

A.V.Panchenko

*Ye.A.Buketov Karaganda State University  
(E-mail: idpanchenko@rambler.ru)*

## Social identity and personal perception of Ukrainian conflict

This study investigates the multidimensional nature of group identity of people who were not directly involved in Ukrainian conflict and how this different dimensions are uniquely related to in-group and out-group evaluations, intergroup bias, and perceived above-mentioned intergroup conflict. It was expected that at least one of the major dimensions of group identity will influence the perception of a conflict, additionally, was hypothesized that affective dimension of group identity to be the most strongly related to expressions of bias in conflict perception, since it is most likely to be related with the strength of connections between group and person.

*Key words:* conflict, social identity, prejudice, psychology, group perception, politics, ideology, self-identity, ethnocentrism.

In most cases, the vast majority of countries coexist peacefully with their neighbors. As it is impossible to exist in complete isolation, they interact with each other in various ways, for example, they exchange information, goods, cooperate with each other in international projects and so on.

Problems that inevitably arise in the course of this interaction, in most cases are resolved peacefully through negotiations and international law. However, sometimes, some problems can't be solved in a peaceful way (unfortunately). In these cases the problem is transformed into conflict, conflict, in turn, in armed confrontation.

War as a way of resolving contradictions is expensive and inhumane way. Scientists are trying to learn different aspects of this phenomenon in order to reduce the risk of military action in the future, or even stop it completely.

This line of research is an important part of research activities in several areas of the social sciences, including psychology. The importance of such research can't be overemphasized. Indeed, the war in all its forms affects almost all aspects of human life both an individual and social, it affects not only the direct participants in hostilities, but also on the whole population of the conflicting countries, affecting history, identity, culture and collective behavior of millions of people.

At the same time, war conflicts are a very complex phenomenon and it makes it very problematic for scientific research. Attempts to achieve the main goal of this research — to understand how to manage conflict faced to the needs to answer the main question which is the question about origins (causes) of conflict behavior.

In this context, despite the fact that some psychologists attempt to explain the conflict in terms of intra-individual psychology, considering intra-individual factors (such as personality traits or frustration theory of aggression [1], as a source of conflict, a much more convenient position to explain it, this is attempt to focus on social-psychological, intergroup phenomena.

Socio-psychological approach to explaining the origin of intergroup conflict offers three distinct theories of this phenomenon.

Firstly, the most ancient concept, which was formulated in the beginning of the last century by sociologist Sumner, it is the concept of *ethnocentrism*. Sumner termed intergroup biases in general ethnocentrism, defined as «the view of things in which one's own group is the centre of everything, and all others are scaled or rated with reference to it» [2]. This general tendency can be seen in preferences for in-group characteristics, products, customs, languages, speech styles, and such. Sumner saw such biases as resulting from intergroup competition and functioning to preserve ingroup solidarity and justify the exploitation of out-groups.

Second is «*Realistic Group Conflict Theory*». This approach to intergroup relations was created by American psychologist Sherif [3] and it assumes that group conflicts are rational in the sense that groups have incompatible goals and compete for scarce resources. Thus, the source of conflict is «realistic». Sherif and colleagues carried out a number of famous field studies of boys at summer camps, who were split up into different groups and engaged in various competitive behaviors.

Last one is the «*Social Identity Theory*». According to social identity theory [4], individuals define themselves to a large extent in terms of their social group memberships and tend to seek a positive social identity. This social identity consists of those aspects of an individual's self-image that derive from the social categories to which the individual perceives him or herself to belong; and to the value and emotional significance ascribed to that membership.

Thus, it is a self-definition in terms of group membership. A positive social identity is achieved by comparing one's own group with other groups to establish a positively valued psychological distinctiveness for the in-group. Emphasizing that motivational as well as cognitive factors underlie intergroup differentiation, social identity theory holds that positive comparisons (intergroup differences seen to favor the in-group) provide a satisfactory social identity, whereas negative comparisons (differences that favor the outgroup) convey an unsatisfactory identity.

