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ABSTRACT

Purpose. In Kazakhstan, there exists a problem of societal division based on language. Despite a gradual shift towards the use of the Kazakh language in society, there are latent processes where a significant portion of the urban population in Kazakhstan is represented by Russian-speaking Kazakhs. The aim of this research is a comparative analysis of the concept of ethno-communication stereotypes, aimed at identifying the specificity of stereotypes within one ethnic group.

Methods. The research employed the method of free descriptions to determine intra-group auto- and hetero-stereotypes, content analysis, as well as the “barriers” diagnostic method by V.V. Boyko to identify obstacles in establishing emotional contacts. The survey involved 208 Kazakh students, with 104 participants each from Kazakh-speaking Kazakh students and Russian-speaking students of Kazakh ethnicity.

Results. The survey results showed a significant difference between the two groups in terms of unwillingness to emotionally connect with people. Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking subgroups demonstrated the different level of unwillingness to establish emotional connections ($T_{\text{empirical}} = 4.908$). Auto- and hetero-stereotypes of one ethnic group were also studied with a division based on language. There is a duality in stereotypes based on the idea of “personal qualities of a typical Kazakh who speaks only Kazakh, such as “composed” and “relaxed”, “responsible” and “irresponsible”, “restrained” and “impulsive”. Both groups endowed the Kazakh-speaking group with characteristics indicating warmth in relationships and ethical qualities aimed at strengthening interpersonal relations. The qualities of the Russian-speaking group were directed towards the development of personal qualities. This perspective is shared not only by members of their groups but also by members of the other group, to whom they attributed qualities.

Conclusions. These results have practical implications for research in the field of ethnolinguistics and linguaculturology, as the complex interaction of stereotypes, culture, language, and emotions within one ethnic group has been demonstrated.

Key words: associations, bilingualism, communication barriers, dominant language, emotional contacts, ethno-stereotypes, intra-ethnic groups.
Introduction

Studying stereotypes in a society divided by language within one state is an important area of research aimed at understanding and addressing social disparities, as well as promoting harmonious intergroup relations. On the one hand, newly independent states following the dissolution of the USSR actively promoted the language of titular nations for study and the consolidation of citizens, the development of unified social representations to unite them, and the formation of a single national identity (Turner & Gak-Vassallo, 2022). On the other hand, the mental well-being of individuals depends on the existing tense situations in language use, leading to cognitive dissonance among citizens of one ethnic group who use different languages in daily life, work, and communication (Turdałyievich, 2022). This study examines the case of Kazakhstan, where growing tensions in the relationships within one ethnic group are explored, while simultaneously harbouring the potential to enrich stereotypes and behaviour models of individuals and groups.

The annexation of Kazakh lands to Russia in the 18th century following the dissolution of the Kazakh Khanate, subsequent incorporation into the USSR for over 70 years, and the dominance of the Russian language over other languages of ethnic groups have divided society in Kazakhstan between Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs and Russian-speaking Kazakhs. This situation has led to the majority of Kazakhs being proficient in both Kazakh and Russian languages, with their perceptions and thinking being either bilingual, Kazakh-speaking, or Russian-speaking (Karabassova, 2020). Presently, the official state language in the Republic of Kazakhstan is Kazakh. However, Russian is also officially used alongside Kazakh in state organizations and local self-government bodies (Article 7 of the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan). Despite programs supporting both Kazakh and Russian languages, fostering bilingualism, there still exist social groups within one ethnic group, specifically within the Kazakh ethnic group, who exclusively speak either Russian or Kazakh (Terlikbayeva & Menlibekova, 2021). While there is a gradual shift towards the use of the Kazakh language in society, latent processes persist, where a significant portion of the urban population in Kazakhstan is predominantly Russian-speaking Kazakhs.
Language serves as the primary tool for information exchange in communication. A lack of proficiency in the language spoken by another group constitutes a significant communication barrier (Bonvillain, 2019; Bureau of National Statistics of Kazakhstan, 2023). Consequently, due to this barrier, social groups, even within a single ethnic group, become isolated from each other based on language identification. Additionally, tension arises in everyday relationships. Moreover, language is not merely a tool for transmitting information; it also functions as an ethnocultural foundation, a code of multigenerational perception, a framework of thought, and norms of behaviour. Over centuries, these aspects have shaped values and perceptual frameworks regarding self, one's ethnicity, and the world (Besolova et al., 2020).

Any communicative contact constitutes psychological tension (Nguyen et al., 2020). This stress may arise from the fear of misunderstanding, cultural differences, or perceived biases and prejudices. To alleviate it, it is necessary to delve into the mechanisms of how individuals perceive representatives of other social groups, including their ethnicity. This involves studying cognitive processes, biases, stereotypes, and prejudices that influence how people perceive and react to others (Hofhuis et al., 2020). Personal characteristics, self-awareness, and awareness of one's socio-ethnic identity are integral factors in shaping the content of social interactions. These elements influence how people communicate with others, seek reference groups of like-minded individuals, and define their place in a changing world while preserving their individuality and cultural values. Personal characteristics, such as personality traits, play a significant role in determining the nature of social interactions (Reagan, 2019). For instance, a person's extraversion or introversion can influence their social preferences and communication style. Equally important is an individual's perception of other socio-ethnic groups. Stereotypes and prejudices, or conversely, open and inclusive thinking, can dictate how a person interacts with members of different groups. Achieving a balance between preserving one's identity and embracing diversity is a dynamic process (Mowlana, 2019). Communicators navigate the tension between personal specificity and the universality of the human experience, adapting their social contacts accordingly.

