

Tatiana L. Smolina

Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Docent

St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia

E-mail: talesm@mail.ru

Alla A. Melnikova

Doctor of Culturology, Professor

St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia

E-mail: 88alla88@mail.ru

Anna A. Dmitrieva

Doctor of Art Criticism, Docent

St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences, St. Petersburg, Russia

E-mail: annadmi@mail.ru

ART AS A FACTOR IN REVEALING CULTURAL STEREOTYPES OF RUSSIANS AND POLES: MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Abstract. *The article presents the results of an empirical study of the content of cultural stereotypes of Poles and Russians in relation to each other. Students from St. Petersburg and Warsaw universities were the object of the study. The study was carried out before the start of a special military operation. Since the task was to obtain both conscious and unconscious stereotypical representations, it also determined the choice of methods. On the one hand, a semantic differential was taken for the study of manifested, conscious stereotypes, offering to evaluate a heterostereotypic image on a bipolar graded scale (such qualities were suggested as: brave / cowardly; active / passive; hardworking / lazy; educated / uneducated; tolerant / intolerant; sociable / unsociable, etc.). On the other hand, a projective drawing was used for the study of unconscious attitudes, following the instructions to draw a typical representative of the studied nationality. Russians' perception of a typical Pole and the Poles' perception of a typical Russian is generally neutral, according to the results of the semantic differential. At the same time, in the projective drawing, the evaluation of each other differs: if there is no negative symbolism in the drawings of Russians when depicting Poles, then the Poles draw a rather negative portrait of a typical Russian. Thus, it is the use of the resourcefulness of art that makes it possible to reveal deep stereotypes, especially in the case when there is a mismatch between conscious and unconscious attitudes.*

Keywords: *national stereotypes, ethnic stereotypes, heterostereotypes, the stereotypical image of the Pole, the stereotypical image of the Russian*

For citing: *Smolina T. L., Melnikova A. A., Dmitrieva A. A. 2023. Art as a Factor in Revealing Cultural Stereotypes of Russians and Poles: Main Provisions of the Research. Culture and Arts Herald. No 1 (73): 85–91. (In Engl.).*

Introduction

The roots of stereotypes lie in the history of human beings. People have a common trend to acquire and hold characteristics of each other and regarding themselves. Traces of national characteristics can be found in Ancient Greek poems, in traveler's reports and especially in the folklore of different cultures across the world. Proverbs, songs, and tales constitute a powerful source of information about stereotypes of other groups of people.

D. Katz and K.W. Braly [7] in their first empirical study of stereotypes at Princeton University defined stereotypes as cultural beliefs shared by a large number of people. The most

important contribution, however, lies not in the field of defining stereotypes but in the fact that this concept can be scientifically measured. In fact, some social science techniques have been invented due to the inquiry of the nature of stereotypes. In particular, the Bogardus scale was constructed for the purpose of measuring social distance between ethnic groups in a study of stereotypical perception.

According to Walter Lippmann, stereotypes are not simply neutral pictures of the world, on the contrary they have positive or negative connotations. Thus, he states: "the stereotypes are... highly charged with the feelings that are attached to them" [10, p. 103]. The example of the stereotypical features in the adjective list which was

constructed by Katz and Braly [7] on the basis of the respondents' answers supports this statement. Such characteristics as lazy, aggressive, ignorant and deceitful clearly represent negative meanings, while more favorable traits (e.g. intelligent, honest, progressive) describe positive beliefs. More frequently, however, people use negative labels when they refer to other groups [5]. It is clear that stereotypes about others contain different emotions – either positive or negative, sometimes ambivalent – that are ascribed to them.

In most cases, stereotypes are embedded in the society's cultural life and are shared among its members [14; 11]. Group consensus is one of the central characteristics of stereotypes. Consensual stereotypes from this viewpoint are seen as common sets of beliefs [see for example: 13]. The word "common" suggests that stereotypes are held and expressed in a similar way by most members of the group. This characteristic of stereotypes has been emphasized by supporters of the collective approach to the nature of stereotypes.

