

ETHNIC AND PSYCHOLOGICAL PARTICULARITIES OF PATRIOTISM IN STUDENTS OF THE CIS COUNTRIES

Marina Rushina* and Galina Kameneva**

Abstract: The relevance of the research is conditioned by the necessity of obtaining more data on the problem of personal patriotism, namely, having to identify patriotic and non-patriotic representatives of various ethnic groups. Within the world's current political situation, the question of the patriotic calling of a personality is highly relevant. With regard to this, the paper is aimed at detecting and describing the particularities of patriotism in representatives of various national groups (using the example of students coming from the CIS countries – Tajikistan, Azerbaijan and Armenia). The study of patriotism is presented within the systemic and functional approach that allows viewing the properties of a personality in an integrated way. The paper provides the results of both theoretical and empirical study of personal patriotism, as a total of which the ethnic and psychological particularities of patriotism among the Tajik, Azerbaijani and Armenian students have been revealed. It has been found that students coming from Tajikistan and Azerbaijan have more social and personal difficulties when displaying their patriotism than students from Armenia. Similarly, in Tajik and Azerbaijani students as compared to the Armenian ones, patriotism is induced by a wish to attract more attention to themselves, by trying to gain a favorable attitude to themselves, by trying to solve their own problems at the expense of others, etc. The materials of the paper are of practical value for working with the multinational audience of higher education institutions as well as for constructing the training sessions on increasing the personal patriotism for the purpose of enhancing the communication level and reducing the difficulties when showing one's patriotism.

Keywords: Patriotism, patriotic feeling, foreign student, CIS countries, ethnoses.

INTRODUCTION

The problem addressed in this research has lately come to occupy important places in science, namely, the personal patriotism has started to be considered from the viewpoint of psychology very frequently. Representatives of each certain ethnic group try to make themselves out as patriotic people while achieving their objectives, supporting the culture of their countries and showing them as good only.

In the recent time, the questions of patriotism have become of interest for youth, in particular, for the youth going to study in various countries bringing a touch of their national spirit with them. So it is in a strange land that patriotism can perform the function of consolidating their native state and its population. What is obtained here is that patriotism can be “evoked” in a man by the state in a special way, e.g. by providing some appropriate information. Similarly, patriotism can adjust the

* Candidate of Psychology, Associate Professor of the Department of Social and Differential Psychology at the Philological Faculty of Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow, Russia. *Email: rushina_ma@rudn.university*

** Candidate of Psychology, Associate Professor of the Department of Social and Differential Psychology at the Philological Faculty of Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow, Russia. *Email: kameneva_gn@rudn.university*

people's behavior which is oriented to the formation of people's readiness to make a stand for the state and its interests at any moment.

Many speak about patriotism being a love for one's Motherland, for one's Land. However, this is not always the case. Patriotism is an immense feeling, i.e. state of mind of a personality which is akin to the love for another person, for the God, nature, knowledge, science etc. Patriotism is a consequence of an individual's upbringing – any personal property can be cultivated, enhanced in one, which is the patriotism level in the case, and so on. Hence the problem of personal patriotism under consideration is relevant nowadays.

It can be said that patriotism is subject to changes just like any human property or quality. Casting a glance far back into history, it can be seen that the notion of patriotism was understood in different ways during different historical time spans. So, in the Ancient Greece, a patriot was considered to be a follower of one's city-state. In the Roman Empire, patriotism was aimed at protection of autocracy and the emperor, so it meant a person's readiness for actions that were necessary for achieving the common objectives of the state. In the Middle Ages, the term lost its relevance regaining it in the Modern Age. In the time of bourgeois revolutions abroad, the notion of "patriot" became a synonym of that of "revolutionary". Both the people and the army are known to have shown immense patriotism during the Great Patriotic War, as the destiny of the USSR was in question, with the patriotism subsequently becoming the basis of the spiritual and moral superiority over the Nazi ideology. In those times, by the "people", many nations were actually understood who were united by the one goal – fighting the enemy (Kotov, 2015). Currently, being united back then Russia and CIS countries are trying to maintain their rights and interests, culture including.

A dictionary of psychology views the notion of patriotism as "a feeling of love for one's Motherland, a readiness to subdue one's personal and group interests to the common interests of the country, to serve it faithfully and to protect it" (Great Psychological Dictionary, 2003, p. 498).

