

6. Norman D. A. Description: n intermediate stage in memory retrieval / D. A. Norman, D. G. Bobrov // *Cognitive Psychology*. – 1979. – Vol. 11. – P. 107–123.
7. Nourkova V. V. Why historical becomes personal? Spontaneous historical content of individual autobiographical memory / V. V. Nourkova, D. M. Bernstein ; Y. Zinchenko, V. Petrenko (eds.). – Moscow : Lomonosov State University, 2010. – P. 1–21.
8. Nurkova V. Biography becomes autobiography: Distorting the subjective past / V. Nurkova, D. M. Bernstein, E. F. Loftus // *The American Journal of psychology*. – 2014. – Vol. 117, No 1. – P. 65–80.
9. Pennebaker J. The secret life of pronouns: what our words say about us / J. Pennebaker. – New York : Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011. – 511 p.
10. Rubin D. C. Remembering our past: Studies in autobiographical memory / D. C. Rubin. – Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press, 1995. – 441 p.
11. Sotgiu I. Why autobiographical memories for traumatic and emotional events might differ: theoretical arguments and empirical evidence / I. Sotgiu, M. L. Rusconi // *The Journal of Psychology*. – 2014. – Vol. 148 (5). – P. 523–547.
12. Zasiékina L. Psycholinguistic reorganization of individual traumatic memory / L. Zasiékina // *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*. – 2014. – Vol. 2. – P. 87–94.

УДК 159.922.4

O. V. Kykhtyuk, A. V. Kulchytska, O. A. Solovei

Received February 02, 2015;

Revised March 12, 2016;

Accepted April 26, 2016.

PSYCHOLINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF PERSONAL ETHNIC TOLERANCE/INTOLERANCE

Psycholinguistic peculiarities of personal ethnic tolerance/intolerance manifestation. The article is devoted to analysis of theoretical and empirical research psycholinguistic markers manifestation of ethnic tolerance/intolerance students.

The basic approaches to definitions of ethnic tolerance, ethnic identity, ethnic prejudices and ethnic stereotypes are analyzed. The characteristic features of ethnic tolerance/intolerance, levels of ethnic identity, the relationship with the level of ethnic tolerance of ethnic identity cards are revealed. Empirical research involved the definition of social distance in relation to a representative of an ethnic group according to the social role that is acceptable to subjects in interaction, determine the type of ethnic identity of respondents and identify psycholinguistic markers manifestation of ethnic intolerance against members of ethnic communities in relation to

which social distance in interpersonal interactions were the most. It was empirically found that 48,9 % of the subjects with positive ethnic identity, which is characterized by a combination of positive attitudes towards their own people with a positive attitude to other people; 30,2 % of respondents identified this type of ethnic identity as an ethnic indifference, which indicates a “fuzzy”, blurred ethnic identity, expressed in uncertainty ethnicity irrelevant ethnicity. For 20,9 % of respondents are ethnic inherent selfishness that can be expressed in harmless form on a verbal level as a result of perception through the prism of “my nation / people” but may involve tension and irritation in communication with other ethnic groups or recognition of the rights of their people solve problems “expense of others”. The results of empirical studies have shown the presence of ethnic prejudices and stereotypes among students regarding members of certain nationalities, namely the presence of negative, deep heterostereotypes against the Russians and surface negative stereotypes about Germans as members of other ethnic groups and positive underlying autostereotypes towards own ethnic group.

Keywords: ethnic tolerance, xenophobia, ethnic identity, ethnic self-consciousness, ethnic prejudices and ethnic stereotypes, etnophobia.

