagement: psychological construct and methods of its measurement]. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta*, 4, 23-39. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu16.2016.402>
- Lo Cricchio, M. G., García-Poole, C., te Brinke, L.W., Bianchi, D., & Menesini, E. (2021). Moral disengagement and cyberbullying involvement: A systematic review. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 18(2), 271-311, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2020.1782186>
- Macbeth, J. (2005). Towards an ethics platform for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 962-984. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.11.005>
- Maccannell, D. (2012). On the ethical stake in tourism research. *Tourism Geographies*, 14(1), 183-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2012.639387>
- Marnburg, E. (2006). I hope it won't happen to me! Hospitality and tourism students' fear of difficult moral situations as managers. *Tourism management*, 27(4), 561-575. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.02.001>
- McMullen, J. L. (2012). Metaphors and morality: are digital media epistemologically compatible with moral socialization? *Explorations in Media Ecology*, 11(3-4), 325-343.
- Moore, C., Detert, J. R., Baker, V. L., & Mayer, D. M. (2012). Why Employees Do Bad Things: Moral Disengagement and Unethical Organizational Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(1), 1-48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01237.x>

- Perren, S., & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E. (2012). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in adolescence: Differential roles of moral disengagement, moral emotions, and moral values. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*(2), 195-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2011.643168>
- Prontenko, K., Griban, G., Okhrimenko, I., Bondarenko, V., Bezpaliy, S., Dikhtiarenko, Z., Yeromenko, E., Bulgakov, O., Bloschchynskiy, I., Dzenzeliuk, D. (2019). Rendimiento académico y capacidad mental de los cadetes que practican deportes durante los estudios [Academic performance and mental capacity of cadets engaged in sports during studies]. *Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores, VII(Edición Especial Octubre 2019)*, Artículo no.: 23. <https://doi.org/10.46377/dilemas.v29i1.1896>
- Runions, K. C., & Bak, M. (2015). Online moral disengagement, cyberbullying, and cyber-aggression. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 18*(7), 400-405. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2014.0670>
- Shahnawaz, M. G., Nasir, S., & Rehman, U. (2020). Sadism and cyber aggression: moral identity as a possible moderator. *Journal of aggression, maltreatment and trauma, 29*(8), 969-983. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2019.1575302>
- Schmitt, M., Baumert, A., Gollwitzer, M., & Maes, J. (2010). The justice sensitivity inventory: Factorial validity, location in the personality facet space, demographic pattern, and normative data. *Social Justice Research, 23*, 211-238. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-010-0115-2>
- Sychev, O. A., Protasova, I. N., & Belousov, K. I. (2018). Diagnostika moral'nykh osnovanii: aprobatsiya russkoyazychnoi versii oprosnika MFQ [Diagnostics of moral foundations: testing the Russian-language version of the questionnaire MFQ]. *Rossiiskii psikhologicheskii zhurnal, 15*(3), 88-115. <https://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2018.3.5>
- Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing Up Digital. The Rise of the Net Generation.* McGraw Hill.
- Thomas, R., (2020). Affective subjectivation or moral ambivalence? Constraints on the promotion of sustainable tourism by academic researchers. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 30*(9), 2107-2120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1770262>
- Tsilmak, O., Okhrimenko, I., Barko, V., Protsenko, O., & Gerashchenko, O. (2020). Psychological Profile of Unsuccessful University Students. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala, 12*(2), 267-289. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.2/278>
- Tsilmak, O., Okhrimenko, I., Okhrimenko, S., Yusupov, V., & Hryshchenko, M. (2020). Characteristics of Volitional Qualities of Successful Students. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology, 9*(12), 119-128. <http://ijaep.com/index.php/IJAE/article/view/1244>

- Wang, X., Yang, L., Yang, J., Wang, P., & Lei, L. (2017). Trait anger and cyberbullying among young adults: A moderated mediation model of moral disengagement and moral identity. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 73, 519-526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.03.073>
- Wolfe, K., Phillips, W., & Asperin A. (2014). Using hotel supervisors' emotional intelligence as a benchmark for hospitality students. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 26(1), 2-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2014.880615>
- Zhamardiy, V., Shkola, O., Ulianova, V., Bilostotska, O., Okhrimenko, I., Okhrimenko, S., Griban, G., Prontenko, K., Bloschynskyi, I. (2019). Influencia de las tecnologías de acondicionamiento físico en el desarrollo de las cualidades físicas de los jóvenes estudiantes [Influence of fitness technologies on the student youth's physical qualities development]. *Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores*, VII(Número: Edición Especial), Artículo no.: 49. <https://doi.org/10.46377/dilemas.v29i1.1947>