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is important to mention that the feeling of patriotism cannot be mixed up with the feeling of animosity towards other peoples in any case. Another very important point is that there are essential distinctions in the understanding of patriotism of various nations. The distinctions are due to particularities of mentality of the different peoples. What is more, the approaches to the understanding of patriotism may fail to coincide even in ethnoses belonging to the same civilization. As for the said approaches, there are many of them in investigation of the essence of patriotism: the historical, the political and the philosophical one.

Such scholars as A. Podberezkin and Yu. Bulatov (2003) try to present the basis of patriotism by means of a nation's struggling for survival, for consolidation of the state and government institutions, a high extent of spirituality, religious tolerance and benevolence. They also maintain that for a state to develop efficiently, reorientation in the society's value system is critical – from the corporate and “family” ones to the common national values.

In the foreign studies, the notions of “nationalism”, “chauvinism” and “patriotism” are almost not separated. Separation of the notions, if any, is rather conventional and is not marked clearly (Druckman, 1994; Schatz et. al., 1999; Dekker et. al., 2003). Some researchers when speaking about patriotism only mean the “national pride” by it (Worchel & Coutant, 1997; Blank & Schmidt, 2003). J. Kateb (2006) pays attention to the irrational nature of motives of patriotism while also mentioning that patriotism often leads to abhorrent cruelty and injustice in people's lives. By means of patriotism, one can fulfill oneself and one's life interests (Schoenborn, 2008). Some scholars characterize patriotism within the context of racism (Gomberg, 1990), which causes separate interest in the problem of patriotic feeling of personality. It should be pointed out that the concept of patriotism within the framework of social sciences belongs to the theory of ethnocentrism (Wine & Campbell, 1972). The modern scholars assume it in a quite justified manner that tolerance and patriotism are inseparably connected to the self-understanding of a personality as a constituent of the society, in particular, within one nation (Murtiningsih, 2016). Notably, the question of tolerance just like that of patriotism is very important in considering the intercultural adaptation of ethnic groups in areas which are new for them (Novikova & Novikov, 2015, p. 109).

The methodological side of the research of the problem of personal patriotism is well presented in the work of V.A. Minakov (2010) within which the main conceptual approaches to understanding of patriotism, ways of formation of patriotism, its structure and functions are discussed. In the paper by E.V. Okorochkova (2016), the author determines the identification attributes and main characteristics of patriotic behavior which characterizes a person exactly as a patriot of the person's country.

The question of patriotic upbringing of students is highly important. Much depends on the adults, on the way they imagine a person – patriot and on the way they bring the understanding across to the younger generation (Kozhanova et. al., 2016). Certainly, there are its difficulties and controversies in upbringing of patriotism (Koltsova & Sosnin, 2005). The aspect of responsibility in manifesting and upbringing a patriotic person is essential (Kudinov & Kudinova, 2014).

From the standpoint of the systemic and functional approach which clearly demonstrates the connection between dynamic, content-related and result-related characteristics, personal patriotism acts as an integral formation. Studying the basic properties of personality within the approach is possible if all structural

components are analyzed in their unity and interrelation. This approach in science was represented by A.I. Krupnov (1987) who in his studies proceeded from the fact that any personal property is a composite systemic formation being a close unity of motivational, cognitive, productive, emotional, regulatory and dynamic components which integrate in themselves the unity of main mental functions, personal and individual characteristics of the subject. According to A.I. Krupnov's (1987) standpoint, each personal property is an integral structure of motivation and meaning-related, instrumental and dynamic characteristics ensuring the persistence of aspirations and an individual's readiness to fulfill the attitudes towards the surrounding world and oneself. A.I. Krupnov (1987) believes that any person can have basic properties – ones that make up the basis for development of other, more particular personal properties. According to him, here belong the initiative, inquisitiveness, purposefulness, organization, persistence, hard-working nature, responsibility and sociability. Within this approach in science there is a large quantity of works on identification of basic properties of personality using the example of ethnic groups of students: hard-working nature (Kameneva et. al., 2014); sociability (Rushina, 2016) etc.

However, A.I. Krupnov (1987) does not put up the question of personal patriotism and does not refer it to the basic properties of personality. In his turn, A.V. Potyomkin (2004a) states there are methodological grounds that enable the researchers to refer patriotism to the basic personal properties. It is the integral and functional approach that allows identifying the role of individual characteristics in the structure of patriotism and, together with this, identifying the weak and strong features of this property (Potyomkin, 2004b; Kameneva & Farbotko, 2015).