Social identity differs from earlier group perspectives in two key respects. First, in contrast to Sumner's claim that ethnocentrism have innate and universal nature, social identity theory predicts that members of social groups will differentiate primarily on dimensions that provide them a favorable view of their own group (i.e. dimensions on which the in-group is superior to the out-group). Moreover, intergroup discrimination is often driven by in-group favoritism rather than out-group derogation. Second, in contrast to Sherif's claim that competitive goals cause conflict, social identity theory argues that social categorization per se can cause intergroup discrimination.

Some later Tajfel [5; 63] defined group identity as «...that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership».

As this definition illustrates, Tajfel postulated a tridimensional conceptualization of group identity consisting of a cognitive component (knowledge of group membership), an evaluative component (value of group membership), and an affective component (emotional significance of group membership).

In addition to Tajfel's original work, other multidimensional conceptualizations of group identity have been presented in latest modifications of his theories [2; 6–8]. Empirical investigations of the multidimensional nature of group identity have also been conducted and confirmed the structure (see table 1).

Table 1

**Multidimensional Conceptualizations of Group Identity**

Researcher (s)	Cognitive	Affective	Evaluative
Tajfel (1981)	Knowledge of group membership	Emotional significance of group membership	Value of group membership
Phinney (1990)	Self-identification	Feelings of belonging	Positive, negative attitudes toward group
Deaux (1995)	Cognitive aspects: Self categorization and beliefs about category	Affective aspects: Passionate feelings and evaluations	Not used
Jackson & Smith (1999)	Depersonalization	Attraction to the ingroup	Not used
Brewer (1999)	Self-categorization, depersonalization	Motivation-concern for group welfare	Not used

#### *The Cognitive Dimension*

All of the researchers listed in Table 1 identify a cognitive dimension that basically corresponds to the process of self-categorization. For Tajfel this dimension was defined as «knowledge that one belongs to a group» [5; 229]. Given the results of numerous minimal group studies involving purely cognitive groups, it may be concluded that this is theoretically necessary dimension.

It makes logical sense that one must acknowledge that a group exists and that one is part of that group (by choice, circumstance, or other means) before one can become emotionally attached to the group or con-

template the group's value. Deaux [6] suggests that the cognitive aspects of identification include not only the process of categorization itself, but also an analysis of the beliefs that associated with the self-designated category (What does it mean to be a member of group X?).

Depending on various situational and dispositional attributes, an individual may think of himself or herself as a separate individual or as a member of a social category.

#### *The Affective Dimension*

All of the researchers listed in Table 1 include an affective dimension of group identity. Tajfel [5; 229] stated those group identities involve affect «... in the sense that the cognitive and evaluative aspects of the group and one's membership of it may be accompanied by emotions (such as love or hatred, like or dislike) directed toward one's own group and toward others which standing certain relations to it». In discussing affective aspects of identification, Deaux [6] includes passionate feelings about the group as well as such concepts as group cohesion and collective self-esteem. These concepts are also stressed by Jackson and Smith [9] in their analysis of the affective component.

Empirically, Jackson [9], generated factors labeled affective or emotional aspects of identity. These factors basically reflect being satisfied with group membership and feeling a sense of commitment to the group or belongingness.

#### *The Evaluative Dimension*

In contrast to the affective dimension of group identification, Tajfel [5; 229] identified the evaluative component as «... the notion of the group or of one's membership in it may have a positive or negative value connotation». As shown in Tables 1, relatively few researchers explicitly identify an evaluative component.

Phinney's [10] evaluative dimension, «...positive and negative attitudes toward the ingroup» includes such concepts as pride in and satisfaction with the ingroup, and having positive or negative feelings associated with the ingroup, such as joy, excitement, arrogance, and failure. Some researchers found out an empirically-derived evaluative factor marked by such concepts as group pride and respect. This contrasts with their affective factor, commitment to the group.

