



Ethnic Stereotypes in the Minds of Russian and Tatar Youth

Gulnara Ilgizovna Khasanzyanova¹, Elvira Albertovna Islamova², Ramziya Marsova Bolgarova³, & Ilsever Rami⁴

¹Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University;
930922.90@mail.ru

²Corresponding author, Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University; *ea_islamova@mail.ru*

³Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University;
ramziya5@yandex.ru

⁴Department of Russian Language and Translation, Istanbul Okan University, Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey; *ilsiyar.rameeva@okan.edu.tr*

Abstract

An important role in intercultural communication is played by ethnic stereotypes - stable ideas about the moral, mental, physical qualities inherent among representatives of various ethnic communities. An urgent task is the study of Tatar and Russian people stereotypes living in the same territory. The material for Tatar and Russian autostereotypes and heterostereotype description was the data collected as a result of a free-associative experiment among the students (17-25 years old) of higher educational institutions of Kazan in 2016-2017. The results of the study show that Russian linguistic consciousness in the Republic of Tatarstan has a higher level of tolerance towards the Tatar people. The “other” ethnic environment influences the structure and content of heterostereotypes in the first place due to the greater immersion in the culture and history of other people. The results of the work are intended to help in solving the problems of intercultural communication related to education and upbringing in a multi-ethnic environment.

Keywords: Autostereotypes; Ethnic Stereotype; Free Associative Experiment; Heterostereotypes; Linguistic Consciousness.

1. Introduction

International and international cultural interpenetration is a phenomenon little discussed in consumer behavior studies. In the next quarter century, it is also a phenomenon that is destined to develop dramatically. Two sweeping reforms, one under way, one in the offing, make it important for researchers of consumer behavior to pay special attention to it (Leskova, Muslimova, & Zyazin, 2018; Melikov & Skorodumova, 2019; Zhdanova, Gavritskov, Antonenko, Khripunov, & Mishukovskaya, 2019). The first shift is the accelerating pace of in-migration into the United States of new immigrant groups. The U.S. has seen a significant change in the inflow of other nationalities into the society over the last two decades. The key immigrant groups in the first half of the century came from communities that were not much different from those already here (Ciorabai, 2019; Johnson, Curtis, & Egan-Robertson, 2017; Oliver et al., 2020).

These include the 19th and early 20th centuries of the Irish and Italians, and the late 1930s and 1940s of the Central Europeans. Nevertheless, since the late 1960s, the United States has undergone a significant change in the roots of its refugees. The new immigrants are overwhelmingly concentrated in six major Asian cultures that vary greatly from what most Americans are familiar with. In the 1960s, 37 percent of all immigrants to the U.S. and Asians made up 13 percent of families and individuals from Western Europe. However, 11 percent of immigrants came from Western Europe in the period from 1981 to 1986 and 47 percent were Asian. The United States is also influenced by the internal development of another, very separate, Hispanic community. The Hispanic population grew at five times the rate of the



population as a whole between 1980 and 1985 (Cafaro, 2015; Cafaro & Staples III, 2009; Carter & Sutch, 1997; Coleman & Rowthorn, 2004; Lee, Ottati, & Hussain, 2001).

Hispanics currently make up one in every 14 Americans, a proportion that is projected to continue to rise until they become the country's dominant racial and ethnic minority. Blacks and Hispanics are expected to make up 37 percent of the population in 2080, together. The above-mentioned statistics underscore the effect of the cultural penetration of Asian and Hispanic cultures, since they are not spread equally throughout the world, but are concentrated in specific areas. 75 percent of Asians currently live in five states, including California, Hawaii, New York, Illinois, and Washington. Hispanics are even more focused: in only three states, California, New York and Texas, 60 per cent live. The removal of economic and social barriers between the European Common Market countries in 1992 and potentially within the Eastern Bloc, beginning in 1989, is the second major social change that will have a dramatic impact on future world cultural interpenetration. Permanent and temporary migration levels can be expected to increase significantly, as short-term culture sampling by intra-European holidays and exposure to other European media are likely to occur. It is also evident that misunderstanding of international culture is the key cause of most cultural disputes. All of this means that the fundamentals of intercultural communication, a science that helps educate a foreign individual, need to be studied. Among other related sciences, its position is not well known, despite a great interest in the problems of intercultural communication. Among other sciences, there is no traditional and universally acquired vocabulary, no conventional theoretical basis, no well-defined status of intercultural communication and its location. In 1954, in a book «Culture as Contact», written by Hall and Trager, the word 'intercultural communication' was coined in the school of cultural anthropology. For further study in the field of intercultural communication, the ideas formulated by Hall were of great importance. Intercultural contact has been the focus of many American studies since the 1960s (Acioly-Régnier, Koroleva, & Mikhaleva, 2014).