Another significant feature of stereotypes is their rigidity. In other words, they are stable, unresponsive and resistant to change. As Berting and Villain-Gandossi indicated [2, p. 22]: "... national stereotypes may be regarded as rigid shorthand descriptions". However, both these and other authors argue that the development of international relations and the influence of the mass media can have an impact on stereotypical perception of the nations in terms of their change for improvement or deterioration [6]. Stereotypes can alter over certain periods of time, and are affected by historical circumstances and international relations stimulated by mass media [3; 15]. It is especially the case for neighboring countries which have many issues in common and which are territorially and historically bounded (for instance, Poland and Russia) [8].

When considering stereotypes from a collective approach, special attention must be given to the ability of stereotypes to construct reality in the social interactions. This view on stereotypes originates in the theory introduced by Berger and Luckmann [1, p. 45]: "the reality of everyday life contains typificatory schemes in terms of which others are apprehended and 'dealt with' in face-to-face encounters". Stereotypes are seen as the

integral part of the social construction of reality and fulfill the important function of facilitating communication between members of the society as well as among groups of people [4].

Thus, such characteristics as emotional loading, rigidity, ability to construct social reality and group consensus are attributed to stereotypes. Many social scientists have attempted to define stereotypes, but a consensus on this topic has not been reached. Whether they are "pictures in the heads", exaggerated ideas, inaccurate perceptions, individual or cultural beliefs, stereotypes pose many questions to the social scientists who try to understand the nature of this concept.

Procedure

The procedure for a comparative study of national stereotypes was first tested in the study of autostereotypes [16], and then this procedure was used in the study of heterostereotypes, which took place both in Poland and Russia. The research project incorporated two stages. First, a sample of the Russian students from Herzen State Pedagogical University (St. Petersburg, Russia) took part in the research. This group consisted of psychology students aged between 18 and 27. Fifty-two Russian respondents participated in the study: 33 women and 19 men. A second stage of the study was conducted in Poland with thirty-nine sociology students from Warsaw University (22 women and 17 men). The Polish sample consisted of respondents of the same age group, which made the results of the study of the Polish and Russian groups complimentary.

It must be noted that the procedure was carried out identically in order to diminish possible differences of the results. To avoid bias which can occur when the researcher's nationality is discovered by respondents, native speakers were employed to provide oral instructions. First, respondents were asked to think about and draw pictures of a typical representative of the given nationalities (Pole, Russian). Upon its completion, respondents were asked to fill out a questionnaire containing paired characteristics.

Methodology of the research

Methodology of the research is described in detail in the previous article which was

dedicated to the study of autostereotypes of Russians [16].

Two types of data were used to investigate the content of stereotypes. The first is the data obtained from the drawings of the respondents, who were given the assignment to draw the typical representatives of the nationalities under study (for an extended version of the drawing element analysis methodology, see, for example: [12]).

The data gathered from Polish and Russian respondents in the form of drawings were analyzed using the method of content analysis. Although this technique is usually implemented in the interpretation of texts, it can also be used to analyze drawings. In this use case, a drawing element is considered as a coding unit. These received units were assigned to the categories. As for the categories, the study of different approaches to the analysis of paintings [9; 12] depicting a representative of another nation made it possible to single out the following list of categories:

1. Political and national symbols (i.e. national flag).
2. Leisure time symbols (sport and fishing equipment, books, musical instruments).
3. Labor symbols (spade, scythe, hammer, axe).
4. Technical objects (computer, TV, different types of vehicles).
5. Plants and animals (i.e. horse, bear, cat, dog, different types of trees).
6. Food and drinks (i.e. bread, herring).
7. Advertising symbols.
8. Alcohol (beer and vodka).
9. Symbols of economic life of a society (national currencies).
10. Negative symbols (patches in the clothes, different types of guns, bombs).

The elements of the picture belonged to the corresponding category, and then a calculation was made: how many elements were obtained for each category. Thus, it was determined which of the categories were activated in the idea of a typical Russian or a typical Pole, and which are not included in the stereotypical idea of him.