The purpose of this article was to cover some of the key determinants which have influence on the perception of war conflict. Current investigation was designed to study the formation of the perception of the military conflict, through individuals who were not involved in direct conflict interactions (ie, did not fight and are not refugees or affected by war). In fact, they are people who are passive observers, who are interested in studying information but are not parties to the conflict and, therefore, vulnerable for the impact of propaganda. One of the most powerful tools of propaganda impact is the division of people into on and another, that is the reason why the use of the Social identity theory will be productive (in our opinion) in this context.

Ukrainian conflict has been chosen as the basis for the study because of its wide popularity and relevance to the current time period. This situation facilitates the study of perception and allows finding a sufficient number of respondents for the practical part of investigation.

The present study was designed to explore the multidimensional nature of group identity and examine how the different dimensions may be related to perceptions of intergroup conflict.

It is expected that at least one of the major dimensions of group identity discussed above (cognitive, evaluative, and affective) will influence the perception of a conflict (*Hypothesis 1*).

The affective dimension is expected to be the most strongly related to expressions of bias in that perception, since it is most likely to be related with the strength of connections between group and person (*Hypothesis 2*).

### **Method**

#### *Participants*

Total number of participants was 43 people. Sample consist of 25 females and 18 males who were found in Kazakhstan and Romania. Their age ranged from 18 to 30 and the mean age was 21.30 (SD = 3.67). They were students from the Karaganda State University (Kazakhstan) and Babes-Bolyai University (Romania). All participants were volunteers and unpaid.

#### *Measures*

Participants responded to a questionnaire designed to assess affective, cognitive and evaluative dimensions of each group identity (24 items). The table 2 is presented structure of the questionnaire. In original blank items were mixed in random order.

Structure of Group identity questionnaire

Group identity questionnaire	
Scale	Items
Affective Dimension: Affective Ties	Members of the ingroup can always count on each other.
	Most ingroup members would take a substantial risk to rescue me.
	If I were in trouble, an ingroup member would help me.
	In a time of personal need, I can rely on members of my ingroup.
	If an ingroup member were in trouble, I would help him or her.
	When I am with ingroup members, I usually feel like we are one unit.
	My ingroup's successes are my successes.
	Members of the ingroup need to stick together.
Evaluative Dimension: Attraction to the Ingroup	I am glad I am a member of the ingroup.
	I am proud to be a member of the ingroup.
	I feel the ingroup is not worthwhile.
	I attach great value to my ingroup membership.
	It is good to be a member of the ingroup.
	I would not feel badly if I had to leave the ingroup.
	My image of the ingroup is negative.
	I don't really feel like a part of the ingroup.
Cognitive Dimension: Self-Categorization	I am a member of the ingroup.
	My ingroup membership is important to the way I view myself.
	Being a member of the ingroup is an important reflection of who I am.
	Ingroup members have a number of things in common with each other.
	People in the outgroup are a lot alike in many respects.
	It is important to me that others identify me as an ingroup member.
	I prefer to see my ingroup as distinct from the outgroup.
	There are important differences between the ingroup and outgroup.

All responses were made on seven-point Likert scales. The items were partly derived from existing measures [7, 9, 11]. The questionnaire was written in English and Russian language. In original blank items were mixed in random order.

All participants were asked to give answers 3 times — separately for every social identification.

The second questionnaire was the provisional Motives of Wars questionnaire that was made of 21 items. These items were devised in multiple ways. First, a list of items was created by the investigators on the basis of the current literature on the causes of wars [8, 12] and on the basis of the literature on human motivation [13, 14].

This list was then shown to six people who formed an expert group. These people suggested delete irrelevant (to Ukrainian situation) items based on their personal views and experience. They also reformulated the items that were judged as ambiguous. A 7-point scale was printed following each item. The two extremes of the scales were labeled «disagree completely» and «completely agree». Examples of items are shown in table 3.

The questionnaire was written in English and Russian language. In original blank items were mixed in random order.