Within the work by S.A. Gavrilushkin (2012), distinctive features in manifestation of various kinds of patriotic orientation are presented that are conditioned by the emotional and volitional, motivational and meaning-related determination. He also highlights the psychological particularities of manifestation of responsibility in students having various patriotic orientation (Gavrilushkin, 2012, p. 129-154).

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Within the paper, the objective was set aimed at revealing the ethnic and psychological particularities of patriotism among students. The objective of the work has also determined the research tasks: to identify distinctions and similarities of patriotism in representatives of different national groups, namely, to single out more and less patriotic students of the CIS countries. It is in the sample of the tested ones including the students of the CIS countries that the novelty of the research consists as they have not been considered previously in such a combination from the standpoint of systemic study of personal patriotism.

In order to achieve the set research objectives, a complex of mutually supplementing and relevant to the research subject methods was used: the analysis of psychological and pedagogical literature on the problem under study including that of earlier research; the empirical methods, testing and questionnaire survey. For processing of the data obtained, statistical methods were used, in particular: the analysis of mean values, hierarchical analysis, and correlation analysis. This paper does not encompass the results of hierarchical and correlation analysis but they confirm the obtained valid distinctions in the extent of patriotism which were evaluated using Fisher's F-test.

The study of personal patriotism was based on using the fill-in form patriotism research test "Patriogram" developed by A.V. Potyomkin (2004a) under the guidance of S.I. Kudinov. The technique contains 8 main forms – blocks – corresponding to each component of patriotism as a systemic property of personality and including the harmonic (one that helps manifest patriotism) and aharmonic (one hindering the manifestation of patriotism) variables. The first block contains value-related characteristics ("socially significant values" and "personally significant values"); the second block – the dynamic ones ("energetic nature" and "aenergetic nature"); the third block – the emotional features ("sthenicity" and "asthenicity"); the fourth block encompasses the volitional characteristics ("internality" and "externality"); the fifth block – the motivational ones ("sociocentrism" and "egocentrism"); the sixth block – the cognitive features ("sense" and "awareness"); the seventh block consists of the productive characteristics ("objectness" and "subjectness"), and the eighth block contains the characteristics of difficulties ("operational difficulties" and "personal difficulties").

The reesearch was conducted on the basis of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (hereinafter – RUDN) in 2016-2017, with representatives of over 140 countries of the world studying at the university so the question of patriotism being very important for them. The time span of the research was targeted at the full-fledged work with the students: interviewing, testing, observation during the survey etc. The total of 261 people took part in the research: 90 students coming from Tajikistan, 83 students – from Azerbaijan, and 88 – from Armenia. The tested ones were aged 21 on average. It was of these CIS countries that the representatives were engaged in the research not by random choice but for the reason of the communities of these ethnic groups being located at RUDN. The results obtained were processed using the statistical methods (Fisher's F-test), with the Statistics for Windows 10.0 software package used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The validity of distinctions of the mean values of variables of personal patriotism in students coming from various CIS countries is considered below. According to the data given in the table, it can be seen that the essential difference in manifestation

of patriotism by the samples has taken place in the following variables: “personally significant objectives” of the attitudes and objective component, “asthenicity” of the emotional component, “externality” of the volitional component, “egocentrism” of the motivational component, “awareness” of the cognitive component, “objectness” of the productive component, and the block of difficulties (both operational and personal ones). The majority of distinctions in the level of patriotism among the student sample have been found in aharmonic variables of the studied property of personality (personally significant objectives, asthenicity, externality, egocentrism, awareness, and personal difficulties). However, there are also manifestations of patriotism in harmonic variables of the personal property, such as the objectness and operational difficulties. The variables of the motivational and meaning-related block of patriotism have been more pronounced.