In this context, the concept of preserving ethnic identity evolves, shaped by the language of communication, education,
and self-awareness. Examining how members of one ethnic group perceive each other when separated by a dominant language poses a complex task due to differences in how they interpret shared experiences and events (Balidemaj & Small, 2019). This underscores the importance of acknowledging the role of language in shaping perception and self-identification, necessitating detailed research to comprehend and navigate this intricate dynamic. As individuals identify with multiple ethnic or cultural groups, understanding how they navigate and balance these numerous identities holds significant importance for effective communication and harmonious interactions (Safarova Elshad, 2020). Consequently, exploring how people’s everyday behaviour reflects their perceptions of their ethnic origin becomes a pertinent issue, holding significance in both theoretical and practical realms. Multilingual societies often encounter unique challenges and opportunities. Bilingualism or multilingualism can serve as a bridge to understanding and recognizing various cultures but may also be a source of tension when language barriers exist. Educational institutions play a pivotal role in the development of intercultural competence and understanding (Branch, 2020). Educational programs that promote cultural diversity, tolerance, and intergroup communication can contribute to more harmonious interethnic interactions.

This study aims to determine the personal characteristics attributed to each other by members of a mono-ethnic group, simultaneously divided into two intra-ethnic groups: Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs and Russian-speaking Kazakhs – subsequently identified as stereotypes. The relevance of this issue lies in the fact that despite the language barrier, representatives of these two social groups engage in communication and interpersonal relationships during economic and cultural interactions. Thus, this study addresses a gap in the existing literature as ethnopsycholinguistics has not described a synchronic cross-section of the psycholinguistic characteristics of intra-ethnic groups in a mono-ethnic context.

Literature Review

Exploring Tensions in Interethnic Interactions: A Study of Issues

In a series of studies, issues related to the identification of mixed effects of ethnic affiliation and socio-economic status on respondents'
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judgments have been analyzed (Glock & Kleen, 2023). However, the
literature predominantly focuses on conflicts between ethnic groups,
inequalities among ethnic minorities, and immigrants (Basilici et al.,
2022; Bosker & De Ree, 2014; Rademakers & van Hoorn, 2021).
Simultaneously, the significance of the concept of “general trust in
people” in individuals has been highlighted – a characteristic trait
wherein the trusting party lacks direct information about the party being
trusted (Choi & Lee, 2021). A polyethnic society contributes to the
development of general trust between ethnicities, as ethnic diversity in the
environment provides opportunities for direct interaction among different
individuals and ethnic groups. The presence of factors such as “general
trust” within groups facilitates economic growth through collaborative
activities and fosters social cohesion. Additionally, a positive correlation
has been identified between a polyethnic environment and the overall
level of education. A polyethnic environment proves beneficial for the
comprehensive development of individuals.

A study conducted in Indonesia demonstrated that language
proficiency positively influences social well-being, particularly
emotional well-being (Sari et al., 2019). The importance of a “lingua
franca”, a language serving as a common means of communication for
speakers of different first languages, was underscored. In Kazakhstan,
although the Russian language serves as the language of interethnic
communication, the “lingua franca” can be any language spoken by the
majority of people, depending on territorial peculiarities. In Kazakhstan,
this is primarily either the Kazakh or Russian language. It was identified
that the knowledge of two languages has its distinctive application;
predominantly, in society, people speak the language that serves as the
“lingua franca”, the one spoken by the majority of residents. The use of
this language influences the level of emotional well-being.

Language is more than a tool for communication; it serves
as a means for exchanging knowledge, expressing emotions, and
maintaining cultural authenticity. The language of a nation acts as
a repository for its collective history and identity, through which the
stories of the past are transmitted to future generations, ensuring the
preservation of cultural heritage. Many scholars argue that language
defines ethnic belonging and serves as the most common ethnic
boundary (Heller, 2020; Rademakers & van Hoorn, 2021).

It has been researched that three interconnected processes
influence the formation of ethnic images: self-identification, interethnic
differentiation, and awareness of relations between ethnic groups (Norbekova, 2019). Self-identification involves a person's identification with a specific ethnic group and the recognition of their ethnic identity. Interethnic differentiation implies an awareness of the differences between one's own culture and the culture of other groups. The third process involves reflection and contemplation on one’s feelings, prejudices, and biases associated with these groups.

Within this framework, two key concepts related to ethnic images are auto-stereotypes and hetero-stereotypes. Auto-stereotypes are the internal representations and beliefs that individuals hold about their ethnic group (Mendoza-Baquing, 2023). Hetero-stereotypes refer to a set of ideas and representations that a particular ethnic or cultural group holds about other ethnic groups (Husnutdinov et al., 2020).

The formation and maintenance of both auto-stereotypes and hetero-stereotypes can have serious consequences for intergroup relations, social cohesion, and cultural understanding. These stereotypes can shape how people and groups interact with each other and can lead to both positive, respectful relationships and negative, prejudiced relationships. Stereotypes have been considered as categories used for the classification and understanding of social groups, and their structure and functioning resemble the characteristics of categories in general (Asylbekov & Asylbekova, 2016; Brubaker, 2012). Like the development of other categories, stereotypes are shaped by blending various elements such as prototypical traits, specific instances, anticipated behaviour, and a pseudo-scientific comprehension of causation.

