

Cross-Cultural Research of Ethnic Stereotypes in Polyethnic Kazakhstan

L. Alzhanova, O.Aimaganbetova, M.Yermekbayeva

Abstract—In given article problems of studying of ethnic stereotypes of representatives of the Kazakh and Russian culture, living in Post-Soviet Kazakhstan are considered.

Keywords—ethnic stereotypes, inter – ethnic relations, auto- and heterostereotypes, emotionally – assessed component

I. INTRODUCTION

RESEARCH of ethnic stereotypes in the context of inter – ethnic relations have more than a centenary history. In 1899 V.Du Bua's work "Philadelphian Negro" devoted to ethnic perception of black and white representatives of both ethnic groups [1]. Method of social distance developed by S.Bogurdus became the basis for development of theoretical – methodologic basis to study ethnic stereotypes [2]. D. Kats and K.U. Breily carried out one of the first empirical research of ethnic stereotypes with the help of "Method of assignment of features". Then G.M. Gilbert carried out longitude research in the center of it there were dynamics of their transformation rather than ethnic stereotypes themselves. T.Adorno's investigations became most significant for study of ethnic stereotype [3]. Ethnic stereotypes' problem was also in the centre of A. Teshfel's attention [4].

In regards to Kazakhstan current realities of inter – ethnic relations in the republic define significance of this problem not only in the theoretical – methodologic but also in the applied, empirical meaning. This has defined actuality of our research.

II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

G.U.Soldatova's "Diagnostic tests of relations" was used within the bounds of research of demonstration of ethnic stereotypes in the context of inter – ethnic relations [5]. The main modeling principle of which was based on the measurement of emotionally – assessed component as a dominant in the structure of ethnic stereotypes. Thus, study of ethnic stereotypes on the basis of this method is peculiar projection of existing inter – ethnic relations.

In our research modified variant of a test when the pairs of qualities were chosen from the set of personal characteristics which are the most often referred to the representatives of their own or other national – ethnic group and which are defined as stereotype. Correspondingly a positive position on scale "attractive – unattractive" was found for each pair. Exactly such kind of axis of assessment acts as filter with the most divergent emotional meanings.

L.Alzhanova is with Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, 050038, Kazakhstan, (phone: +7 701-277-89-67, e-mail: l.alzhanova@gmail.com).

O.Almaganbetova is with Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, 050038, Kazakhstan, (phone: +7 701-480-34-25, e-mail: alnara25@mail.ru).

M. Yermekbayeva is with Kazakh British Technical University, Almaty, 050000, Kazakhstan, (phone: +7 701-726-62-82, e-mail: makhabbat@hotmail.com).

Use of "Diagnostic tests of relations" allowed to measure the following parameters of ethnic stereotypes: ambivalence (degree of emotional definiteness of ethnic stereotypes), evidence (strength of stereotype effect) and direction (amount of common emotional orientation of the person). Their quantity indices calculated by the formula, were considered as empiric indicators of emotional – assessed components of ethnic stereotypes. Statistic calculations of presentation of these indicators were carried out with the use of the package of applied computer programmes of universal treatment of table data of Microsoft Excel XP "SPSS".

Coefficient of ambivalence was defined by the formula:

$$A = \frac{\min(a_i^+ a_i^-)}{\max(a_i^+ a_i^-)} (0 \div 1) \quad (1)$$

Coefficient of evidence was defined by us by the formula:

$$S_i = \frac{a_i^+ - a_i^-}{3(1 + A_i)} (0 \div 1) \quad (2)$$

Direction or diagnostic coefficient of stereotype characterizing sign or amount of common emotional orientation of the person relative to the given object was defined by the formula:

$$D = \frac{\sum a^+ - \sum a^-}{\sum a_i} (0 \div 1) \quad (3)$$

At that calculation of the evidence coefficient was carried out subject to the mark sign. As a result of this not only ethnic stereotypes' intensity but their positive or negative direction was defined as well. Common evidence coefficient of the given stereotype was defined subject to direction coefficient of all pairs of qualities as their average arithmetic, higher the ambivalence coefficient then relation of the given object is characterized by more indefiniteness. Besides while studying absolute indicator of diagnostic coefficient level of self-assessment of "I" image was investigated.