Кихтюк О. В., Кульчицька А. В., Соловей О. А. Психолінгвістичні особливості прояву етнічної толерантності/інтолерантності особистості. У статті проаналізовано результати теоретичного й емпіричного досліджень психолінгвістичних особливостей прояву етнічної толерантності/інтолерантності особи. Визначено основні підходи до визначення понять етнічної толерантності, етнічної ідентичності, етнічних упереджень і етнічних стереотипів. Схарактеризовано особливості прояву етнічної толерантності/інтолерантності, рівні розвитку етнічної ідентичності, взаємозв'язок етнічної толерантності з рівнем розвитку етнічної ідентичності особи. Емпіричне дослідження передбачало визначення соціальної дистанції щодо представника тієї або тієї етнічної групи відповідно до соціальної ролі, допустимої у взаємодії для випробовуваних, визначення типу етнічної ідентичності опитаних і виявлення психолінгвістичних маркерів прояву етнічної інтолерантності щодо представників етнічних співтовариств, стосовно яких соціальна дистанція в міжособовій взаємодії виявилася найбільшою. Емпірично встановлено, що 48,9 % досліджуваних мають позитивну етнічну ідентичність, яка характеризується поєднанням позитивного ставлення до власного народу з позитивним ставленням до інших народів; у 30,2 % опитаних виявлено такий тип етнічної ідентичності, як етнічна індіферентність, що вказує на «розмиту», нечітку етнічну ідентичність, виражену в невизначеності етнічної приналежності, неактуальності етнічності. 20,9 % опитаних властивий етнічний егоїзм, який може виражатися в нешкідливій формі на вербальному рівні як результат сприйняття крізь призму «мій народ», але може передбачати напруженість і роздратування в спілкуванні з представниками інших етнічних груп або визнання за своїм народом права розв'язувати проблеми за «чужий рахунок». Результати проведеного емпіричного дослідження показали наявність етнічних упереджень і стереотипів серед студентської молоді щодо представників певних національностей, а саме: наявність негативних,

глибинних гетеростереотипів щодо росіян та негативних поверхневих стереотипів щодо німців як представників інших етнічних груп і позитивних, глибинних аутостереотипів щодо власної етнічної групи.

Ключові слова: етнічна толерантність, ксенофобія, етнічна ідентичність, етнічна самосвідомість, етнічні упередження, етнічні стереотипи, етнофобізми.

Кихтюк О. В., Кульчицкая А. В., Соловей О. А. Психолінгвістическіе особености проявлення етніческої толерантності/інтолерантності личности. В статті проаналізовані результати теоретического і емпірического дослідження психолінгвістических особеностей проявлення етніческої толерантності/інтолерантності личности. Определены основные подходы к определению понятий этнической толерантности, этнической идентичности, этнических предубеждений и этнических стереотипов. Охарактеризованы особенности проявления этнической толерантности/интолерантности, уровни развития этнической идентичности, взаимосвязь этнической толерантности с уровнем развития этнической идентичности личности. Эмпірическоє дослідження передбачувало определение социальной дистанции по отношению к представителю той или иной этнической группы в соответствии с социальной ролью, которая является допустимой во взаимодействии для испытуемых, определение типа этнической идентичности опрошенных и выявление психолінгвістических маркерів проявлення етніческої інтолерантності в отношении представителей этнических сообществ, в отношении которых социальная дистанция в межличностном взаимодействии оказалась наибольшей. Эмпірическіе установленно, что 48,9 % исследуемых имеют положительную этническую идентичность, которая характеризуется сочетанием позитивного отношения к собственному народу с положительным отношением к другим народам; у 30,2 % опрошенных выявлен такой тип этнической идентичности, как этническая индифферентность, что указывает на «размытую», нечеткую этническую идентичность, выраженную в неопределенности этнической принадлежности, неактуальности этничности. 20,9 % опрошенных присущ этнический эгоизм, который может выражаться в безобидной форме на вербальном уровне как результат восприятия сквозь призму «мой народ», но может предполагать напряженность и раздражение в общении с представителями других этнических групп или признание за своим народом права решать проблемы за «чужой счет». Результаты проведенного эмпирического исследования показали наличие этнических предубеждений и стереотипов среди студенческой молодежи в отношении представителей определенных национальностей, а именно: наличие негативных, глубинных гетеростереотипов по отношению к русским и негативных поверхностных стереотипов по отношению к немцам как представителям других этнических групп и положительных, глубинных аутостереотипов по отношению к собственной этнической группе.