Isolated groups, which can be any social groups of the same ethnic culture based on territorial or other socio-distinguishing features, form stereotypes about each other. Ethnic stereotypes are biased beliefs or generalizations about the characteristics, behaviour, or attributes of people belonging to specific ethnic or cultural groups (Madon & Sekhon, 2023). They may cover various aspects such as appearance, language, cultural traditions, and perceived traits. These stereotypes can lead to prejudice and discrimination when people are unfairly judged or treated based on these generalizations (Gurieva & Sinelnikova, 2020). Ethnostereotypes can be positive, negative, or ambivalent. Autostereotypes are self-perceptions of one's ethnic group; heterostereotypes are stereotypical perceptions of other ethnic groups (Capraru et al., 2021). Research has shown that these stereotypes are
not fixed and uniform but are expressed individually for each member of an ethnic group, and their manifestation may vary depending on the specific situation and circumstances (Barfoot, 2022; Grigoryev et al., 2019). In other words, ethnic stereotypes are not static, universal beliefs; rather, they are dynamic and context-dependent representations.

**The research aims** to conduct a comparative analysis of the concept of “ethnostereotypes in verbal communication”, with a focus on identifying the specifics of stereotypes within a single ethnic group.

**Research objectives:**

1. Identify the level of emotional efficiency in communication among students and the type of emotional interference.
2. Collect stereotypical perceptions (autostereotypes and heterostereotypes) of Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking Kazakhs among students.
3. Describe positive, neutral, and negative stereotypical perceptions in both groups.
4. Describe the obtained results based on the theory of the “stereotype content model” (Fiske et al., 2002)

**Research hypothesis:** The language of interaction can influence the content of stereotypes within a single ethnic group.

**Methods**

**Research Design**

In this research, the method of free description was employed for the collection of ethnic stereotypes, serving as a means of gathering information. This method involves a specific procedure where participants are invited to articulate character traits they associate with individuals of their ethnic affiliation. Unrestricted by any predetermined criteria set by the experimenter, participants are encouraged to express their thoughts independently without limitations on the quantity or form of responses. Subsequently, the collected data underwent content analysis – a rigorous analytical process aimed at extracting meaning and patterns from the information provided by participants. The analysis aimed to identify the most frequently mentioned qualities and characteristics, which were then classified as stereotypical attributes associated with that particular ethnic group.
Beyond uncovering prevalent stereotypes, the study delved into the intensity and directionality of these stereotypes. The research examined the intensity of expression of these stereotypes and the sequence in which these qualities were ascribed by different participants. This provided a deeper understanding of the nuances of the stereotypical landscape, shedding light on how individuals from one ethnic group perceive themselves and their counterparts from other groups, especially considering factors such as language proficiency.

Additionally, the Diagnostic Technique for Identifying Emotional Contact Interference (Barriers) by Boyko (1996, 2017) was employed. This technique was developed to assess the level of emotional efficiency in communication. Through it, the type of emotional barriers was identified, encompassing difficulties in managing emotions, inadequate expression of emotions, emotional underdevelopment, dominance of negative emotions, and a reluctance to emotionally connect with others.

Participants
The sample for this study comprised a total of 208 students aged 18 to 24. Within this group, there was an almost even distribution in terms of gender: 86 male participants and 122 female participants. Such a gender-balanced composition facilitated a comprehensive examination of the research questions, considering potential differences in responses between males and females. Furthermore, the study participants belonged to a single ethnic group, namely “Kazakhs”, but differed in their primary languages – “Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs” and “Russian-speaking Kazakhs”. The distribution of participants by primary language revealed an equal ratio: Russian-speaking Kazakhs – 104 individuals, Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs – 104 (responses in the Kazakh-speaking group exceeded this number and were excluded). This balanced and representative sample aimed to capture nuances in understanding the subject of the study. The inclusion of both language groups within the Kazakh population acknowledged linguistic diversity coexisting within a single nation, reflecting the complexities of identity, culture, and language in a multiethnic and multicultural society.

Survey
The online survey was designed in both Kazakh and Russian languages. Respondents were asked to provide sociometric information such as gender, age, nationality, and language of communication.
In the first section, questions were derived from the “Diagnosis of Emotional Barriers in Interpersonal Communication” by Boyko (2017). This methodology was selected because ethnic stereotypes involve not only cognitive beliefs but also influence emotions and behaviour. The use of a methodology that assesses emotional aspects can offer a more comprehensive understanding of how stereotypes manifest in interpersonal interactions and impact social dynamics. The test, whose name was not specified, consisted of 25 questions, presented in Appendix 1.

In the second part of the survey, the research objectives were outlined:

1. To study ethnic stereotypes, we ask you to write down at least 10 qualities that, in your opinion, most fully and accurately characterize a Kazakh primarily speaking Kazakh (what are they?)

2. To study ethnic stereotypes, we ask you to write down at least 10 qualities that, in your opinion, most fully and accurately characterize a Kazakh primarily speaking Russian (what are they?).

3. To study ethnic stereotypes, we ask you to write down at least 10 qualities that, in your opinion, most fully and accurately characterize a Kazakh who speaks both Kazakh and Russian (what are they?).

**Statistical Processing**

The collected data, along with survey responses, were compiled into tables, graphically represented for each group, and subjected to analysis. In this study, Cronbach's alpha (Barbera et al., 2020) was employed to assess the reliability of the obtained data, with SPSS 25 utilized as the computational tool. The questionnaire's validity revealed an acceptable Cronbach's alpha value ($\alpha = 0.88$). Additionally, the Student's t-test was applied to compare the results between the two groups (Mishra et al., 2019).