Structure of Motives of wars questionnaire

Motives of wars questionnaire	
Type of motivation	Items
Personal popularity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>... wanted to prove to themselves that they can lead their people to victory</li> <li>... wanted to leave their name in history</li> <li>... wanted to prove to themselves that they are unyielding</li> <li>... wanted to prove to themselves that they have warriors' qualities</li> <li>... did not want their people to shame them</li> <li>... wanted their people to view them as paragons of hope</li> <li>... wanted their soldiers to be accustomed to their enemy's suffering</li> <li>... wanted to prove to themselves that they are relentless</li> </ul>
Exporting democratic values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>... wanted to fight against dictatorial regimes</li> <li>... wanted to fight for the rights of their population</li> <li>... wanted to help people in their fight for freedom</li> <li>... believed they were invested with a political mission</li> <li>... wanted to help people in their fight for democracy</li> <li>... wanted to preventively defend their country against an aggressor</li> <li>... wanted to prove to themselves that they are able to spread justice</li> <li>... wanted to prove to themselves that they can preserve or restore the dignity of their country</li> </ul>
Increasing economic power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>... thought it was good for their country's economy</li> <li>... thought it can invigorate their country's economy</li> <li>... wanted to seize material resources</li> <li>... wanted to dismantle a power that acted against their economic interests, and make a new world order emerge</li> <li>... wanted to justify the Defense budget</li> </ul>
Territorial issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>... wanted to submit different populations to their will</li> <li>... wanted to expulse minorities and enlarge the vital space of their people</li> <li>... wanted to recover lost territories</li> <li>... wanted to take possession of new territories</li> <li>... wanted to destroy a country that was perceived as an enemy</li> </ul>

The questionnaire should be answered twice — the first time the subjects were asked to evaluate prospective motives of the Ukrainian party, and the second time prospective motives separatists (Donetsk and Luhansk Republics).

#### *Procedure*

Each participant responded individually to the paper-and-pencil questionnaire in individual order. 27 respondents were questioned by the mail (Kazakhstan). The experimenters asked the participants to read the questionnaire items and rate his/her degree of agreement with each statement. It took them approximately 30 minutes to complete the two questionnaires.

#### **Results**

In order to test the research hypotheses, it was necessary to clarify the direction of the social identities of the subjects. It was assumed that the identification of a group involved in the conflict, or is associated with one of the parties will significantly change the nature of the perception of a conflict situation. This information is presented in table 4.

Table 4

## Directions of social identification

Type	Directions	Amount
Ethnicity	Kazakh	11
	Russian	13
	Romanian	9
	Turkish	1
	Ukrainian	3
	Portuguese	4
	Macedonian	2
Culture	Kazakh	4
	Russian	22
	Romanian	5
	Turkish	1
	Portuguese	3
	Macedonian	1
	West and European	7
Religious beliefs	Catholic	3
	Orthodox	18
	Islam	12
	Others	10

Despite restricting of the possible identifications (ethnicity, culture, religion), table 4 shows that although, some identifications associated with the Ukrainian conflict (Russian ethnicity and culture, orthodoxy), however most of the identifications (others) can't be a directly associate with this war.

To detect differences in the perception of the conflict of subjects with different social-identifications were used the U-test (Mann-Whitney). Subjects were divided into two groups and then, these groups were compared with the results of the questionnaire «Motives of wars».

Table 5

## The results of the comparison groups (Separatists' motives)

Type of motive	U-test	p-level
The results of the comparison groups divided on the basis of ethnicity (13 Russian, 30 others)		
Personal popularity	450,0000	0,366233
Exporting democratic values	338,0000	0,297563
Increasing economic power	587,0000	0,628791
Territorial issues	572,0000	0,511771
The results of the comparison groups divided on the basis of culture (22 Russian, 21 others)		
Personal popularity	545,0000	0,385611
Exporting democratic values	<b>159,0000</b>	<b>0,033701</b>
Increasing economic power	363,0000	0,447449
Territorial issues	338,0000	0,397563
The results of the comparison groups divided on the basis of religious beliefs (18 Orthodox, 25 others)		
Personal popularity	478,0000	0,561061
Exporting democratic values	<b>143,0000</b>	<b>0,012299</b>
Increasing economic power	314,0000	0,251673
Territorial issues	213,0000	0,183707