An interest in intercultural issues emerged in Europe later, in the 1970s, and intercultural contact was developed in the 1970s and 1980s. This was attributed to the integration processes leading to the establishment of the European Union and as a result, to the widespread growth of trade, tourism and the economy. Several research on the theory of intercultural communication concentrate mainly on the history of intercultural communication in the USA and Europe. This is due to the fact that since the mid-20th century, Western researchers have been involved in intercultural issues, while Russian science took over intercultural communication only after the fall of the USSR in the 1990s. It is no wonder that international studies are greatly affected by the Russian theory of intercultural communication. Also Soviet research, however has focused on cross-cultural interaction problems (Batkina, 2020; Gladkova, 2017; Ismailov, Prudnikov, Tulentin, & Berzina, 2019; Kasatkin & Romanenko, 2019; Klyukanov & Leontovich, 2017).

In the context of globalization, interaction and interpenetration of cultures, the problems of intercultural communication are of particular relevance (Laopongharn & Sercombe, 2009; Yu, Weiler, & Ham, 2002). One of the most complex new sciences is intercultural communication. An efficient relationship with other cultures is becoming urgent in the context of globalization that has covered virtually all areas of our lives. At the same time, as many researchers have noted, conflicts and misunderstandings between individuals from different cultures are not associated with inadequate language knowledge, but with a lack of cultural knowledge (Anatolyevich Rubtzov, Minnahmatovich Biktimirov, Espinoza Hugo, & Viktorovich Rozhko, 2019; Chiknaverova, Gazizova, & Mingazova, 2019). Knowing the language gives an impression of understanding people of different cultures, but does not give an adequate understanding of foreign culture.

E. Sepir wrote: “The inner content of all languages is one and the same - intuitive knowledge of experience. Only their external form is diverse indefinitely” (Sepir, 1993). And this diversity of external form is a problem when learning a new language when communicating with the representatives of another culture.

Ethnic stereotypes play an important role in intercultural communication since the culture of each nation has the ideas about their ethnic group and about other ethnic groups (Mardanova, Karimullina, Karimullina, & Sarekenova, 2018).

The problem of ethnic stereotypes has attracted the attention of many linguists, psychologists, sociologists, ethnographers, etc. (Gilazetdinova, Edikhanov, & Aminova, 2014; Soldatova, 1998; Ufimtseva, 2012). Ethnic stereotypes are considered as “a schematized image of an ethnic community representative, usually representing a simplified,

sometimes one-sided or inaccurate (distorted) knowledge of the psychological characteristics and behaviour of people of a different nationality” (Sibaeva, Salakhova, & Mukhamedova, 2017; Van den Berghe et al., 1996).

The source of an ethnos stereotype can be intercultural or interethnic contacts, during which the most typical characteristics of a people or culture are revealed (Dildora & Nigora, 2019; Omelaenko, 2019; Shanayev, Dzholdasbekova, & Tumanova, 2019).

Ethnic stereotypes are divided into autostereotypes and heterostereotypes. Autostereotypes are a complex of representations, judgments and assessments (usually positive) of an ethnos about itself (Goncharova & Khaleeva, 2019; Rustamov, 2020; Tameryan, Zheltukhina, Sidorova, & Shishkina, 2019; Zharikova, 2019). They are called to educate certain qualities from the desire to correspond to the ideal, the standard of the ethnos. Heterostereotypes (descriptions of other ethnic groups) can be both positive and negative (Výrost & Martonyik, 2018).

In intercultural communication, the stereotypes of “friends and foes” can lead to condemnation, rejection or idealization of representatives of another nation (Murzina, Safonova, & Chupryakova, 2016). Since “ethnic stereotypes affect ethnic sympathies, antipathies, national attitudes, determine the nature of interethnic interaction” (Ufimtseva, 2012), the study of the ethnic stereotypes of contacting peoples can help predict ethnic relations.