Ключевые слова: этническая толерантность, ксенофобия, этническая идентичность, этническое самосознание, этнические предубеждения, этнические стереотипы, этнофобизмы.

The problem of prejudice and xenophobia continues to worry more and more the investigators of different spheres: psychologists, teachers, ethnologists, sociologists, linguists etc. The objective factors of this problem actualization are firstly the situation of the Crimea annexation and warfare on the Ukrainian territory, which makes the sharp necessity of a dialogue about peaceful coexistence of different nationalities representatives, and secondly the strengthening of integral processes in different spheres of a social life, resulting having a big amount of polycultural environments.

The issue about tolerant attitude to representatives of different countries is also sharpened because of increasing of social tension level and attention on national self-identity, ethnic consciousness, which development should not transfer into xenophobia expression.

The tasks of our research are firstly the determination of categorical field of ethnic tolerance/intolerance meaning through the installation of relevant concepts; secondly, empirical study of psycholinguistic markers of personal ethnic intolerance expression.

The ethnic tolerance is a systematic set of psychological attitudes, senses, certain set of knowledge and social and legal norms (expressed by law or traditions) and also ideological and behavioral orientations, which suppose patient or acceptable approach of one nationality representatives (especially on the personal level) to other alien national phenomena (language, culture, customs, behavior norms etc) or representatives of other ethnic groups.

The ethnic tolerance is the patience to any alien ethnic mentality manifestation (in behavior, lifestyle, character, statements etc).

The results of theoretical exploration and generalization of experimental data concerning the problem of ethnic tolerance enable to highlight main approaches to its investigation:

- tolerance as universal and general public value (R. A. Artsyshevskyi, G. O. Ball, V. O. Lektorskyi, V. Frankl, E. From and others);
- tolerance as steady personal feature and property, personal sense and value orientations, the indicator of psychological, in particular communicative and political culture (O. G. Asmolov, V. O. Vasyutynskyi, A. I. Gusiev, Z. S. Karpenko, G. S. Kozhukhar, O. M. Korniyaka, P. V. Lushyn, M. V. Savchyn, G. Olport, A. Maslow, V. V. Moskalenko, I. D. Pasichnyk, V. V. Rybalka, T. D. Shcherban);
- tolerance as an attitude to personality in professional, educational, psycho-therapeutic and psycho-correctional activities (Ya. A. Bere-

govyi, O. F. Bondarenko, Zh. P. Virna, V. V. Boiko, Ya. O. Goshovskiy, O. Ye. Ivanashenko, O. A. Mateyuk, M. I. Mushkevych, A. G. Skok, O. O. Holodova, T. S. Yatsenko);

- ethnic tolerance in the context of ethnic identity and personal ethnic consciousness and opposition to xenophobia (O. K. Bychko, L. V. Zasyekina, O. A. Donchenko, O. O. Leontiev, D. O. Leontiev, N. M. Liebiedieva, O. M. Lozova, G. U. Soldatova, V. S. Homyk, M. A. Shugay) [5].

For the analysis of ethnic tolerance phenomenon we have chosen the last direction, because the definition of ethnic identity and ethnic prejudice belongs to categorical tolerance field and it is the subject for a huge amount of psychological investigations. Some scientists think that there is the close connection between ethnic identity and ethnic tolerance, in particular, “positive group identity causes tolerance, and lack of this identity – impatience and extremism” [4].

The most common definition of ethnic identity is the following. It is a clear understanding of accessory to a certain ethnic group. In a polyethnic society, according to G. U. Soldatova, positive ethnic identity has a character of a norm and is characterized for most people. It makes such optimal tolerance balance referring to the own and to the other ethnic groups, that allows to consider it on the one hand as the condition of independence and stable existence of ethnic group and on the other hand as the condition of intercultural interaction in the polyethnic world. The transformation of ethnic consciousness according to the hyper-identity type responds to other three scales:

- ethnic selfishness (can express in a inoffensive form on a verbal level as a result of acceptance through the construct prism “my people”, and we can suppose, for example, the tension and irritation in a communication with other ethnic groups or rights recognition of its people to solve the problems not by their own);
- ethnic isolationism (confidence in its people preference, recognition of “cleaning” necessity of a national culture, negative attitude to interethnic marriages, xenophobia);
- ethnic bigotry (readiness to any actions in the name of particular interests, almost to ethnic “cleaning”, refusing other peoples in a right to use resources and social privileges, priority recognition of people’s ethnic rights over the personal rights, justification of any victims in the struggle for well being of its people) [6].