Table 6

**The results of the comparison groups (Ukrainian government's motives)**

Type of motive	U-test	p-level
The results of the comparison groups divided on the basis of ethnicity (13 Russian, 30 others)		
Personal popularity	620,0000	0,922062
Exporting democratic values	587,0000	0,632882
Increasing economic power	621,0000	0,926633
Territorial issues	620,0000	0,922062
The results of the comparison groups divided on the basis of culture (22 Russian, 21 others)		
Personal popularity	557,0000	0,436452
<b>Exporting democratic values</b>	<b>158,0000</b>	<b>0,028330</b>
Increasing economic power	613,0000	0,735334
<b>Territorial issues</b>	<b>162,0000</b>	<b>0,048601</b>
The results of the comparison groups divided on the basis of culture (18 Orthodox, 25 others)		
Personal popularity	318,0000	0,201379
<b>Exporting democratic values</b>	<b>155,0000</b>	<b>0,028300</b>
Increasing economic power	337,0000	0,287497
Territorial issues	452,0000	0,375463

Coefficient were calculated twice, the first times to detect differences between groups based on the separatists' motives (table 5), the second to detect differences between groups in the Ukrainian government's motives (table 6).

Table 5 shows that the opinions of the subjects about separatists are differ only in two cases. Both cases are associated with a group of motifs which were called «Exporting democratic values». A comparison of the medians shows that persons with close to separatist's identity evaluate their motives as more democratic than the Ukrainian government, and vice versa subjects didn't have a common identity with the separatists assess their motives as less democratic.

These differences were found by criteria of «culture» and «religion», the criterion of «nationality» showed no significant difference. For other motives the differences were not detected.

Table 6 shows almost the same results: the opinions of the subjects about Ukrainian government are differ only in two cases. As in the case with previous table, both cases are associated with a group of motives which were called «Exporting democratic values». A comparison of the medians shows that persons with close to separatists identity evaluate the motives of Ukrainian government as less democratic than the separatists, and vice versa.

These differences were found by criteria of «culture» and «religion», the criterion of «nationality» again didn't show significant difference. However, unlike Table 5, the difference is found in the group of motives «Territorial issues» — persons with close to separatist's identity evaluate the motives of Ukrainian government as more invasive than the separatist's motives, and accordingly vice versa.

For other motives the differences were not detected.

In order to test the hypothesis, we need to find the relation between the different levels of social identity and characteristics of the perception of conflict. To achieve this, we measured the correlation between the indicators of the questionnaire «The motives of the war» (especially the perception of conflict) and «Group identity questionnaire» (levels of social identity).

Table 6 shows almost the same results: the opinions of the subjects about Ukrainian government are differ only in two cases. As in the case with previous table, both cases are associated with a group of motives which were called «Exporting democratic values». A comparison of the medians shows that persons with close to separatists identity evaluate the motives of Ukrainian government as less democratic than the separatists, and vice versa.

These differences were found by criteria of «culture» and «religion», the criterion of «nationality» again didn't show significant difference. However, unlike Table 5, the difference is found in the group of motives «Territorial issues» — persons with close to separatist's identity evaluate the motives of Ukrainian government as more invasive than the separatist's motives, and accordingly vice versa.

For other motives the differences were not detected.

In order to test the hypothesis, we need to find the relation between the different levels of social identity and characteristics of the perception of conflict. To achieve this, we measured the correlation between the indicators of the questionnaire «The motives of the war» (especially the perception of conflict) and «Group identity questionnaire» (levels of social identity).

For statistical analysis, we used the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. The group with identity that close to separatists and the group «other» were analyzed separately. Unfortunately, Spearman correlation for the group «other» showed no significant associations. It may happen because this group has low homogeneity and, consequently, the large dispersion of values

For statistical analysis, we used the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. The group with identity that close to separatists and the group «other» were analyzed separately. Unfortunately, Spearman correlation for the group «other» showed no significant associations. It may happen because this group has low homogeneity and, consequently, the large dispersion of values.

The results of correlation analysis for the group with the identity that close to separatists are presented in the tables 7, 8.