The initial analysis is conducted based on the quantity of stereotypical statements assigned by both language groups to themselves (ingroup) and to the other group (outgroup). The number of stereotypical statements (characteristics) ranged from 1 to 10. These stereotypical statements (free responses from participants) were encoded based on their semantic features into 26 categories applicable to both groups: internal (Kazakh speakers about Kazakh speakers or vice versa, Russian-speaking Kazakhs about Russian-speaking Kazakhs)
and external (Kazakh speakers about Russian-speaking Kazakhs and vice versa, Russian-speaking Kazakhs about Kazakh speakers). The stereotype descriptions obtained from the survey were scored, with one point per characteristic, and distributed across the 26 characteristics based on the similarity of content. These scores were processed in SPSS. The responses of the Kazakh-speaking group in Kazakh were translated into Russian, categorized initially by stereotype groups (according to linguistic coding), and reduced to synonyms (e.g., friendly, responsible...), resulting in a final count of 26 categories. An SPSS data file was created, and for each participant, 26 variables in stereotype expressions for their ingroup and outgroup were established. The minimum variable value was one characteristic (1 point) (stereotypical statement) for one group (ingroup or outgroup), and the maximum was 10 characteristics for one variable. Participants unable to provide at least one characteristic were excluded from further analysis. The first research question addressed the extent of stereotype content among Kazakh- and Russian-speaking groups attributed to their ingroup and outgroup: would they differ? Responses to this question were aggregated for each participant separately for each target group.

A statistical MANOVA analysis was employed to examine hypotheses regarding the differential content of stereotypes attributed by both linguistic groups in terms of their ingroup and outgroup perceptions. For attributes related to the ingroup and outgroup, three factorial scales were calculated, resulting in six variables. Alongside the two linguistic groups, Kazakh and Russian speakers, a MANOVA study was conducted according to the following scheme: 2 (Kazakh-Russian speakers) * 2 (objectives of “ingroup” and “outgroup”) * 3 (stereotype scales). The last two factors involved repeated measures.

Research Limitations

While the study encompassed a sufficiently diverse sample, it is limited to a specific group of students aged 18 to 24. This age group and educational level may not be representative of a broader population. The findings may not apply to older or younger individuals who are not enrolled in educational institutions. Additionally, the use of V.V. Boyko’s “Barriers” Diagnostic Method introduces a specific psychological framework that may not be universally accepted or applicable to all contexts.
Results

In the Kazakh audience (first-year students of the Kazakh department across various disciplines), there were 108 respondents, with 4 respondents not providing answers to the questions in the second part of the questionnaire. Thus, the total number of participants in this group was 104 students. In the Russian-speaking audience (first-year students of the Kazakh department across various disciplines), 124 respondents participated, including 12 who were not of Kazakh nationality; their responses were not included. Additionally, 8 respondents did not answer the second part of the questionnaire (stating “I don’t know”, “I can’t say”, “How should I know”, or “I don’t divide in such a way”). This resulted in the group also having 104 students. It is noteworthy that not all respondents wrote down 10 characteristics. In general, the described traits were mostly fewer, but in the Kazakh department, there were more respondents who both numerically indicated and wrote down 10 characteristics. Responses describing characteristics for bilingual individuals, who speak two languages in both groups (Kazakh and Russian), included fewer characteristics than those describing characteristics for a Kazakh speaker who exclusively speaks Kazakh or a Kazakh speaker who exclusively speaks Russian.

The conducted statistical analysis provides grounds to assert that the following assumptions have been confirmed: language of interaction can influence the presence of stereotypes within a single ethnic group. In order to assess the level of emotional effectiveness in communication and identify the type of emotional disturbances, testing was conducted. The obtained results are reflected in Table 1.

In Table 1, a reluctance to establish emotional connections with people is evident in both examined groups. However, in the Russian-speaking sample, some indicators are higher than in the Kazakh-speaking sample. The first attribute assesses the ability to manage and regulate emotions. Both the Kazakh-speaking (1.754) and Russian-speaking (2.008) groups demonstrate some difficulties in controlling and regulating their emotions, with the Russian-speaking group having a slightly higher average score, but differences not significant (T_empirical = 1.641). The Kazakh-speaking group may have a higher tendency for inadequate emotional expression, but this difference is not statistically significant (T_empirical = 1.834). Both groups
Table 1
Results of the Boyko Test for Identifying Barriers in Establishing Emotional Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean Indicator Value Kazakh-speaking Group N=104</th>
<th>Mean Indicator Value Russian-speaking Group N=104</th>
<th>Comparison of Results between the Two Groups Using Student’s t-test (confidence interval) p0.05=1.9; p0.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in managing emotions, regulating and modulating them</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>T_empirical = 1.641 (not significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate expression of emotions</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>T_empirical = 1.834 (not significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility, underdevelopment, and lack of expressiveness of emotions</td>
<td>2.127</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>T_empirical = 0.612 (not significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance of negative emotions</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td>T_empirical = 0.428 (not significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness to connect with others on an emotional basis</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>T_empirical = 4.908 (significant at the level of p&gt;=0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s development

demonstrate some level of inflexibility and underdevelopment in emotional expression, with no significant difference between them (T_empirical = 0.612). Additionally, the results show that both groups exhibit low dominance of negative emotions, with the indicator slightly higher in the Russian-speaking group (T_empirical = 0.428). However, a significant difference (T_empirical = 4.908) exists between the two groups in terms of reluctance to establish emotional connections: the Russian-speaking group demonstrates a significantly higher level of unwillingness to form emotional bonds. These results confirm the presence of ethnostereotypes within the investigated ethnicity, both in the Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking subgroups. One important finding is that the Russian-speaking subgroup shows a noticeable reluctance to establish emotional connections compared to the Kazakh-speaking subgroup.