1.1. Research Objective

The objective of our study is to study the ethnic stereotypes of the Tatar and Russian peoples, who have been in constant contact in the Republic of Tatarstan for a long time.

Our study differs from existing works on this subject (Khanova & Stankevich, 2016; Gabdrakhmanova, Mukhametzyanova, & Shayakhmetova, 2016), with an extensive factual basis and the ability to compare autostereotypes and heterostereotypes regarding the same peoples.

2. Methodology

The work used such methods of linguistic analysis as generalization and systematization (Zagidulina, Kh, & Islamova, 2016), the analytical method, descriptive, comparative, statistical, associative experiment method, etc.

An effective way of linguistic consciousness study is recognized as the technique of free-associative experiment (Gabdrakhmanova et al., 2016). The responses of native speakers to the stimulus word form associative fields, on the basis of which it is possible to model certain fragments of linguistic consciousness.

The material for our study was the results of free-associative experiments conducted in 2015-2017 with 17-25-year-old students (700) of Kazan Federal University and other universities of Kazan who are the native speakers of the Tatar and Russian languages. The students of different specialties were interviewed; the gender feature is represented approximately equally. Among other stimulus words, they proposed the ethnonyms "Tatars", "Russians" and their correspondences in the Tatar language.

The experimental data allowed us to consider autostereotypes and heterostereotypes among young representatives of these ethnic groups living in the Republic of Tatarstan.

3. Results

As the results of associative experiments showed, the "руслар" stimulus word (“Russians”) caused a fairly wide range of associations among the Tatar speakers: from 345 reactions to this stimulus, the number of different reactions was 122 (35.4%), quite a few same reactions - 93 (27%). The most frequent reactions to the word "татарлар" (“Tatars”) (60 reactions): дуслар “friends” (41), кешеләр “people” (17), күршеләр “neighbours” (17), безнең туганнар “our relatives” (3), иптәшләр “comrades” (1); all this testifies to the good neighbourly relations of two peoples. Respondents perceive Russians as friends, neighbours with whom they communicate, and study; at the same time, their status as a great people is recognized (милләт “nation, nationality” (43), халык “people” (6), көч “strength” (2) with their own language (тел “language” 4), religion (чиркәү “church” 8, христианнар Christians” 2, Orthodoxy 1) culture (культурасы “their culture” 1).

The contrast between friends and strangers is especially pronounced in a small number of individual reactions: ике дөнъя - two worlds, икенче төрлерәк - slightly different, чит - alien.

The characteristic features of the Russian ethnos are widely represented, and are mostly positive: айбәт - “good, kind” 5, яхшы - “good, kind” 3, тату - “friendly, peaceful” 2, горур - “proud” 1, young men 1, көчле - “strong” 1 кыю - “bold, courageous” 1, etc. Negative characteristics are mainly among single reactions: тәкәббер - “arrogant”, тәрбиясез - “ill-bred”, шаулы - “noisy”, эчәләр - “drink”, явыз - “evil”, ялкаулар - “lazy”.

Respondents feel the unity of the two peoples living in a large multinational country, which is manifested in the associations һәм татарлар - and Tatars 3, Рәсәй - Russia 8, безнеке - ours 1, дуслык - friendship 1. Single reactions, which are an echo of the historical events of the 16th century indicate some tension: басты - “captured”, килә безнең жиргә - “come to our land”, and юлбасарлар - “invaders”.

The linguistic consciousness of the Tatar youth was not devoid of widespread stereotypes about Russians like matryoshka 2, alcohol 1, аракы - “vodka” 1, balalaika 1, аю - “bear” 1.

In the course of experiments on the stimulus "Russian", 398 reactions of the interviewed Russian students were obtained; the number of different reactions is 152 (38.2%), and the number of single reactions is 111 (27.9%).

Russians living in the Republic of Tatarstan are aware of their belonging to a certain community: people 24, nationality 15, nation 14, strength 13, power 4, traditions 9, Orthodox 1. They consider themselves endowed with the following positive characteristics: strong 9, best 5, good 3, sincere 2, handsome 2, the best 2, funny 1, good nature 1, friendly people 1, sincerity 1, open soul 1, simplicity of soul 1, with soul 1, clever 1. Emotionally expressive characteristics are widely represented: they don't give up 45, good lads 4, forward 3, rule 1, this is force 1, never give up 1.

Negative characteristics have the frequency of use no higher than two: greedy 2, arrogant 2, sloven 2, stupid 1, rudeness 1, drunk 1.