Table 7

**The results analysis of correlations r-Spearman (Separatists' motives)**

Russian ethnicity, 13 cases				
	Personal popularity	Exporting democratic values	Increasing economic power	Territorial issues
Affective Dimension: Affective Ties	-0,39	0,50	-0,38	0,51
Evaluative Dimension: Attraction to the Ingroup	-0,12	0,42	-0,01	0,22
Cognitive Dimension: Self-Categorization	0,26	0,38	-0,24	0,45
Russian culture, 22 cases				
	Personal popularity	Exporting democratic values	Increasing economic power	Territorial issues
Affective Dimension: Affective Ties	-0,40	0,58	0,22	0,56
Evaluative Dimension: Attraction to the Ingroup	-0,41	0,43	0,45	0,42
Cognitive Dimension: Self-Categorization	0,14	0,40	0,09	0,57
Orthodoxy, 18 cases				
	Personal popularity	Exporting democratic values	Increasing economic power	Territorial issues
Affective Dimension: Affective Ties	-0,40	0,61	0,01	0,49
Evaluative Dimension: Attraction to the Ingroup	-0,33	0,08	-0,10	0,26
Cognitive Dimension: Self-Categorization	-0,37	0,13	0,35	0,04

The data presented in table 7 show that significant correlations are found on the basis of cultural and religious identity with the separatists. Nature of the relationship indicates that:

- stronger identification with the Russian culture leads to the higher grades in the level of democratic motivation and to the higher grades in the level of territorial and economic motives of separatists;
- stronger identification with Orthodoxy leads to the higher score in the democratic and territorial reasons of separatists;



- correlations prevail in affective and evaluative dimension (and for religion only affective)
- no any correlation between the Russian ethnicity identification and the evaluations of separatist's motives.

As the previous case, the data presented in Table 8 show that significant correlations are found in the same segments but with some specific features:

- stronger identification with the Russian culture leads to the higher grades in the level of territorial and economic motives of Ukrainian government; — stronger identification with the Russian culture leads to the decrease in the level of democratic motivation in evaluation of Ukrainian government;
- stronger identification with Orthodoxy leads to the lower scores in the democratic and to the higher scores territorial reasons of Ukrainian government;
- correlations located only in affective and evaluative dimension;
- no any correlation between the Russian ethnicity identification and the evaluations of separatist's motives.

Table 8

**The results analysis of correlations r-Spearman (Ukrainian government's motives)**

Russian ethnicity, 13 cases				
	Personal popularity	Exporting democratic values	Increasing economic power	Territorial issues
Affective Dimension: Affective Ties	0,34	-0,29	0,31	0,44
Evaluative Dimension: Attraction to the Ingroup	0,24	-0,33	0,41	0,24
Cognitive Dimension: Self-Categorization	0,43	0,19	0,48	0,43
Russian culture, 22 cases				
	Personal popularity	Exporting democratic values	Increasing economic power	Territorial issues
Affective Dimension: Affective Ties	0,34	-0,46	0,60	0,54
Evaluative Dimension: Attraction to the Ingroup	0,38	-0,53	0,40	0,38
Cognitive Dimension: Self-Categorization	0,17	0,34	-0,36	0,17
Orthodoxy, 18 cases				
	Personal popularity	Exporting democratic values	Increasing economic power	Territorial issues
Affective Dimension: Affective Ties	0,39	-0,48	0,03	0,41
Evaluative Dimension: Attraction to the Ingroup	0,42	-0,43	0,47	0,42
Cognitive Dimension: Self-Categorization	0,26	0,27	0,15	0,40

The common results indicate that the groups of motives have various power of differentiation in respect of social identity and context Ukrainian conflict. Group motives related to personal popularity, despite the presence of well-known leaders, show nothing. A little more useful are the groups of economic and territorial reasons, although obviously from the territorial (separatism) and economic (the EU against Eurasian Customs Union) conflict could expect greater differentiating strength. The most interesting group was a group of motives which was associated with democratic values. In comparison with the other groups, this group contains the largest number of significant results. Both statistical analysis showed significant results for this group. Moreover, changes in the results during the transition from assessment of separatists to the assessment of Ukrainian government, allows to effectively distinguish between these two categories. It can be assumed that this group of motives were used as a marker «bad — good», because it connected with moral values.