In connection with this that at one and the same indicator level of self - assessment of two under test may be interpreted in one case as high (if diagnostic coefficient of "I" image is equal or higher than similar indicator for "Ideal" image, and in the other as low (if distance between diagnostic coefficient of "I" images and "ideal" will be considerable), then relying upon the research of V.P. Pavlenko for the self-assessment analysis difference between diagnostic of "Ideal" image and "I myself" image were used.

Similar approach was used for the research of ethnic preferences as well when degree of ethnic groups with the "Ideal" image was defined. In the digital expression this indicator was defined as a difference between diagnostic coefficients of "Ideal" image and image of a typical representative of Kazakh or Russian Ranging the results of "Ideal" image comparison with the character types of

different national – ethnic groups information about common system of inter – ethnic preferences of the given respondent was received.

Following V.P.Pavlenko's recommendations to analyze ethnic identification degree of coincidence of "I" image with the images of different ethnic groups were studied. At that rate of ethnic identification in digital expression was studied as a difference between diagnostic coefficients on the one hand "I myself" image and on the hand autho – and heterostereotypes.

III. RESULTS

Thus, quantity analysis of emotional – assessed components of ethnic stereotypes carried out with the help "Diagnostic tests of relations" showed that there is difference between characteristics of myself, "My ideal" and typical representatives of Kazakh and Russian ethnos on the parameters – ambivalence: Kazakh – respondents — 0,52%; 0,36%; 0,53%; 0,54% and Russian – respondents – 0,5%; 0,38%; 0,51%; 0,44% (Almaty); Kazakh – respondents – 0,52%; 0,43%; 0,53%; 0,61% and Russian – respondents – 0,54%; 0,25%; 0,63%; 0,37% (Shymkent); Kazakh – respondents – 0,58%; 0,44%; 0,62%; 0,62% and Russian – respondents – 0,42%; 0,27%; 0,65%; 0,42% (Aktobe).

Considering these data we one make conclusion that students – respondents of Kazakh and Russian national – ethnic groups living in Almaty don't give vivid preference to positive or negative evaluation pole. Polarization on the "My ideal" and "Typical Russian" scales is characteristic to Kazakh and Russian respondents living in Shymkent. Kazakh and Russian respondents from Aktobe have low polarization on the same scales "My ideal" and "Typical Russian".

Rate – evidence of emotionally – evaluated component of ethnic stereotype was defined by the same characteristics: "I myself", "My ideal", "Typical kazakh", "Typical Russian". Consequently the following quantitative results were received: Kazakh – respondents — 0,19%; 0,21%; 0,17%; 0,22% and Russian – respondents – 0,14%; 0,31%; 0,15%; 0,10% (Almaty); Kazakh respondents – 0,14%; 0,31%; 0,15%; 0,10% and Russian respondents – 0,31%; 0,27%; 0,19%; 0,31% (Shymkent); kazakh respondents – 0,12%; 0,3%; 0,13%; 0,11% and Russian respondents – 0,19%; 0,3%; 0,1%; 0,25% (Aktobe).

Direction of diagnostic coefficient of ethnic stereotype designating dimension of common emotional orientation on the same characteristics "I myself", "My ideal", "Typical kazakh", "Typical russian" is presented by the following quantitative results: Kazakh respondents – 0,3%; 0,5%; 0,31%; 0,29% and Russian respondents – 0,37%; 0,51%; 0,33%; 0,38% (Almaty); Kazakh respondents – 0,31%; 0,4%; 0,3%; 0,21% and Russian respondents – 0,25%; 0,6%; 0,21%; 0,47% (Shymkent); kazakh respondents – 0,22%; 0,41%; 0,22%; 0,19% and russian respondents – 0,46%; 0,57%; 0,11%; 0,41% (Aktobe).