To assess the representation of stereotypes, the method of free associations of descriptions was used. The results are reflected in Table 2.
Table 2
Stereotypical Representations (Autostereotypes and Heterostereotypes) of Kazakh-Speaking and Russian-Speaking Kazakhs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Stereotypical Representations</th>
<th>Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs</th>
<th>Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs</th>
<th>Russian-speaking Kazakhs</th>
<th>Russian-speaking Kazakhs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Friendliness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communicativeness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Politeness (respect, cultural awareness, courtesy)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hospitality</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Generosity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Calm, composed, collected</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cheerfulness (liveliness, humor)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intellectuality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Optimistic, persistent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Adaptability, flexibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Industrious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Responsible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Respects personal boundaries, defends rights, self-assured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Punctual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Development-oriented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Expresses thoughts freely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Stereotypes</td>
<td>Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs</td>
<td>Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs</td>
<td>Russian-speaking Kazakhs</td>
<td>Russian-speaking Kazakhs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Patriotism</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Traditional values as a priority</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Emotional (noisy)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Freedom, non-traditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conducted content analysis of topics allowed the researchers to draw the following conclusions (personal qualities were grouped by researchers into positive, neutral, and negative categories).

The analysis of the semantic content of the categories “personal qualities of a typical Kazakh who speaks only Russian”, “personal qualities of a typical Kazakh who speaks only Kazakh”, and “personal qualities of a typical Kazakh who speaks both languages” shows that, in describing the “personal qualities of a typical Kazakh who speaks only Russian, “positive, neutral, and negative qualities are represented.

Positive stereotypes that gained the highest scores from the Kazakh-speaking group according to the Russian-speaking sample include qualities such as communicativeness, friendliness, politeness (respect, cultural awareness, courtesy), cheerfulness (liveliness, humour), intellectuality, hospitality, generosity, composure. At the same time, Kazakh-speaking individuals attribute to themselves characteristics such as friendliness, communicativeness, politeness (respect, cultural awareness, courtesy), hospitality, generosity, composure, cheerfulness (liveliness, humour), intellectuality, optimism, and persistence (characteristics are listed in descending order, with the highest number of points for personal qualities listed first, and so on). In general, the characteristics mostly coincide, and Kazakh-speaking individuals also note characteristics such as optimism and persistence in themselves.

Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs highlighted positive personal qualities in Russian-speaking Kazakhs, such as the ability to express thoughts freely, intellectualism, friendliness, politeness (respect, cultural awareness,
courtesy), a desire for personal development, communicativeness, adaptability (flexibility), respect for personal boundaries, the ability to defend their rights, confidence, cheerfulness (liveliness, humour), industriousness, and honesty. Russian-speaking Kazakhs attributed themselves to the following characteristics: intellectualism, friendliness, communicativeness, politeness (respect, cultural awareness, courtesy), composure, cheerfulness (liveliness, humour), generosity, honesty, and industriousness. Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs perceive the positive traits of Russian-speaking Kazakhs differently and emphasize characteristics such as the ability to express thoughts freely, a desire for personal development, the ability to respect personal boundaries, defend their rights, and confidence, which Russian-speaking Kazakhs did not highlight in themselves. This may reflect the most appealing personal characteristics for Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs that they would like to develop. Russian-speaking Kazakhs characterize Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs as more industrious than Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs characterize themselves. Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs noted the quality of “industriousness” in Russian-speaking Kazakhs in the same percentage ratio as Russian-speaking Kazakhs described themselves.

Russian-speaking Kazakhs attributed characteristics to the personal qualities of a typical Kazakh who speaks only Kazakh, as seen from their perspective. These characteristics were identified as neutral: patriotism, prioritization of traditional values, emotional expressiveness (noisy), and religiosity. Russian-speaking Kazakhs also assigned these same characteristics to themselves, albeit in a different sequence: emotional expressiveness (noisy), non-traditional (liberal), prioritization of traditional values, and patriotism (personal qualities such as prioritization of traditional values and patriotism at a low percentage ratio). Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs believe that Russian-speaking Kazakhs mostly do not adhere to traditions and, in this regard, consider them to be liberal (having many choices). They attribute qualities such as patriotism, prioritization of traditional values, and emotional expressiveness (noisy) to themselves. However, Russian-speaking Kazakhs did not highlight these qualities. Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs see themselves as patriotic and prioritizing traditional values.

Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs identified only one negative quality in themselves: unpunctuality. Russian-speaking Kazakhs did not specify any negative qualities in themselves. Russian-speaking Kazakhs highlighted
aggressive tendencies (irritability, rudeness, impulsiveness) and arrogance as negative characteristics in Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs. Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs attributed the same qualities to Russian-speaking Kazakhs, but the percentages for aggressiveness (irritability, rudeness, impulsiveness) and arrogance were lower, and the quality of egocentrism was added. Thus, Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs see Russian-speaking Kazakhs as more egocentric, while Russian-speaking Kazakhs perceive Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs as more aggressive. Overall, it can be concluded that positive stereotypes prevail over negative ones in all studied groups.