Another interesting finding is that national identity don't show statistically significant effect on the perception of conflict. This is quite strange, since ethnicity is traditionally considered as a strong determining

factor (as an example: ethnocentrism). Nevertheless, in our study, the acquired (culture and religion) identification show a much larger determinative power than innate (ethnicity) identification.

In conclusion, in the process of estimating the impact of various dimensions of social identity on the perception of the conflict, we can say that the results indicate that this relation exists. Indeed, during the correlation analysis we have received sufficient number of statistically significant relationships between these two variables and this allows us to consider that our first hypothesis is proved.

On the other hand, considering these relationships, it is easy to notice that they are unevenly distributed in the three dimensions of social identification. As noted above, the highest concentration of significant results observed in the affective dimension, a little bit less were in the evaluation dimension and only one in the cognitive dimension. This situation allows us to consider that our second hypothesis is proved.

### References

- 1 Billig M. *Social psychology and intergroup relations*, London: Academic Press, 1976, 391p.
- 2 Brewer M. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1999, vol. 55, p. 429–444.
- 3 Brewer M.B. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1997, vol. 53, p.197–211.
- 4 Tajfel H. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 1979, vol. 18, p.183–190.
- 5 Tajfel H. *Human groups and social categories*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 369.
- 6 Deaux K., Reid A., Mizrahi K., Ethier K.A. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1995, vol. 68, p. 280–291.
- 7 Brown R.J., Condor F., Mathews A., Wade G., Williams, J.A. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 1986, vol. 22, p.78–92.
- 8 Diehl P.F. & Goertz G. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1988, vol. 32(1), p.103–122.
- 9 Jackson J.W., Smith E.R. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1999, vol. 25, p. 120–135.
- 10 Phinney J.S. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1990, vol. 108, p.499–514.
- 11 Ellemers N., Kortekaas P., Ouwerkerk J.W. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1999, vol. 29, p. 371–389.
- 12 Midlarsky M.I. *Handbook of war studies*, Chicago: The University of Michigan Press, 2000, p. 527.
- 13 McClelland D.C. *Human motivation*, Glenview: Scott Foresman and Company, 1985, p. 354.
- 14 Hunter J., Platow M., Howard M., Stringer M. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1996, vol.26, p.631–647.

А.В.Панченко

### Украина шиеленісін қабылдау және тұлғаның әлеуметтік біртектіленуі

Мақалада Украина аймағындағы шиеленіске тікелей қатысы жоқ адамдардың әлеуметтік топтық біртектіленудің кешені зерттелді. Сонымен бірге біртектіленудің жоғары айтылған шиеленісті кешенді қабылдануы, топаралық наным-сенімдер, өзінің және бөтен топтардың әрекеттеріне әсері бағаланды. Топтық идентификацияның, ең болмағанда, бір негізгі параметрлері қактығысты қабылдауға ықпал етеді. Сонымен қатар топтық идентификацияның аффективті өлшемі қактығысты қабылдаудағы жаңсақ нанымдардың байқалуымен тығыз байланысты болады деген болжам айтылды, себебі бұл жоғары дәрежелі ықтималдылықпен топ пен адам арасындағы байланысты бейнелейді.

А.В.Панченко

### Социальная идентичность личности и восприятие украинского конфликта

Данное исследование посвящено комплексному изучению социально-групповой идентичности у лиц, не являющихся непосредственно вовлеченными в текущий конфликт на территории Украины, а также влиянию этой идентичности на оценку действий своей и чужих групп, на межгрупповые предубеждения, на комплексное восприятие упомянутого выше конфликта. Ожидалось, что, по крайней мере, один из основных параметров групповой идентичности будет влиять на восприятие конфликта, кроме того, была высказана гипотеза, что аффективное измерение групповой идентичности наиболее тесно связано с выражениями предубеждения в восприятии конфликта, так как это с наибольшей степенью вероятности отражает связь между группой и человеком.