The second type of data was obtained using the semantic differential method. The respondents were asked to rate a typical Pole or Russian by 12 pairs of antonyms of psychological characteristics. The questionnaire offered the following pairs of characteristics: brave / cowardly; active / passive;

hardworking / lazy; educated / uneducated; tolerant / intolerant; sociable/unsociable; frank/devious; modest/conceited; kind / mean; generous / stingy; patriotic / unpatriotic; well-mannered / primitive. Graduation is from 1 to 7, from left to right (brave 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 cowardly). In the pairs presented, the left characteristic is positive, and the right one is negative. Accordingly, if the respondents' answers fell within the range from 1 to 3, then they ascribed a positive characteristic to a typical Russian or Pole, and if the answers fell within the range from 5 to 7 points, then – negative.

The choice of these two methods of studying stereotypes was due to the task of determining how conscious and unconscious stereotypes. Choosing the degree of expression of characteristics in pairs of the semantic differential, the respondents made the choices they were aware of, while when drawing a typical representative of one or another nation, unconscious stereotypes were manifested to a greater extent.

A Pole in the Eyes of Russians

It should be noted that not all Russian subjects who participated in the study were able to draw the image of a typical Pole or answer the question about characteristics of Poles. In particular, 11% of subjects left the page blank or refused to rate the proposed features. Their reasoning was the following: “I don’t know anything about Poles” or “Never met any Poles”. This fact indicates that Russians do not have many stereotypical beliefs about Poles.

The analysis of the drawings shows that the stereotype of the Pole is determined by five categories of symbols. More frequently, Russians view Poles in relation to such category as “Plants and animals”. Images of cows, cats, dogs, horses as well as flowers and trees appeared in the 58% of the cases, as is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Stereotype of the Pole by Russian Respondents (%)

Category	Code	%
Political and national symbols	PN	0
Leisure time symbols	LT	25,5
Economic life of a society	E	0
Labor symbols	L	5,5
Technical objects	T	0
Advertising symbols	AD	0
Plants and animals	PA	58
Food and drinks	FD	0
Alcohol	A	5,5
Negative symbols	N	5,5

It should be stressed that in the drawings of a typical Pole half of the categories were absent, which can once more testify to the notion that Russians do not hold many stereotypes of Poles. This result echoes data from other studies [17]. Interestingly enough, the second dominant category is the category containing leisure time symbols, such as musical instruments (accordion, piano) and books. As we can see, almost 90 % of the associations are positive (plants or animals, books or musical instruments, symbols of labor), which indicates a positive image of the Pole in the views of Russian respondents.

The results obtained using the semantic differential technique are shown in Table 2. According to data given in Table 2, Russian subjects consider Poles to be well-mannered and hard-working. Besides these positive characteristics, the majority of the respondents rated other traits close to the middle point (4), which indicates a neutral perception of the stereotyped other.

Table 2

Bipolar Scale Characteristics of a Typical Pole by Russian Respondents (Mean Values)

Characteristics	Pole
brave / cowardly	3,9
active / passive	3,9
hard-working / lazy	2,8
educated / uneducated	5,4
tolerant / intolerant	3,3
sociable / unsociable	3,2
frank / devious	3,7
modest / conceited	3,7
kind / mean	3,5
generous / stingy	3,8
patriotic / unpatriotic	3,2
well-mannered / primitive	2,9

As we can see from the results obtained, among 12 pairs of psychological characteristics, 9 received an average (neutral) assessment, according to 2 characteristics, the Russians gave the Poles a positive assessment (well-mannered and hard-working), and only one characteristic was given a negative assessment by the Russian respondents (the Poles were assessed more as uneducated). The results presented in the table show that the stereotype of the Pole among Russians can be interpreted as neutral, with a slight predominance of a positive assessment.

A Russian in the Eyes of Poles

Similar to the findings obtained from the drawings of the Russian students, the analysis of the Polish drawings reveals the same trend in relation to gender differences. From the qualitative analysis it is clear that the images of Russians in winter clothes appeared regularly in the drawings of Polish respondents. Also, it should be noted that 23 % of Poles drew a person selling goods at the market, referring to the Russians encountered at Polish markets. The hetero-stereotypes of Poles toward Russians reflected in the drawings are presented in the table below.