L. V. Zasiékina emphasizes, that the limit between the ethnic identity and the ethnic prejudice is very shaky and disappears when the accessory consciousness to the ethnic group transforms into clear statement that expresses negative attitude to others through the consciousness of its preference in a way of recognition of other's inferiority [7].

The ethnic prejudice is different from the personal prejudice because the negative attitude is caused not by personal features of character but also by its accessory to a certain ethnic group.

The formation of the ethnic prejudice is connecting with ethnic stereotyping – the basic process of ethno-social categorization, the result of which is ethnic stereotypes [3]. The ethnic stereotypes are socially determined, generalized, emotionally saturated, steady ideas about peculiarities of ethnic group socio-cultural existence, and also about moral, mental, physical and other qualities of other representatives [2]. Ethnic stereotypes are divided into auto- and hetero-stereotypes. Auto-stereotypes are the set of attributive features of real or imaginary features, characteristics of the own ethnic group, which do the function of its positive value differentiation, because, as a rule, contain the complex of its positive estimation. Hetero-stereotypes are estimative, as usual negative statements about other ethnoses and their representatives. Hetero- and auto-stereotypes are interconnected, because ethnic differentiation and identification always happen in a comparison and opposition of strangers and representatives of its nation and vice versa [2].

According to G. Soldatova, ethnic stereotype plays important social role as the factor of consolidation and fixation of an ethnic group, showing the people's desire to safety of positive ethno-cultural identity. Changes in a structure of ethnic stereotype which is the result of negative emotions accumulation and stereotype transformation into negative one, is, into scientist's opinion, the beginning of ethnic prejudice existence and a cause of intolerant behavior formation. The psychological base of prejudice formation is the deepening the tendency of differences exaggerating between own and other ethnic groups on the one hand and minimization of differences inside the own group on the other hand, which finally leads to replacement of a positive balance social perception sphere to own ethnic community. Prejudice depending on concentration stage and ethno-contact situation type respond to such forms of behavior as avoiding of communication with representatives of certain ethnic communities or evasion from interethnic contacts in some life spheres [6].

Ethnic prejudice is estimative construct, which is based on hetero-stereotypes and expresses value attitude of one ethno-social community to other ethnos representatives. Ethnic prejudice expresses score, which divides all or most members of ethnic or any other ethno-social [3].

American investigator F. Eboud determines three main prejudice figures [1]. First figure is represented by negative score, and we need clearly divide the definition of prejudice and stereotype, despite of their following of each other. Prejudice is a negative approach and stereotype is generalized idea about intellectual, physical, moral peculiarities of different ethnic group representatives. Stereotypes can be positive, however, they don't form prejudicial attitude to other ethnos. Other figure of the ethnic prejudice is the manifestation of negative evaluation of personal ethnic accessory, but not of her personal features, so negative evaluation is expanding on the most representatives of a certain ethnic group. Stereotypes can be positive, therefore, do not form the prejudices against other ethnic groups. Third figure is represented by readiness to act and react on members of a certain ethnic group exceptionally by negative way, which is considered as the intolerance (xenophobia) manifestation in action.

The research methods. For empiric problem study of ethnic intolerance among students' youth we have chosen and used next methodologies: 1. "The scale of a social distance" by E. Bogardus; 2. Methodology "Incomplete sentences" for determination of ethnic stereotypes and prejudice to other ethnic communities; 3. Methodology "Types of ethnic identity" (G. U. Soldatova, S. V. Ryzhova); 4. Questionnaire "ethno-tolerant personality" (O. V. Kyhtyuk).