The quantitative characteristics of patriotism of students coming from various CIS countries are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1: VALIDITY OF DISTINCTIONS OF MEAN VALUES OF PATRIOTISM IN STUDENTS COMING FROM TAJIKISTAN (N = 90), AZERBAIJAN (N = 83) AND ARMENIA (N = 88)

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Region Variables</i>	<i>Tajikistan</i>	<i>Azerbaijan</i>	<i>Armenia</i>	<i>F-test</i>	<i>Probability</i>
<i>Regulatory and dynamic constituents of patriotism</i>						
Value-related	Socially significant objectives	26.82	28.53	33.55	1.76	0.18
	Personally significant objectives	29.14	25.37	21.90	3.06	0.05
Dynamic	Energetic nature	29.32	29.84	35.55	2.30	0.11
	Aenergetic nature	24.82	24.74	24.25	0.04	0.96
Emotional	Sthenicity	28.91	29.05	34.80	1.99	0.15
	Asthenicity	20.36	15.95	12.65	4.34	0.02
Volitional	Internality	29.05	28.89	29.40	0.01	0.99
	Externality	28.36	18.42	14.95	9.84	0.00
<i>Motivational and meaning-related constituents of patriotism</i>						
Motivational	Sociocentrism	32.27	28.16	34.55	1.51	0.23
	Egocentrism	27.50	24.32	18.55	5.18	0.01
Cognitive	Sense	31.64	26.21	24.95	2.68	0.08
	Awareness	24.05	22.42	18.05	3.09	0.05
Productive	Objectness	30.55	25.47	20.10	4.36	0.02
	Subjectness	28.00	23.89	25.75	1.24	0.30
Difficulties	Operational difficulties	27.91	22.84	16.50	7.18	0.00
	Personal difficulties	29.32	20.11	8.95	21.12	0.00

Note: Valid distinctions are highlighted by the grey background

When considering the regulatory and dynamic block of patriotism in students coming from various CIS countries, it can be seen that the Tajik students are characterized by the extent of personally significant objectives (29,14) dominating over the socially significant ones (26,82) while the Azerbaijani and Armenian students feature the reverse ratio. The Azerbaijani students have more socially significant objectives (28,53) than personally significant ones (25,37) and so do the students from Armenia, with the socially significant objectives (33,55) prevailing over the personally significant ones (21,90).

As for the dynamic component of patriotism, here, all CIS countries students are characterized by the extent of the energetic nature prevailing over the aenergetic nature, without any valid distinctions in this block.

The emotional component of patriotism features a specific representation: in all students, the extent of sthenicity prevails over the asthenicity, but it is the asthenicity that yields valid distinctions (28,91 and 20,36 – Tajikistan; 29,05 and 18,95 – Azerbaijan; 34,80 and 12,65 – Armenia).

There are also valid distinctions in the volitional component of patriotism in representatives of all samples within the context of internality and externality where the harmonic variable dominates over the aharmonic variable of patriotism. Here, the Tajik students have almost similar results as for the internality (29,05) and externality (28,36) variables; while the Azerbaijani students have 28,89 and 18,42, and the Armenian ones – 29,40 and 14,95.

As it can be seen in the motivational component of patriotism, all samples have sociocentrism prevailing over the egocentrism (32,27 and 27,50 – Tajikistan; 28,16 and 24,32 – Azerbaijan; 34,55 and 18,55 - Armenia), with the “egocentrism” variable having valid distinctions throughout all groups of samples.

There are also valid distinctions in the cognitive component, namely, in the “awareness” variable. In this case, the harmonic variable of patriotism again dominates over the aharmonic variable, that is, sense prevails over the awareness in all students of the CIS countries.

The productive component of patriotism is presented in a special way: the objectness dominates over subjectness in the Tajik students (30,55 and 28,00) and in Azerbaijani students (25,47 and 23,89). Meanwhile, as for the representatives of Armenia, here it is the subjective sphere that prevails over the objective one – 25,75 and 20,10. In this component, it is in the harmonic variable that the valid distinctions exist.

As a result of mathematical data processing, it has been found that there are distinctions in both operational and personal difficulties in the difficulties block of patriotism of the CIS countries students; i.e. all students have difficulties when manifesting their patriotism. In students coming from Tajikistan, it is characteristic for the extent of personal difficulties (29,32) to dominate over that of operational

ones (27,91) while a reverse ratio is seen in students from Azerbaijan and Armenia (students from Azerbaijan have more operational difficulties (22,84) as compared to personal ones (20,11), and operational difficulties (16,50) exceed the personal ones (8,95) in the Armenian students).