The minds of the respondents have the opposition “friends - strangers”, which is reflected in the reactions "ours" 4, and a number of answers based on ethnonyms: Germans 3, foreigners 1, Ukrainians 1, not Russians 1.

Stereotypical reactions are widely represented: balalaika 2, dumplings 2, alcohol 1, vodka 1, bath 1, pancakes 1, loaf 1, bear 1.

Let's consider the reaction of Russian students to the "Tatars" word stimulus. Out of 399 reactions, the number of different reactions is 135 (33.8%), and individual reactions make 97 of cases (24.3%).

The response strategies of the Russians and Tatars surveyed are basically the same. As a rule, general characteristics, are in the foreground: nation 38, people 26, nationality 26, nation 18, Muslims 3.

The ideas of Russians living in the Republic of Tatarstan about Tatars are distinguished by a high level of tolerance: Tatars are friends 18, neighbours 11, good 4, brothers 3, strength 3, great people 1, fellow countrymen 1, relatives 1. They are kind 3, funny 2, handsome 2, good lads 2, hospitable 1, friendly 1, beautiful 1, working 1, neat 1. At the same time, according to the respondents, negative traits are also present in the Tatars: cunning 23, evil 7, dark 2, trick 3, evil 2, harmful 1.

There are single positive emotional, expressive reactions: forward 1, Tatars rule the world 1, cool 1, rule 1, also normal 1, respect 1, яхшы - “good” 1.

Respondents are well acquainted with the realities of the Tatar people life, which led to the emergence of widespread reactions: skullcap - “national headdress” 6, names of dishes of national cuisine - chakchak 11, boursak 1, belyashi 1, ochpomak 1, Sabantuy - “national holiday” 2.

"Ours" (1 answer) are opposed by "foreigners, distant" (1). Negative reactions are mostly single: not people, do not understand, hostility. However, it is necessary to mention separately the association with the Mongols (15 answers), which is related with the widespread stereotype of the Tatars as conquerors in the linguistic consciousness of Russians (Mongol-Tatar invasion).

The associations of Tatars with respect to themselves are characterized by great diversity: out of 350 reactions to the "татарлар" stimulus (Tatars), the Tatars have 147 different reactions (42%), while quite a few individual reactions make 108 of cases (30.9%).

The most frequent reactions: милләт - "nation, nationality" 50, без - "we" 14, халык - "people" 13, халкым - "my people" 2, көч - "strength" 12, бердәм - "single, friendly" 10, кешеләр - "people" 7, дуслар - "friends" 6, "бөек" 4, көчле халык - strong people 4, туганнар - kin' 3, бердәмлек - unity 2, мөселманнар - Muslims 2, бөек халык - 'great people' 1.

The participants in the experiment draw a psychological portrait of their people: көчле - "strong" 19, горур - "proud" 4, батырлар - "heroes" 3, әйбәт, әйбәтләр - "good, kind" 3, кунакчыл - "hospitable" 2, тырыш - "diligent, persistent" 2, яхшы кешеләр - "good people" 2, башлы - "smart" 1, матурлар - "beautiful" 1, тыйнак - "modest" 1, уңганнар - "skillful, capable" 1, etc. A few negative qualities were also named: хәйләкәр - "cunning" 3, усал - "evil" 2, начар - "bad" 1, ялкау - "lazy" 1.

The opposition "friends - strangers" is represented in the answers like үзәбезнекеләр - friends, чит - "strangers"; own, strangers, distant.

Numerous reactions of an emotional-expressive nature that express pride in your people are in focus: алга! - "forward!" 7, булдыра, булдыралар - "can" 7, килә - "go, will come" 3, без булдырабыз! - "We can!" 2, жинә - "they win" 1, көч! - "power!" 1, молодецлар - "well done" 1, super good 1, текә милләт - "cool nation" 1.

There were some realities that usually makeup heterostereotypes relative to the Tatars: чәй - "tea" 2, озын толымнар - "long braids" 1, Sabantu "national holiday" 2, өчпочмак - "triangle, a dish of national cuisine" 1.

3.1. Discussion

The response strategies of the interviewed native speakers of the Russian and Tatar languages basically coincide.