Consequently the most high ambivalence coefficient determining low polarization of marks of opposite qualities of each pair characteristic to the image

"Typical Kazakh" except Russian respondents living in Almaty.

Research of evidence of emotionally – evaluated component of ethnic stereotypes showed that the most positive autho-stereotypes are characteristic for Kazakh students living in Shymkent and Aktobe [6]. Coincidence of images "I myself" and "Typical Russian" are characteristic for Russian students from Shymkent.

Quantitative indicator of "Typical Russian" and "Typical Kazakh" for Russian students from Aktobe and Kazakh students from Almaty is much higher than the image "I myself".

More negative heterostereotype is characteristic for Russian students living in Aktobe and Almaty where the difference between quantitative images "I myself" and "typical kazakh" comparatively large.

Study of direction of ethnic stereotype showed that respondents – Russian students from Aktobe and Almaty and Kazakh respondents living in Almaty more emotionally oriented to the representatives of their own.

Study of the self –assessment level on the basis of quantity analysis, represent by itself difference between coefficients of "Ideal" image and "I myself" image showed that that the highest self - assessed level is characteristic to Kazakh and Russian students of Shymkent and the lowest for Russian students living in Aktobe (0,22%; 0,07%; 0,23%).

Study ethnic preferences system defining the degree of coincidence of images of ethnic groups with "My ideal" image showed that for Kazakh respondents living in Shymkent characteristic more high level rate of ethnic preferences (as since difference between "My ideal image" and "Typical Kazakh" image appears to be minimal). For Kazakhs living in Aktobe degree of coincidence of "Typical Kazakh" and "Typical Russian" images and "My ideal" image nearly the same (kazakhs – 0,18%; 0,18%; 0,19% and Russians – 0,18%; 0,19%; 0,22%). For Russian respondents from Almaty degree of coincidence of "My ideal" and "Typical Russian" images higher (0,10%; 0,03%; 11%).

On the assumption of the analysis of the results of the carried research one may conclusion that representatives of Kazakh ethnos differ by more positive authostereotype than representatives of Russian ethnos. At the same time it is characteristic for Russian ethnos more negative heterostereotype of kazaks, for Kazakhs Russian heterostereotype more positive. On the whole degree of ethnic preferences for Kazakh students respondents turned out to be less minimal than for Russians.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus, study of emotionally – evaluative component of ethnic stereotypes showed that system of interethnic perception and interethnic idea with regard to Kazakhs to representatives of Russian ethnos. This proves to be evidence of demonstration of in – group favoritism at ethnic level as well as presence interethnic discrimination in some ideas in favour of own ethnic group. Thus, in the process of interethnic relations evaluation of not only personal and universal characteristics but perception and understanding of ethnic peculiarities of representatives of own and other ethnos take place.

REFERENCES

- [1] Petrenko V.F., Mitina O.V., and others. Psychosemantic ethnic stereotypes: images of tolerance and intolerance. M.: Smysl, 2010.
- [2] Bogardus E.S. Stereotypes, attitudes versus sociatypes // Sociology and Social Research. 1950. Vol.34. - P.286-291.
- [3] Allport G.W. Attitudes. In C.M. Murchison [ed]. The Handbook of social Psychology. – Worcester, Clars Univ. Press, 1935. – C.114.
- [4] Tajfel H. Social stereotypes and social groups // Intergroup behavior. Oxford, 1981. - P.144-167.
- [5] Soldatova G.Y. Psychology interethnic tension. - M.: Sense, 1998. - 389 p.
- [6] Aimaganbetova O.K. Cross-cultural research structure interethnic relations. – Kiev: Institute Psychology, 2010. – 286 p.