The analysis revealed a significant correlation: $F(1.138) = 42.53$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.236$. The Russian-speaking group attributed more attributes to the external group speaking Kazakh [$F(1.138) = 5.64$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.039$]. Simultaneously, the Kazakh-speaking group ascribed more characteristics to their group than to the Russian-speaking external group [$F(1.138) = 11.27$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.075$]. In other words, those who speak Kazakh generally described themselves with more attributes than their Russian-speaking peers. The quantitative results of the stereotype attribute analysis are presented in Figure 1.

**Figure 1**
The Number of Stereotypical Statements (Attributes) Ascribed to Russian-speaking and Kazakh-speaking Individuals by Their Internal (Own) and External (Other) Groups

![Figure 1](image_url)

*Source: Author’s development*
At the next stage, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test yielded a value of 0.55, indicating the adequacy of the sample. Bartlett’s test demonstrated a correlation matrix sufficient for conducting the procedure \( [\chi^2(325) = 392.53, p < 0.005] \). The results are presented in Figure 2.

**Figure 2**

*Principal Component Analysis (PCA) Criterion of 26 Stereotypical Attributes within Intragroup Data*

![Scree test graph](image)

**Source:** Author’s development

Based on the screen test and theoretical justification, three components were identified; they explained only 23.57% of the total variance but corresponded to the categories of Fiske et al. (2002), the content model of stereotypes discussed in the introduction. Table 1 presents the structural matrix of this three-factor solution, defined by elements that feature most prominently. Factor 1 was identified as interpersonal orientation due to items such as hospitable, friendly, generous, and polite. Factor 2 was labelled self-orientation based on defining characteristics: egocentrism, self-esteem, industriousness, or intellectual interests (examples of items in Russian). Factor 3: traditional social orientation based on traits such as religiosity, patriotism, or traditional values. Due to bipolar, opposing responses to question categories and their asymmetric distribution, the internal reliability of these factor scales is relatively low (Cronbach’s \( \alpha = 0.53 \) for
interpersonal relations, $\alpha = 0.49$ for social orientation, but close to zero for self-orientation).

Table 3 displays the structural matrix of the 3-factor solution for stereotype characteristics.

**Table 3**

*Structural Matrix of the 3-factor Solution for Stereotype Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units of measurement</th>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Societal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosity</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness (liveliness, humor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principledness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional expression (loud)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness (irritability, rudeness, impulsiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogance</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentrism</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectuality</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of expression of thoughts</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industriousness</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for personal boundaries, protection of rights, confidence</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional values in priority</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm, restrained</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability, flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Author’s development
The interaction of these three factors proved to be highly significant: $F(2276) = 83.75$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.378$, confirming that the previous second-order interaction between the first language and attributes within/outside the group (Figure 1) implied different profiles for each stereotype dimension.

Figure 3 presents the results of the analysis of the interpersonal orientation of Russian-speaking and Kazakh-speaking groups as both internal (own) and external (other).

**Figure 3**

*Interpersonal Orientation Attributed to Russian-speaking and Kazakh-speaking Groups, Both Internal (own) and External (other) Groups*

![Graph showing interpersonal orientation](image)

*Source: Author’s development*

Here, in interpersonal orientation, Russian speakers attribute more warmth and friendliness to their Kazakh-speaking peers from the other group than to themselves [$F(1.138) = 8.63$, $p = 0.004$, $\eta^2 = 0.059$], while Kazakh speakers tend to consider themselves much warmer in interpersonal communication than they attribute this characteristic to their Russian-speaking counterparts [$F(1.138) = 72.41$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.344$].

A different pattern of results was observed for the “self-orientation” scale (Figure 4). These results show similarities to the theory of the Stereotype Content Model by S. Fiske and others (2002).
In this context, Russian speakers attributed themselves significantly more characteristics related to self-orientation than the Kazakh-speaking group \(F(1.138) = 11.07, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.074\), a perception supported by Kazakh language speakers who found the Russian-speaking external group more self-oriented than themselves \(F(1.138) = 43.84, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.241\).

Finally, the social orientation of the two linguistic groups as actors and observers was analyzed (Figure 5). Here, the results parallel those in interpersonal orientation: Russian speakers attribute traditional social orientation (patriotism, religiosity) much more to the Kazakh-speaking group than to themselves \(F(1.138) = 105.06, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.432\). This aligns with the Kazakh-speaking group, which also attributes significantly more of these characteristics to themselves than to their Russian-speaking counterparts in terms of stereotype perceptions \(F(1.138) = 39.96, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.225\).

Overall, these results do not indicate a bias toward one’s group in mutual intergroup relations: across each of the three dimensions, the perception of one’s own (internal) group and the other (external)
group is similar. Both linguistic groups, both Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking groups, believe that speakers of the Kazakh language excel in “interpersonal and social orientations”; similarly, Russian speakers dominate in the characteristics of “self-orientation”. These results provide supporting evidence for the validity of stereotypes and the qualities that are indeed possessed by two different linguistic groups within the same ethnic group.