The largest number of reactions is associated with the generalizing characteristics of Russians and Tatars as the representatives of ethnic groups with their own language, history, culture, and religion (people, nation, nationality, language, traditions, church, Christians, Muslims). The autostereotypes of both ethnic groups have one of the main reactions - strength: strength 13, strong 9, power four among Russians; көчле - "strong" 19, көч - "strength" 12 among the Tatars.

Associations calling the characteristic features of ethnic groups are distinguished by a wide variety, primarily positive, but negative characteristics are also present.

Autostereotypes, as a rule, are more diverse and detailed, however, in the case of the ethnic image of Russians, the differences are not so obvious, since young representatives of the Russian and Tatar peoples live in a single cultural and educational space and have the opportunity to study each other well and form their own opinions about others.

Russians consider the Tatars to be good, cheerful, hospitable, friendly, hardworking, but at the same time evil. The cunning of the Tatars seems to be a bright national feature for Russians. Tatars call themselves strong, proud, kind, hospitable, diligent, modest but recognize they are tricky. Kindness, hospitality and cunning coincided in the autostereotype and heterostereotype of the Tatars.

Tatars represent Russians as good, kind, friendly, peaceful people, who in some cases can be rude, and noisy. The most striking features of the Russian character, in their own opinion, are kindness, cheerfulness, and soulfulness. At the same time, Russians call their negative traits such as arrogance, greed, sloppiness, and they are more prone to self-criticism than the Tatars.

Russians were more critical in relation to the Tatars. Their negative characteristics of Tatars quantitatively exceed the negative assessments of Russians by Tatars: Tatars cunning 23, evil 7, dark 2, trick 3, evil 2; Russians: тәкәббер - "arrogant" 1, тәрбиясез - "ill-bred" 1, шаулы - "noisy", эчәләр - "drink" 1, etc.

It should be noted the almost complete absence of reactions describing the appearance of people in the studied autostereotypes and heterostereotypes. This fact coincides with the data by Hanova and Stankevich (2016). The only example is the association of озын толымнар - "long braids" in the Tatar autostereotype.



The heterostereotype of the Tatars represents their ethnic culture. This is mainly the names of various dishes of Tatar culinary and the name of the holiday Sabantuy. However, Tatar students gave a limited number of answers related to the rich culture of the Russian people (balalaika, matryoshka).

A certain place is occupied by reactions in the form of a motto, a slogan in the structure of the examined autostereotypes. Russians - do not give up 45, forward 3, this is strength 1; Tatars: алга! - "forward!" 7, булдыра, булдыралар - "can" 7, без булдырабыз! - "We can!" 2, көч! - "power!" One and others. Без булдырабыз! - "We can!" - This is a kind of unofficial motto of Tatarstan, introduced into use by the first president of the republic M. Shaimiev.

The reactions with a negative connotation in heterostereotypes are interesting: басты - "captured", килә безнең жиргә - "come to our land", юлбасарлар - "invaders". 15 Russian students out of 399 associate Tatars with the Mongols.

However, in general, the respondents feel many years of friendly relations between two peoples living in the Republic of Tatarstan.

4. Conclusion

Ethnic stereotypes are a fragment of the world picture, a stable cultural and national idea of one or another ethnic group. They are assimilated when a person begins to associate himself with a certain ethnic group, a certain culture and becomes aware of himself as their element.

Our study confirmed the conclusion of a number of scientists that autostereotypes are always more positive than heterostereotypes (Khanova & Stankevich 2016). The number of frequency reactions with a positive connotation is greater in the studied autostereotypes as compared with heterostereotypes. At the same time, our respondents are quite self-critical.

In terms of reaction diversity, heterostereotypes are behind autostereotypes. This difference is especially noticeable in relation to the ideas about the Tatars (42% of different reactions among the Tatars and 33.8% of different reactions among the Russians).

In general, one can say about a certain number of coincidences of the image of Russians and Tatars in heterostereotypes and autostereotypes, especially in relation to Tatars. Thus, the autostereotype of Tatars as kind, hospitable and cunning is reflected in the reactions of Russian respondents; all respondents note the kindness of Russians. Usually, the researchers of ethnic stereotypes record significant discrepancies in such cases.

Emotional, expressive reactions in auto-stereotypes express the sense of patriotism, and pride. Interviewees are aware of their ethnic identity and distinguish among their own people and strangers; their answers reflect knowledge and ideas about other cultures. Russians living outside the Republic of Tatarstan usually imagine a more generalized image of the Tatars.