The research procedure. The sample of our research consisted of students of Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University (86 persons) at 17–21 years old (law faculty, faculty of psychology, pedagogical institute). The nationality of all respondents is Ukrainian, among them there are 63 females and 23 males. Procedure of empiric investigation has been realized step by step. On the first stage we used the scale of a social distance by E. Bogardus which allowed us to single out ethnic groups, for which the social distance is too big. In to our opinion, it could be the evidence for existence of certain prejudice, stereotypes referring to this ethnic group and be the base for manifestation of intolerant behavior with representatives of these ethnic groups. Next stage predicted the research of existence or lack of stereotypical opinions or/and prejudice about distant ethnic groups with the help of usage of incomplete sentences method. The last stage of our investigation predicted the detection of

ethnic identity type, characterized for experimental and measuring of manifestation level of ethnic tolerance among youth.

The discussion of results. The usage of “Scale of a social distance” by E. Bogardus predicted the experimental evaluation of representative of one or another ethnos according to the main category – social role, which he/she can play in a personal life. Proposed ethnic groups have been represented by Russian, Ukrainian, German and Polish. Generalized results are presented in a chart 1.

Chart 1

Generalized results of a research according to the methodology “The scale of a social distance” (modified version), %

Social role	Ethnic group			
	Russian	Ukrainian	German	Polish
Husband (wife)	2,3	83,7	4,7	9,3
Neighbor	4,7	65,1	11,6	18,6
Friend	1,2	81,4	5,8	11,6
Colleague	3,5	67,5	9,3	19,7
District manager	0,0	95,3	1,2	3,5
Manufacture manager	0,0	59,3	26,7	14,0
Citizen of my district	2,3	74,4	9,3	14,0

So, from the general number of interviewed 83,7 % respondents want to have the representative of his/her own ethnos as a husband (wife), because they think that they are the most adapting to common life; the least amount of voters concerning this social role is Russians (2,3 %). For having a neighbor students have chosen Ukrainians – 65,1 %. Respondents prefer also representatives of their ethnos – 81,4 % and Polishes – 11,6 % as a friend. As a colleague interviewed have chosen Polishes – 19,6 %, considering them as hardworking and single-hearted, and traditionally Ukrainians (67,5 %). As a district manager students would like to see only the representative of their own ethnos (95,3 %), though as a manufacture manager interviewed want to see not only Ukrainians (59,3 %), but also Germans – 26,7 %. As a citizen of his/her district, interviewed preferred Ukrainians – 74,4 % and Polishes – 14 %. We can observe that in all categories interviewed prefer Ukrainians as the representatives of their own ethnic group. Quite high figures are got by Polish as representatives of a neighbor state, which can be explained by a high level of sympathy, understanding, worrying about the problems which happened in Ukraine and great emotional support of Ukrainians in a struggle for its integrity, freedom by representatives of this ethnic community. The most distant are Russians and quite high level of a social distance has been got by Ger-

mans, that is a base for choice of these two ethnic groups and own ethnic group (as the least distant) for the following research with the help of incomplete sentences method. We have analyzed a big amount of respondent answers and singled out semantic universals, which are psycholinguistic markers of ethnic tolerance/intolerance manifestation among youth. The separate list of semantic universals for each ethnic group is presented in a chart 2.