**Discussion**

National identity shapes interactions between different ethnic groups, and stereotypes contribute to personal identification within and outside ethnic groups. In a recent study, a psycholinguistic analysis was conducted to explore how Kazakhs are conceptualized by both Russians and Indians (Kuzembayeva, 2021). The results largely reflected positive perceptions of Kazakhs by members of both ethnic groups. Both Russians and Indians acknowledged the Turkic heritage of the Kazakh people, associating it with Kazakhstan, and considered
Kazakhs respectful towards elders and patriotic. This contributed to the improvement of intercultural communication (Sharipova, 2020). The current study has shown subtle differences in emotional characteristics between Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking subgroups within one ethnic group. Importantly, these differences, while existing, are not statistically significant for most categories. This finding emphasizes the idea that, despite language differences, emotional characteristics within the group remain relatively constant (Alff et al., 2023).

It has been established that Kazakh auto-stereotypes encompass the following perceptions: “polite, honest, responsive, hospitable; more independent than dependent; serious, generous; more peaceful than aggressive; friendly; more industrious than non-industrious; calm; more neat than untidy; pleasant; more confident than unconfident; intelligent” (Shanayev et al., 2019). These findings correlate with the current results, as they demonstrate a certain duality of stereotypes based on a single representation of the “personal qualities of a typical Kazakh, proficient only in the Kazakh language”, such as “collected” and “relaxed”, “responsible” and “irresponsible”, “reserved” and “impulsive”. Overall, according to respondents, the auto-stereotypical portrait of a Kazakh includes qualities such as communicativeness, friendliness, politeness (respect, cultural awareness, courtesy), liveliness (cheerfulness, humour), intellectuality, hospitality, generosity, and restraint, portraying a positive image. Such differences may lead to tension in interpersonal communication (Kultanova & Kussainova, 2019).

A study conducted in Russia has demonstrated that not only the complexity of intergroup relations but also acculturation processes significantly depend on mutual interactions and expectations between members of dominant and nondominant groups (Grigoryev et al., 2019). The content of stereotypes about non-dominant group members generates expectations regarding whether these others should maintain their original culture, yet it inevitably triggers a desire for cultural assimilation. However, the current study did not distinguish between dominant and nondominant groups of the same ethnicity, as it primarily pertains to immigrants. One of the results of this research is the pronounced reluctance of the Russophone subgroup to establish emotional connections with people on an emotional basis compared to the Kazakhophone subgroup. This finding raises questions about the underlying factors contributing to this reluctance.
In another study, the continuity and changes in various stereotypes about ethnic Chinese in contemporary Indonesian society are discussed (Kuntjara & Hoon, 2020). The results indicated that deeply rooted stereotypes depicting Chinese as exclusive, disloyal, and apolitical persist, but a detailed analysis reveals that the formulations of these stereotypes are less simplistic and often accompanied by counterexamples from social reality. It was observed that young educated Indonesians increasingly realize that stereotypes have the potential to lead to racial discrimination. These findings take into account history and politics to a significantly greater extent than the current study, which may provide more detailed insights.

The study by Deutschmann and Steinvall (2020) underscores the crucial role that cultural and linguistic factors play in shaping ethnostereotypes. In this context, the language spoken by individuals of a particular ethnic group appears to significantly influence their emotional behaviour and relationships. Understanding the interplay between culture, language, and stereotypes is crucial for comprehending the dynamics within a group (Tameryan et al., 2019). The focus of the research on emotional characteristics and nuances of communication sheds light on the nature of stereotypes (Tankosić, 2022). Stereotypes encompass various aspects of behaviour, including the expression of emotions, and can have a substantial impact on interpersonal relationships and communication.

**Conclusion**

Thus, the results obtained from the empirical and theoretical investigation provide grounds to assert that the language of interaction can influence the presence of stereotypes within one ethnicity. Survey results indicated a common reluctance to connect with people on an emotional basis within both studied groups. However, in the Russian-speaking sample, this inclination is significantly higher than in the Kazakh-speaking sample. Both Kazakh-speaking (1.754) and Russian-speaking (2.008) groups exhibit some difficulties in controlling and regulating their emotions, with the Russian-speaking group having a slightly higher average score. The Kazakh-speaking group may have a higher tendency toward inadequate emotional expression,
but this difference is not statistically significant (1.834). Both groups demonstrate a certain level of inflexibility and underdevelopment in emotional expression, with no substantial difference between them (0.612). Additionally, the results showed that both groups exhibit a low dominance of negative emotions, with the Russian-speaking group having a slightly higher indicator ($T_{\text{empirical}} = 0.428$). However, a significant difference ($T_{\text{empirical}} = 4.908$) exists between the two groups in terms of reluctance to connect with people on an emotional level: the Russian-speaking group demonstrates a significantly higher level of unwillingness to establish emotional connections. These findings confirm the existence of ethnostereotypes within the studied ethnicity, both in the Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking subgroups.

According to respondents, the auto-stereotypical portrait of a Kazakh includes qualities such as communicativeness, friendliness, politeness (respect, cultural awareness, and courtesy), cheerfulness (joy, humour), intelligence, hospitality, generosity, and restraint, portraying a positive image. Both groups attributed characteristics indicating warmth in relationships and ethical qualities (sociable, friendly, generous, hospitable) to the Kazakh-speaking group. A similar pattern is observed in the assessment of the two groups in the “competence” category, referred to as “self-orientation” in the study. The Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking groups consider the Russian-speaking group to possess more of these characteristics in this analogy. The Kazakh-speaking group attributed these characteristics more to the Russian-speaking group than the Russian-speaking groups attributed to themselves. This may indicate that these characteristics are more desirable for the Kazakh-speaking group or sharply contrast, distinguishing the Kazakh-speaking group from the Russian-speaking one in the view of the Kazakh-speaking group.