Despite the recorded differences in the content of the studied fragments of the world image, the Tatars and Russians are united by a common understanding of the basic vital concepts. This ensures peaceful coexistence on one territory of peoples that are aware of their cultural specificity and difference from others.

The study of associative experiment materials allows us to identify ethnic stereotypes of Tatars and Russians in the everyday linguistic consciousness of students of the Republic of Tatarstan.

In the modern world, the study of ethnic stereotypes is important for international communication. It is necessary to develop interethnic relations taking into account the peculiarities of perception by one people of another.

It is also necessary to note the importance of this kind of research to solve the problems associated with the study of foreign languages. Associative experiments make it possible to establish the most frequent associative-semantic relations of words, fix the most important paradigmatic and syntagmatic connections, reflecting the characteristics of national culture.

4.1. Contribution

The research materials contribute to the system of knowledge about ethnic groups, their linguistic consciousness, and are also the basis for further studies of the relationship between different peoples. Studying the content of ethnic images of Russians and Tatars can help determine the nature of interethnic communication.

Acknowledgments

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Acioly-Régnier, N. M., Koroleva, D. B., & Mikhaleva, L. V. (2014). Problems and Discrepancies of Intercultural Communication in Russian and Foreign Science. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, 204–208.
- Anatolyevich Rubtzov, V., Minnahmatovich Biktimirov, N., Espinoza Hugo, B., & Viktorovich Rozhko, M. (2019). A Survey of Intercultural Communication in the Development of Regional Tourism. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1415–1426.
- Batkhina, A. (2020). Values and communication apprehension as antecedents of conflict styles in intercultural conflicts: A study in Germany and Russia. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 26(1), 22.
- Cafaro, P. (2015). *How many is too many?: The progressive argument for reducing immigration into the United States*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cafaro, P., & Staples III, W. (2009). The environmental argument for reducing immigration into the United States. *Environmental Ethics*, 31(1), 5–30.
- Carter, S. B., & Sutch, R. (1997). *Historical perspectives on the economic consequences of immigration into the United States*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Chiknaverova, K., Gazizova, A., & Mingazova, N. (2019). Selection of Foreign Language Teaching Content in Russian Master of Laws (LLM) Graduate Programs. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 10–30.
- Ciorabai, E. (2019). Means and Procedures for Fighting Illegal Migration. *International Scientific Conference "Strategies XXI"*, 15, 174–183. "Carol I" National Defence University.
- Coleman, D., & Rowthorn, R. (2004). The economic effects of immigration into the United Kingdom. *Population and Development Review*, 30(4), 579–624.
- Dildora, K., & Nigora, R. (2019). Ethnic stereotypes of behavior. *Вопросы Науки и Образования*, (7 (53)).
- Gabdrakhmanova, F. H., Mukhametzyanova, L. R., & Shayakhmetova, L. K. (2016). Associative experiment is an effective method of research of the national character (on the material of tatar and Russian linguistic cultures). *JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE*, 211.
- Gilazetdinova, G. K., Edikhanov, I. Z., & Aminova, A. A. (2014). Problems of Ethno-cultural Identity and cross-language communication. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(3), 39–42.
- Gladkova, A. A. (2017). Psychological and socio-cultural adaptation of international journalism students in Russia: The role of communication skills in the adaptation process. *Psychology in Russia*, 10(4), 45.
- Goncharova, O., & Khaleeva, S. (2019). Stereotypes in Jokes and Anecdotes: The Search for Ethnic and National Features. *International Conference "Topical Problems of Philology and Didactics: Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sciences"(TPHD 2018)*. Atlantis Press.