Now, the qualitative characteristics of the results obtained is going to be presented. Here it can be spoken about the students from Tajikistan and Azerbaijan, unlike the ones from Armenia, directing their patriotism to achieving their own well-being, becoming known, fulfilling their own life objectives, achieving their material independence, expanding the circle of the opinion allies, getting new knowledge and life experience, and improving their own social status (i.e. objectives that are important for individuals).

By contrast to other students, the ones coming from Tajikistan often feel uneasy and embarrassed when they have to manifest their patriotism in public and they feel emotionally wasted due to their having to work for the country and alien people. It is also important to point out that as compared to the three sample groups, it is the Tajik students who experience irritation when someone speaks about their patriotism and who feel apathy and indifference when being surrounded by people who do not conceal exactly their patriotism, i.e. they do not want to listen to anybody else but only to their own ideas about patriotism enhancement (asthenicity).

Unlike the students coming from Azerbaijan and Armenia, most students from Tajikistan tend to have the following beliefs: one's patriotic thinking is formed by the people around one; even if each individual becomes a patriot this will not change anything; there will be no change in the country by efforts of an individual; it is the society and the state who are to blame for the lack of patriotism in people; the efforts of one person in upbringing patriotism in others will never yield any results and so on (externality). What is observed here is the total pessimism of Tajikistan students. It is appealing, however, that the representatives of Azerbaijan and Armenia share a more positive view on the question of upbringing patriotism in a personality.

As for the egocentric expression of patriotism by the students, here the representatives of Tajikistan and Azerbaijan, unlike the Armenians, say that it is by the personal objectives that their patriotism is induced: by a wish to attract more attention to themselves, by trying to gain a favorable attitude to themselves, by trying to solve their own problems at the expense of others, by a wish to build their career etc.

The students coming from Azerbaijan and Tajikistan feature a slightly incorrect knowledge about the questions of patriotism which is not the case of the Armenian students. Due to this, the Azerbaijani and Tajiks think that patriotism means love for one's Motherland, saying no bad things about one's country, watching all championships where the national combined teams participate, going to all

demonstrations, and compulsorily participating in the presidential or parliamentary elections of one's country.

As for the subject area of patriotism of the Tajik students, it is represented in them by what is promoted by their patriotism: achievement of high results in activity, building good relationships with others, improvement of academic or work skills, quality of work etc. The subject area of patriotism in students coming from Azerbaijan and Armenia is detailed below.

Students of the CIS countries have difficulties fulfilling their patriotism – both personal nature ones and operational ones, i.e. those associated with inability to show and hold out their patriotic feeling due to a lack of knowledge and experience. With regard to this, it should be pointed out that it is students from Tajikistan and Azerbaijan who have more difficulties in expressing their patriotism. In particular, on the one hand, they hardly have an idea of what patriotism actually is, they have difficulty getting involved in an activity that can do good to the country and the society, they would like to help other people but do not know how to do that, and they think life in the country cannot be improved using the patriotic movement, etc. (these are operational difficulties). On the other hand, it is Tajik students who feel embarrassed due to not being considered patriots of their country; they are uneasy if they have to persuade others in the necessity to show patriotism; and they believe they cannot do good to their country or the society themselves, etc. (personal difficulties).

CONCLUSION

The analysis of theoretical foundations of the question of personal patriotism and empirical research conducted allow stating that patriotism is one of the important constituents of the human life and one of the leading personal qualities. The use of systemic and functional approach has enabled the authors to comprehensively study patriotism as a personal property.

The objectives set within the work have been achieved, in particular: the results obtained expand and advance the current ideas about personal patriotism, its characteristics; particularities of patriotism in representatives of various ethnic groups have been revealed. Such ethnic group as the Tajiks are not very patriotic individuals and they have more difficulties and problems when manifesting their patriotism. It is the Tajiks who are not consolidated with each other, who stand up for their own interests only and not for those of their Motherland. The Armenians are more peaceful and prepared to help each other out.

Certainly, the problem of personal patriotism can be viewed differently depending on the ethnic belonging and some cultures can be said to be patriots while others cannot. However, everyone who loves their Motherland will always defend it and stand up for its positions thus representing their patriotism. The role

of a person - patriot is fairly vast for the person's culture and country. The obtained results of the research confirm the fact that any personal property can be developed and adjusted.

It should be mentioned that this work matters not only for the Russian science but for the world science as well within the framework of the questions of tolerance and correct construction of communication processes between the national groups.