Table 3

Stereotype of the Russian by Polish respondents (%)

Category	Code	%
Political and national symbols	PN	12,5
Leisure time symbols	LT	0
Economic life of a society	E	0
Labor symbols	L	0
Technical objects	T	0
Advertising symbols	AD	0
Plants and animals	PA	4
Food and drinks	FD	0
Alcohol	A	58,5
Negative symbols	N	25

So, as the results show, Polish respondents build a stereotype of the Russian person around the dominant category “alcohol” (58.5 %). The typical image was a Russian in the forest with a bottle of alcohol and a gun. The second significant category is various negative symbols (25 %). Among such symbols, the most common was the image of a Russian with a gun. Since alcohol is also not a positive symbol, it can be argued that the unconscious attitudes of young Poles towards Russians are mostly negative (83.5 %). Since the study was completed before the start of a special military operation in Ukraine, the image of a Russian with a weapon is not a consequence of associations with the events taking place now.

It is useful to compare these data on the unconscious attitudes of Poles towards Russians with their conscious representations obtained using the method of semantic differential. Table 4 illustrates the findings of the survey.

Table 4
**Bipolar Scale Characteristics of a Typical Russian
 by Polish Respondents (Mean Values)**

Characteristics	Pole
brave / cowardly	4
active / passive	5,3
hard-working / lazy	4,8
educated / uneducated	4,6
tolerant / intolerant	4,3
sociable / unsociable	2,6
frank / devious	3,8
modest / conceited	4,3
kind / mean	3,8
generous / stingy	3,8
patriotic / unpatriotic	3,4
well-mannered / primitive	4,2

Consider the results obtained. First, most of the characteristics are in the area of average ratings. Secondly, two characteristics that fall outside the zone of average assessments balance each other, since one of them is positive (sociability), and the second is negative (passivity). Thus, the conscious stereotypical ideas about typical Russian among young Poles are neutral. Such results differ from the data of the drawing test. In our view, this discrepancy between different types of data can be explained by the fact that while the images try to define attitudes that respondents are not aware of, the questionnaire presents respondents with questions with clear meaning and reveals perceptions that subjects are conscious of.

Conclusions

This article is aimed at studying the content of cultural stereotypes of two neighboring peoples: Poland and Russia. On the whole, the empirical analysis showed how the heterostereotypes of Russians and Poles about each other differ: if the stereotypes of Russians about Poles are rather neutral, then the stereotypes about Russians among the Poles-respondents have negative features. At the same time, among Russian respondents, both conscious and unconscious stereotypes about Poles are neutral. As for the Poles, the conscious stereotypes of the Poles about Russians differ from the unconscious attitudes: if the unconscious attitudes reflected in the drawings of the Polish respondents are dominated by negative

characteristics, then the conscious characteristics that the Poles attribute to the typical Russian are neutral. Since it is the unconscious attitudes that are deep and have a greater influence on a person, it is precisely the appeal to art as a diagnostic form that made it possible to discover the essential cultural attitudes. With regard to the identified differences, they require further study. Perhaps the difference in the conscious and unconscious cultural attitudes of the Polish respondents testifies to the ongoing changes in the perceptions of Russians among young Poles, when meaningful information contradicts the perceptions they received about Russians in the past.

References

- Berger P. L., Luckmann T. 1991. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Pluto Press. (In Engl.).
- Berting J., Villain-Gandossi C. 1995. *The Role and Significance of National Stereotypes in International Relations: an Interdisciplinary Approach*. *Stereotypes and Nations*. Ed. Teresa Wallace. Krakow: International Cultural Center. (In Engl.).
- Borisenko V. N., Venglozh YA. & Goncharova T. N. 2016. World War II in the historical memory of Russians and Poles: a cross view of young researchers. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Istoriya [Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. History]*. No 2: 161–167. (In Russ.).
- Chubarova V. V. 2008. Pole stereotype in Polish and Russian perception: experience anthropological research. *Issledovaniya po prikladnoy i neotlozhnoy etnologii [Research on applied and urgent ethnology]*. No 206: 3–32. (In Russ.).
- Dushenko K. V. 2003. “Lyakh” and “Moskal”: mutual stereotypes of Poles and Russians. *Chelovek: obraz i sushchnost' [Human: image and essence]*. No 1 (14): 133–151. (In Russ.).
- Ivanova S. I. 2015. Features of the formation of a stereotypical image of a Pole in Russian culture. *Kul'tura. Dukhovnost'. Obshchestvo [Culture. Spirituality. Society]*. No 16: 213–218. (In Russ.).
- Katz D., Braly K. W. 1976. *Racial Prejudice and Racial Stereotypes*. Eds. E. Aronson and A.-R. Pratkanis. *Social*