- Ismailov, D. S., Prudnikov, A. A., Tulentin, D. A., & Berzina, G. P. (2019). Military Ranks Of Military Servants Of Russia And The Usa In Intercultural Communication. *Язык И Межкультурная Коммуникация В Современных Условиях*, 91–95.
- Johnson, K. M., Curtis, K. J., & Egan-Robertson, D. (2017). Frozen in place: Net migration in sub-national areas of the United States in the era of the great recession. *Population and Development Review*, 43(4), 599.
- Kasatkin, P. I., & Romanenko, A. V. (2019). The Rhetoric of the Political Leaders of Russia and the US: A Comparative Analysis. *Polis. Political Studies*, 5(5), 167–180.
- Khanova, A.F., & Stankevich, E.A. (2016). Autostereotypes and heterostereotypes of Russians and Tatars in the Republic of Tatarstan. *The issues of Psycholinguistics*, 4 (30), 244-256. [In Russian]
- Klyukanov, I. E., & Leontovich, O. A. (2017). Russian perspectives on communication. *The Handbook of Communication in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, 29–41.
- Laopongharn, W., & Sercombe, P. (2009). What relevance does intercultural communication have to language education in Thailand? *Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences*, 6.
- Lee, Y.-T., Ottati, V., & Hussain, I. (2001). Attitudes toward “illegal” immigration into the United States: California Proposition 187. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 23(4), 430–443.
- Leskova, I., Muslimova, K., & Zyazin, S. (2018). Islam and Christianity in the context of modern culture. *Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings*, 514–519.
- Mardanova, G., Karimullina, G. N., Karimullina, R. N., & Sarekenova, K. K. (2018). Bilingual Dictionary In The Linguocultural Aspect. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 8(11), 108–112.
- Melikov, I., & Skorodumova, O. (2019). Interaction of cultures: From tolerance to culture of dialogue. *Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings*, 779–784.
- Murzina, N. Y., Safonova, S. S., & Chupryakova, O. A. (2016). The native/foreign binary opposition as a way of conceptualization of V. Rasputin’s artistic image of the world. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(3), 80–84.
- Oliver, R. Y., Mahoney, P. J., Gurarie, E., Krikun, N., Weeks, B. C., Hebblewhite, M., ... Boelman, N. (2020). Behavioral responses to spring snow conditions contribute to long-term shift in migration phenology in American robins. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15(4), 045003.
- Omelaenko, N. (2019). Concepts of Ethnos and Nation in Scientific and Theoretical Studies. *International Scientific Conference "Far East Con"(ISCFEC 2018)*. Atlantis Press.
- Rustamov, I. (2020). Ethnic Stereotypes In Anecdotes. *Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI*.
- Sepir, E. (1993). Selected works on linguistics and cultural studies. *Moscow: Progress*.
- Shanayev, R. U., Dzholdasbekova, B. U., & Tumanova, A. B. (2019). Stereotypes of Speech as Indicators of The Ethnic Belonging to Russian-Language Writers of Kazakhstan. *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 16(3), 366–374.
- Sibaeva, F. R., Salakhova, R. R., & Mukhamedova, S. (2017). Representation of person emotional state in the Tatar language picture of the world. *Ad Alta-Journal Of Interdisciplinary Research*, 7(2), 260–262.
- Soldatova, G. U. (1998). Psychology of interethnic tension. *Moscow: Smysl*.
- Tameryan, T. Y., Zheltukhina, M. R., Sidorova, I. G., & Shishkina, E. V. (2019). Stereotype component in the Structure of Ethnocultural Archetype (on internet-blogs). *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences EpSBS*, 1716–1722.
- Ufimtseva, N. V. (2012). *Russia and Russians in the historical perspective: The view of Europeans. Interethnic communication: contacts and conflicts/executive editor NV Ufimtseva. Moscow: Institut yazykoznaniya RAN—MIL. Russ.*



- Van den Berghe, P. L., Cashmore, E., Cashmore, E., Banton, M., Jennings, J., & Troyna, B. (1996). *Dictionary of race and ethnic relations*. Psychology Press.
- Výrost, J., & Martonyik, J. (2018). Hetero-and Auto-Stereotypes of Ethnic Minorities in Slovakia. *Individual & Society/Clovek a Spolocnost*, 21(4).
- Yu, X., Weiler, B., & Ham, S. (2002). Intercultural communication and mediation: A framework for analysing the intercultural competence of Chinese tour guides. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8(1), 75–87.
- Zagidulina, A. F., Kh, G. G., & Islamova, E. A. (2016). Associative fields of lexemes "Homeland" and "Vatan" in Russian and Tatar linguistic consciousness. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7, 289–292.
- Zharikova, M. (2019). Precedent Phenomena And Ethnic Stereotypes In The Anecdote Text. *Сучасні Лінгвістичні Парадигми*, 199.
- Zhdanova, N. S., Gavritskov, S. A., Antonenko, Y. S., Khripunov, P. E., & Mishukovskaya, Y. I. (2019). Promoting Tolerance In Students As A Result Of Studying Cultures Of Ural. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences EpSBS*, 1782–1790.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