These statistics confirm the scientific novelty of the findings, making a new contribution to the existing literature on ethnostereotypes and intra-ethnic dynamics. The obtained results bear practical significance for understanding the self-perception (internal) and perception of the other (external group) among Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking Kazaks. They indicate the diversity of viewpoints even within the framework of shared cultural and ethnic identity, prompting further investigation into the underlying factors and consequences of these ethnostereotypes. The research results provide a foundation for further investigations into the role of language in shaping social cognition and
behavior within diverse cultural settings. Furthermore, a more detailed examination of ethnostereotypes in the linguistic behaviour of bilingual or trilingual Kazakhs is warranted, especially as the English language actively advances in education and professional activities. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, the findings have the potential to advance the understanding of psycholinguistic processes and facilitate the development of strategies aimed at promoting cross-cultural understanding and cooperation.
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Appendix 1

“Diagnosis of Emotional Barriers in Interpersonal Communication”
by V.V. Boyko

1. At the end of the working day, fatigue is usually noticeable on my face.
2. Sometimes, during initial acquaintances, emotions hinder me from making a more favourable impression on partners (I get lost, get nervous, become reserved, or, on the contrary, talk too much, get overexcited, and behave unnaturally).
3. In communication, I often lack emotionality and expressiveness.
4. I might seem too strict to those around me.
5. In principle, I am against pretending politeness when you don’t feel like it.
6. I usually know how to conceal emotional outbursts from partners.
7. Often, while communicating with colleagues, I continue to think about something personal.
8. Sometimes, I want to express emotional support (attention, sympathy, empathy) to a partner, but they do not feel or perceive it.
9. Most of the time, concern is visible in my eyes or facial expressions.
10. In business communication, I try to hide my sympathies towards partners.
11. All my unpleasant experiences are usually written on my face.
12. If I am engaged in a conversation, my facial expressions become excessively expressive and animated.
13. Perhaps I am somewhat emotionally constrained or reserved.
15. I usually feel discomfort when exchanging handshakes in a business setting.
16. Sometimes, close people correct me: relax your facial muscles, don’t twist your lips, don’t frown, etc.
17. While talking, I tend to gesture excessively.
18. Typically, in a new situation, it is difficult for me to be relaxed and natural.
19. Perhaps my face often expresses sadness or concern, although I feel calm inside.
20. It is challenging for me to make eye contact when communicating with someone unfamiliar.
21. If I want to, I can always manage to hide my dislike for a disliked person.
22. I often inexplicably feel cheerful without any reason.
23. It is effortless for me to intentionally or upon request make various facial expressions: depict sadness, joy, fear, despair, etc.
24. I have been told that my gaze is challenging to endure.
25. Something prevents me from expressing warmth and sympathy to a person, even if I have these feelings towards them.

АНОТАЦІЯ
Мета. У Казахстані існує проблема поділу суспільства за мовною ознакою. Незважаючи на поступовий перехід до використання казахської мови в суспільстві, існують залишені норми і процеси, коли значна частина міського населення Казахстану представлена російськомовними казахами. Метою даного дослідження є порівняльний аналіз поняття етнокомунікативних стереотипів, спрямований на виявлення специфіки стереотипів в межах однієї етнічної групи.
Методи. У дослідженні використано метод вільних описів для визначення внутрішньогрупових авто- та гетеростереотипів, контент-аналіз, а також методику діагностики "бар'єрів" В.В. Бойка для виявлення перешкод у встановлених емоційних контактів. В опитуванні взяли участь 208 казахських студентів, з них по 104 учасники з числа казахськомовних казахських студентів і російськомовних студентів казахської національності.
Результати. Результати опитування показали значну різницю між двома групами щодо небажання емоційно контактувати з людьми: російськомовна і казахськомовна групи продемонстрували різний рівень небажання встановлювати емоційні зв'язки (T_емпіричний = 4,908). Ці результати підтверджують наявність етностереотипів у межах досліджуваного етносу, як у казахськомовній, так і в російськомовній підгрупах. Авто- та гетеростереотипи однієї етнічної групи також вивчалися з поділом за мовною ознакою. Спостерігається поділ на два етностереотипів, заснованих на уявленні про "особисті якості типового казаха, який розмовляє тільки казахською мовою", такі як "зібраний" і "роботодавний", "відповідальний" і "безвідповідальний", "стриманий" і "імпульсивний". Обидві групи наділили казахськомовну групу характеристиками, що вказують на теплоту у відносинах та етичні якості, спрямовані на зміцнення міжособистісних стосунків. Якості російськомовної групи були спрямовані на розвиток особистісних якостей. Цю точку зору
поділяють не лише члени їхніх груп, але й члени іншої групи, яким вони приписували якості. У цих аналогіях характеристики цих груп мають вищі бали, що свідчить про контраст і відмінність між казахськомовною та російськомовною групами.

**Висновки.** Отримані результати мають практичне значення для досліджень у галузі этнолінгвістики та лінгвокультурології, оскільки продемонстровано складну взаємодію стереотипів, культури, мови та емоцій у межах однієї етнічної групи.

**Ключові слова:** асоціації, білінгвізм, комунікативні бар’єри, домінуюча мова, емоційні контакти, етностереотипи, внутрішньоетнічні групи.