Chart 2

**Generalized results of a research according to the methodology
“Incomplete sentences”**

Question	Ethnic group		
	Russians	Germans	Ukrainians
1. This people like...	1. Vodka (15). 2. Its people (4). 3. Criticize everyone, besides themselves (3). 4. The head of a state – Putin (3).	1. Money (21). 2. Its nation (3).	1. Fat (9). 2. Freedom (4). 3. Its country (5). 4. Its traditions (3).
2. We all know that this people...	1. Proud (4). 2. Impolite (6). 3. Aggressive (4). 4. Unreliable (3).	1. Cunning (5). 2. Boring (3). 3. Mean (6).	1. Industrious (3). 2. Patriotic (7). 3. Kind (5). 4. Friendly (3).
3. This people differs with...	1. Language (14). 2. Manners of behavior (8). 3. Their government submission (3).	1. Language (3). 2. Appearance (12). 3. Behavior (8).	1. Friendly attitude to others (4). 2. Language (3). 3. Customs, traditions, culture (9). 4. National symbols (5). 5. Cohesion (3).
4. This people always do...	1. According to its interests (8). 2. According to the order of the state head – Putin (6). 3. In a rude way (4). 4. Inhumane to other states (3). 5. Pompously (3).	1. For its benefits (15). 2. Fair (4).	1. Naive (3). 2. Bravely (5). 3. Tolerantly (6). 4. Honestly (7). 5. With dignity (3).
5. All others think that this people...	1. Hostile (4). 2. Guilty in a conflict with Ukraine (6). 3. Intolerant (3). 4. Muscovite (12).	1. Clever (4). 2. Mean (9). 3. Stingy (9).	1. Good-looking (3). 2. Kind (14). 3. Banderivtsi (8). 4. Patriotic (5).

As we can see in the chart, the list of semantic universals which are common for Germans as the representatives of an ethnic group, has negative content, but great part has associations of a neutral character or semantic universals of a positive character. Concerning Russians we can state the existence of ethnic stereotypes among youth about representatives of this nationality, especially existence of deep negative hetero-stereotypes about Russians. Such situation is sharpened because of continuous war conflict between Russia and Ukraine, which is shown in emotional reaction on these representatives. Concerning our own ethnic community we can state the existence as deep as surface positive auto-stereotypes among the interviewed. The important moment which we have to pay attention on is the existence of ethnophobisms among respondent answers. Ethnophobism is emotional and evaluative name of the ethnos. Playing the difficult associative potential of prejudicial ideas of one ethnos about the others, these ethnonimic names are the ways of figurative designation of foreigners, which are based on different nominative models. In our case such ethnophobisms are against Russians – semantic universal “Muscovite” (12) and about own ethnos – semantic universal “Banderivtsi” (8). The functional sphere of ethnophobisms is unofficial communication first of all. The usage of such figures in the institutional kinds of discussion not only conflicts with the communicative norms of a business communication but also is an open expression of xenophobia, hostile, intolerant, timid attitude of youth to foreigners, their culture, religion, traditions etc.

The next methodology, used by us was “Types of an ethnic identity”, which gives an opportunity to diagnose positive ethnic identity among 48,9 % of interviewed. This type of the ethnic identity is characterized by combination of positive attitude to own people with positive attitude to other peoples. In a poly-ethnic society positive ethnic identity has a character of norm and is specific for the major part. It makes such optimal tolerance balance to own and other ethnic groups, which allows to consider it on the one hand as a condition of independence and steady existence of ethnic group, and on the other hand as a condition of a peaceful intercultural interaction in polyethnic world. For 30,2 % of interviewed the characteristic feature is the ethnic indifferentiation, which shows “blurred”, unclear ethnic identity, expressed in uncertainty of ethnic accessory, inactual ethnicity. For 20,9 % of interviewed ethnic selfishness is characteristic. This identity type can be expressed in harmless form on a verbal level as a result of acceptance through the prism “my people”, but we can

suppose, for example, tension and irritation in a communication with representatives of other ethnic groups or its people's recognition of a right to solve the problem not on their own.

We should notice that during the empiric investigation we haven't found out such destructive types of ethnic identity as ethnogolism, ethno-isolationism and ethnobigotry.

For determination of a level of various aspects of ethnic tolerance development, we have used the questionnaire "Ethno-tolerant personality" and have got such results: middle level among 74,4 % of interviewed, high among 24,4 % and low level of cognitive component manifestation among 1,2% of interviewed. It shows that interviewed have knowledge about their origins and about ethnic stereotypes, which are characteristic for different nations, their national character etc, but this knowledge can be and should be improved and expanded.

Concerning emotional component of ethno-tolerant personality 61,6 % have a high level of development, 32,6 % – middle and only 5,8 % – low level of development, that shows that interviewed get pleasure and pleasant emotions from interaction and communication with representatives of other ethnic groups, and most of them don't prefer communication only with their countrymen, but also interact with representatives of other ethnoses.