- Psychology*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. No 3: 204–210. (In Engl.).
8. Kunyayev S. Yu. 2014. *Shlyakhta i my* [The gentry and we]. Moscow: Algoritm. 336 p. (In Russ.).
 9. Lazari A., Riabow O. 2008. *Polacy i Rosjanie we wzajemnej karykaturze* [Poles and Russians in mutual caricature]. Warszawa. 153 p. (In Pol.).
 10. Lippmann W. 1946. *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt Brace. (In Engl.).
 11. Lykoshina L. S. 2016. Poland and Poles in Russian public discourse. *Aktual'nye problemy Evropy* [Actual problems of Europe]. No 2: 66–86. (In Russ.).
 12. Melnikova A. A. 2015. Continuing education from “Silicon Valley”: identifying cultural and semantic ideas in the analysis of video. *Nepreryvnoe obrazovanie: XXI vek* [Continuing education: XXI century]. No 2 (10): 80–102. (In Russ.).
 13. Moscovici S., Doise W. 1994. *Conflict and Consensus. A General Theory of Collective Decisions*. London: Sage Publications. (In Engl.).
 14. Polec V. 2011. Cultural memory as a defining attitude of Poles to Russians. *Interaktsiya. Interv'yu. Interpretatsiya* [Interaction. Interview. Interpretation]. No 5 (6): 069–076. (In Russ.).
 15. Prokop Y. 2006. Polyaki about Russians – two properties of memory. *Rodina* [Homeland]. No 12: 21–24. (In Russ.).
 16. Smolina T. L., Melnikova A. A. 2017. How Russians View Themselves: a Psychological Study of National Auto-stereotypes. *Psychology and Psychotechnics*. No 4: 15–22. (In Engl.).
 17. Voroshilova M. B., Drozdeckaya A. G. 2015. Polyak lives in Poland: the stereotypical image of a Pole in the minds of Russian youth. *Lingvokul'turologiya* [Linguoculturology]. No 9: 54–67. (In Russ.).

Received 01.03.2023

Т. Л. Смолина

кандидат психологических наук, доцент

Санкт-Петербургский гуманитарный университет профсоюзов,
Санкт-Петербург, Россия

E-mail: talesm@mail.ru

А. А. Мельникова

доктор культурологии, профессор

Санкт-Петербургский гуманитарный университет профсоюзов,
Санкт-Петербург, Россия

E-mail: 88alla88@mail.ru

А. А. Дмитриева

Доктор искусствоведения, доцент

Санкт-Петербургский гуманитарный университет профсоюзов,
Санкт-Петербург, Россия

E-mail: annadmi@mail.ru

**Искусство как фактор выявления культурных стереотипов россиян и поляков:
основные положения исследования**

Аннотация. Излагаются результаты эмпирического исследования содержания культурных стереотипов поляков и россиян по отношению друг к другу. Объектом исследования выступили студенты из Санкт-Петербурга и Варшавы. Исследование проводилось до начала специальной военной операции. Поскольку задача была получить как осознаваемые, так и неосознаваемые стереотипные представления, то именно она определила выбор методик. С одной стороны, для исследования проявленных, осознаваемых стереотипов взят семантический дифференциал, предлагающий оценить по биполярной градуированной шкале гетеростереотипный образ (предлагались такие качества, как: храбрый / трусливый; активный / пассивный; трудолюбивый / ленивый; образованный / необразованный; толерантный / нетерпимый; общительный / необщительный и др.). С другой стороны, для изучения неосознаваемых установок был использован проективный рисунок с инструкцией: нарисовать типичного представителя исследуемой национальности. Результаты показывают некоторое сходство в оценивании друг друга: по результатам

семантического дифференциала и у русских представление о типичном поляке, и у поляков представление о типичном русском в целом нейтральное. При этом в проективном рисунке оценивание друг друга различается: если в рисунках русских при изображении поляков отсутствует негативная символика, то поляки рисуют довольно негативный портрет типичного россиянина. Таким образом, именно использование ресурсности искусства позволяет выявить глубинные стереотипы, особенно в случае, когда есть рассогласование сознательных и бессознательных установок.