The results of the research can be applied in practice by teachers and psychologists during training sessions in order to enhance the personal patriotism level and building a favorable atmosphere in the ethnic study groups of the learners. The obtained results can also be used in lecture courses on ethnic psychology, social psychology and psychology of communication.

References

- Blank, T. & Schmidt, P. (2003). National identity in a united Germany: nationalism or patriotism? An empirical test with representative data. *Political Psychology*, 24(2), 259–288.
- Dekker, H., Malov, D. & Hoogendoorn, S. (2003). Nationalism and Its Explanations. *Political Psychology*, 24(2): 345-376.
- Druckman, D. (1994). Nationalism, patriotism, and group loyalty: a social-psychological perspective. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 38(1), 43-68.
- Gavrilushkin, S.A. (2012). Psychological specific character of demonstration of personal responsibility in students having a different patriotic orientation: PhD thesis. Moscow: RUDN.
- Gomberg, P. (1990). Patriotism Is Like Racism. *Ethics*, 101: 144-150.
- Kameneva, G.N. & Farbotko, S.S. (2015). The particularities of patriotism manifestation among the young people. In: *The relevant problems of the modern humanities. Materials of the International conference of young scientists*, 63-68.
- Kameneva, G.N., Rushina, M.A. & Anisimova, Yu.N. (2014). The specific character of relations between the variables of hard-working nature and social and psychological adaptation in foreign and Russian students. *Bulletin of the People's Friendship University of Russia. Series: Psychology and Pedagogy*, 3: 71-77.
- Kateb, G. (2006). Patriotism and other mistakes. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Koltsova, V.A. & Sosnin, V.A. (2005). Social and psychological problems of patriotism and particularities of its upbringing in the contemporary Russian society. *Psychological Journal*, 4: 26.
- Kotov, E.P. (2015). Formation of a patriotic attitude to the small motherland in schoolchildren at classes and in extracurricular activity. [<http://schools.uchfilm.com/article/2469>].
- Kozhanova, M.B., Kozhanov, I.V., Ibraeva, G.R., Komelina, V.A., Krylov, D.A., Kuzmin, N.V., Golovina, N.N. & Arefeva, S.A. (2016). Features of pedagogical management of students civil and patriotic qualities forming. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(S2): 269-273.
- Krupnov, A.I. (1987). Diagnostics of the basic personal properties. Moscow: RUDN.
- Kudinov, S.I. & Kudinova, I.B. (2014). The role of responsibility in manifestation of the personal patriotic feeling. *The Russian Scientific Journal*, 2(40), 162-168.

- Minakov, V.A. (2010). On the question of patriotism investigation methodology. *Bulletin of Buryatia State University*, 14: 67-70.
- Murtiningsih, B.S.E. (2016). The role of cultural competence to overcome intercultural communication conflict: case study of Indonesian and Korean students in Kyungsoong University, South Korea. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(6): 213-222.
- Novikova, I.A. & Novikov, A.L. (2015). Relation between communicative tolerance and intercultural adaptation in international students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (2S2): 109-116.
- Okorochkova, E.V. (2016). Psychological characteristic of personal projections of patriotism. *European Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1: 46-54.
- Podberezkin, A. & Bulatov, Yu. (2003). Russia in the global world: some theoretic aspects of research. Moscow: "Nauchnaya kniga".
- Potyomkin, A.V. (2004a). Ethnic and psychological aspect of studying patriotism. In: *Ethnogenesis and civilization prospects of education of Russia. Materials of the international scientific and practical conference*. Novosibirsk: NSPU, 798-803.
- Potyomkin, A.V. (2004b). Fill-in form technique of studying patriotism. *Postgraduate and external doctorate student*, 2: 141-143.
- Rushina, M.A. (2016). Particularities of the structure of sociability of Chinese students living in China. *Acmeology. Scientific and Practical Journal*, 1(57), 80-83.
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E. & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20(1): 151-174.
- Schoenborn, K. (2008). *The Intersection: a book about faith, patriotism and personal fulfillment*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- The great psychological dictionary. (2003). SPb.: "Prime-Euroznak".
- Wine, R.A. & Campbell, D.T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior*. N.Y.
- Worchel, S. & Coutant, D. (1997). The tangled web of loyalty: nationalism, patriotism, and ethnocentrism. In: *Patriotism in the Life of Individuals and Nations*. N.Y., 190-212.