Third component of ethno-tolerant personality – behavioral shows next results: 79,1 % have high level, 20,9 % – middle, but low level of behavioral component manifestation is absent at all. This indicates that interviewed are ready not only on the level of declaration, but also in real express ethno-tolerant behavior to the representatives of other nationalities. They willingly have contacts with representatives of other nations and think that we should develop ethnic tolerance to other nationalities.

Conclusion. The results of research indicated the existence of ethnic prejudice and stereotypes among youth about representatives of certain nationalities, especially existence of negative deep hetero-stereotypes about Russians and negative surface stereotypes about Germans. Among most interviewed there is diagnosed positive ethnic identity, which is characterized by combination of positive attitude to own people with positive attitude to other people. It has been found that development level of emotional and behavioral component of ethno-tolerant personality is characterized by mainly high level of manifestation, but cognitive component has a middle level of manifestation, that indicates the necessity

of knowledge system expansion about other ethnic groups, their specialties, national character, which allows to avoid the manifestation of intolerant attitude to representatives of any ethnic groups in future.

Prospects of the following research are the development of system of informational and developing methods of increasing the development level of cognitive component of ethnic tolerance among the representatives of youth.

Literature

1. Aboud F. E. Children and prejudice / F. E. Aboud. – Oxford : Blackwell Publishes Ltd., 1994.
2. Газанов И. Б. Национальные стереотипы и образ врага / И. Б. Газанов. – М. : Прогресс, 1994.
Gasanov I. B. Natsionalnyie stereotypy i obraz vruga [National stereotypes and the image of the enemy] / I. B. Gasanov. – M. : Progress, 1994.
3. Гнатенко П. И. Этнические установки и этнические стереотипы / П. И. Гнатенко. – Днепропетровск : Изд-во ДГУ, 1995.
Gnatenko P. I. Etnicheskiie ustanovki i etnicheskie stereotypy [Ethnic guideline and ethnic stereotypes] / P. I. Gnatenko. – Dnepropetrovsk : Izd-vo DGU, 1995.
4. Иванова Н. Л. Идентичность и толерантность: соотношение этнических и профессиональных стереотипов / Н. Л. Иванова // Вопросы психологии. – 2004. – № 6. – С. 54–63.
Ivanova N. L. Identichnost i tolerantnost: sootnosheniie etnicheskikh i professionalnykh stereotipov [Identity and tolerance: the ratio of professional and ethnic stereotypes] / N. L. Ivanova // Voprosy psykhologii. – 2004. – № 6. – S. 54–63.
5. Кихтюк О. В. Психологічні особливості формування етнічної толерантності у студентської молоді / О. В. Кихтюк. – Луцьк : Волин. нац. ун-т ім. Лесі Українки, 2010.
Kykhtiuk O. V. Psykhologichni osoblyvosti formuvannia etnichnoi tolerantnosti u studentskoi molodi [Psychological peculiarities of forming ethnic tolerance in student youth] / O. V. Kykhtiuk. – Luck : Volyn. nats. un-t im. Lesi Ukrainky, 2010.
6. Солдатова Г. У. Психологические механизмы ксенофобии / Г. У. Солдатова // Психологический журнал. – 2006. – № 27 (6). – С. 5–17.
Soldatova G. U. Psykhologicheskiie mekhanizmy ksenofobii [Psychological mechanisms of xenophobia] / G. U. Soldatova // Psykhologicheskii zhurnal. – 2006. – № 27 (6). – S. 5–17.
7. Засекіна Л. В. Феномен толерантності крізь призму етнічного дискурсу / Л. В. Засекіна // Психологічні перспективи. – 2008. – Вип. 11. – С. 99–109.
Zasekina L. V. Fenomen tolerantnosti kriz pryзму etnichnogo dyskursu [The phenomenon of tolerance from ethnic discourse perspective] / L. V. Zasekina // Psykhologichni perspektyvy. – 2008. – Vyp. 11. – S. 99–109.