Ключевые слова: национальные стереотипы, этнические стереотипы, гетеростереотипы, стереотипный образ поляка, стереотипный образ русского

Для цитирования: Smolina, T. L. Art as a Factor in Revealing Cultural Stereotypes of Russians and Poles: Main Provisions of the Research / T. L. Smolina, A. A. Melnikova, A. A. Dmitrieva [= Смолина, Т. Л. Искусство как фактор выявления культурных стереотипов россиян и поляков: основные положения исследования / Т. Л. Смолина, А. А. Мельникова, А. А. Дмитриева] // Вестник культуры и искусств. – 2023. – № 1 (73). – С. 85–91. (На англ. яз.).

Список литературы

1. Berger P. L., Luckmann T. 1991. The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Pluto Press.
2. Berting J., Villain-Gandossi C. 1995. The Role and Significance of National Stereotypes in International Relations: an Interdisciplinary Approach. Stereotypes and Nations. Ed. Teresa Wallace. Krakow: International Cultural Center.
3. Борисенко, В. Н. Вторая Мировая война в исторической памяти русских и поляков: перекрестный взгляд молодых исследователей / В. Н. Борисенко, Я. Венглож, Т. Н. Гончарова // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. – 2016. – № 2. – С. 161–167.
4. Чубарова, В. В. Стереотип поляка в польском и русском восприятии: опыт антропологического исследования / В. В. Чубарова // Исследования по прикладной и неотложной этнологии. – 2008. – № 206. – С. 3–32.
5. Душенко, К. В. «Лях» и «москаль»: взаимные стереотипы поляков и русских / К. В. Душенко // Человек: Образ и сущность. Гуманитарные аспекты. – 2003. – № 1 (14). – С. 133–151.
6. Иванова, С. И. Особенности формирования стереотипного образа поляка в русской культуре / С. И. Иванова // Культура. Духовность. Общество. – 2015. – № 16. – С. 213–218.
7. Katz D., Braly K. W. 1976. Racial Prejudice and Racial Stereotypes. Eds. E. Aronson and A.-R. Pratkanis. Social Psychology. Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. No 3: 204–210. (In Engl.).
8. Куняев, С. Ю. Шляхта и мы / С. Ю. Куняев. – Москва : Алгоритм, 2014. – 336 с.
9. Lazari A., Riabow O. 2008. Polacy i Rosjanie we wzajemnej karykaturze [Poles and Russians in mutual caricature]. Warszawa. 153 p.
10. Lippmann W. 1946. Public Opinion. New York: Harcourt Brace.
11. Лыкошина, Л. С. Польша и поляки в российском общественном дискурсе / Л. С. Лыкошина // Актуальные проблемы Европы. – 2016. – № 2. – С. 66–86.
12. Мельникова, А. А. Непрерывное образование от «Силиконовой долины»: выявление культурно-смысловых идей при анализе видеоряда / А. А. Мельникова // Непрерывное образование: XXI век. – 2015. – № 2 (10). – С. 80–102.
13. Moscovici S., Doise W. 1994. Conflict and Consensus. A General Theory of Collective Decisions. London: Sage Publications.
14. Полец, В. Культурная память в качестве определяющего отношения поляков к россиянам / В. Полец // Интеракция. Интервью. Интерпретация. – 2011. – № 5 (6). – С. 069–076.
15. Прокоп, Я. Поляки о русских – два свойства памяти / Я. Прокоп // Родина. – 2006. – № 12. – С. 21–24.
16. Smolina T. L., Melnikova A. A. 2017. How Russians View Themselves: a Psychological Study of National Auto-stereotypes. Psychology and Psychotechnics. No 4: 15–22.
17. Ворошилова, М. Б. Поляк живет в Польше: стереотипный образ поляка в сознании русской молодежи / М. Б. Ворошилова, А. Г. Дроздецкая // Лингвокультурология. – 2015. – № 9. – С. 54–67.

Получено 01.03.2023