УДК 140.8

FUNCTIONALLY–APPLIED ASPECTS OF THE TOLERANCE

ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНО–ПРИКЛАДНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ТОЛЕРАНТНОСТИ

©Abidova Z.
Ulugbek National University of Uzbekistan
Tashkent, Uzbekistan, aziyoda@gmail.com
©Абидова З. А.
Национальный университет Узбекистана им. Мирзо Улугбека
г. Ташкент, Узбекистан, aziyoda@gmail.com

Abstract. This article is an attempt to systemize the functionally applied aspects of the tolerance phenomenon. The author conducts analytically structured analysis differentiated to functions and its practical application by a subject or subjects in society of the functionally applied tolerance aspects.

Аннотация. В данной статье сделана попытка систематизации функционально–прикладных аспектов феномена толерантности. Автором проводится аналитико–структурированный анализ функционально–прикладных аспектов толерантности, различающийся на функции и их практическое приложение субъектом или субъектами в социуме.

Keywords: tolerance, functions, subject, object, aspect, tool, regulation, psychosocial processes.

Ключевые слова: толерантность, функции, побуждение, субъект, объект, реакция, отношение, действие, инструмент, оценка, регуляция, психосоциальные процессы.

Tolerance analysis as a phenomenon is one of the actual issues of understanding psychosocial processes. Attempt to understand this phenomenon role and purposes and possibilities of its application in society.

Tolerance function (from lat. functio — “implementation”) is the subject features external expression in the relationships system providing its preservation, maintenance and development [21]. Tolerance functions analysis reveals that authors suggest and describe its different variations.

V. Petritskiy analyzing the psychological–pedagogical studies distinguishes following tolerance functions: reference, regulatory, adaptive; peacekeeping, culture saving, felicitalogical, creative; communicative, cognitive processes management, development and “energizing” psychological state of a subject; value, gnosiological, prognostic and preventive [23].

I. Stepanova and E. Dongauzer integrating tolerance functions distinguished by V. Petritskiy, add following functions: syndicated function which finds its expression in the cohesion of large and small groups; translational function required for joint activity performance, study, transfer of knowledge, activity methods and etc.; adaptive, meaning adaptation to adverse environmental factors; active function as an opportunity to change somebody’s opinion, another person behavior but without any compulsion; congruent–empathic function as a skill to understand and accept not only yourself but also communicating partner, orientation to self–respect and respect other people [26].

Tolerance functions pointed out by E. Kleptsova, resemble to abovementioned functions: syndicated, translational, adaptive, active, congruent–empathic, epistemological, hedonistic [16].

According to A. Baybakov there are following functions: resistance, motivational, adaptive, assessed– prognostic and integrated [4].

N. Kukushkina asserts in her study that social nature of tolerant consciousness appears in following functions: cognitive, as tolerant consciousness helps an individual to develop ideal environmental imagery, picture of the world build on non–violent basis is created; goal–setting, promoting goal development of the activity performing on the basis of the tolerance standards and principles adherence; regulative, since presence or absence of the tolerance consciousness affects the relations between individuals, social groups [18].

K. Biekenov, S. Biekenova, G. Kenjakimova, sociologists, define such functions of tolerance as social value, adjusting social relations and relationship of individuals as well as functions to act as behavior value, necessity and motive [8].

As per A. Turova interpersonal tolerance is polyfunctional with following correlated and interdependent functions: educational, tutorial, developmental, coordinated and integrated. The author notes that isolation of the educational, tutorial and developmental functions is conventional whereas in integrated pedagogical process they are synchronously motive and effect to each other and separation is for theoretical analysis purposes only. According to A. Turova, the coordinated function defines modus operandi of the subjects and guide them to coordinated work to achieve priority educational goals. The coordinated function of the interpersonal tolerance assumes underlying impact of this system at forthcoming processes. An integrated function implies that educational process of interpersonal tolerance updates, systemizes and saturates with new content the existing knowledge. To reflect and accumulate achievements of precedent and updated stages of individual development [28].

A. Korableva based on the theoretical resources analysis distinguished the following tolerance functions: peacekeeping, culture–saving, psychological, educational, social–communicative, creative, felicitological. According to author peacekeeping function ensures environmental multi–dimension and secure harmonized peaceful coexistence of individuals differ from each other by various features; culture–saving function guarantees preservation and enhancement of group cultural experience, ethnos, society; psychological function creates auspicious psychological atmosphere in a group and society, facilitating self–identification development emotional stability, decrease the threshold of sensitivity towards unfavorable factors, frustrated situations; educational function provides transfer of constructive social interaction experience, successful socialization and in–culturalization, development of the moral consciousness, empathy, ability to appraise others deeds loyally as well as its own deeds and actions; social–communicative function trains in communication, cooperation and understanding, provides an opportunity for constructive communication with various groups representatives, individuals with different world–view; creative function opens opportunities for creative transformation of the reality and secure occurrence of the divergence, off–standard thinking, creative activity, creative self–affirmation of an individual; felicitological function guarantees happiness (pleasure) from communication with various representatives of the society and understanding of its identity, recognition by others [17].

According to G. Bardier the tolerance acts as a denominator for auto– and hetero–identity, empathy, trust, emotional acceptance, social sensitivity, understanding, social development, social distance, social support, social adaptation, meditation (mediation), cooperation; ensures thinking transparency, divergence, creativity, willingness to innovations; is an adequate response to increasing world diversity; increases emotional resistance and acceptance; supports personal development; guides group values on humanistic ethnic standards; optimizes communication and its basis component social–psychological processes (social relations, social perception, social interaction) [6].

Analyzing the tolerance functions proposed by authors it may be seen that as other psychological processes they have emotional, cognitive and behavioral components. If emotional

component may be observed in responses, the cognitive component may be observed in conscious relationship and behavioral component in respective actions.

The emotional functions of the tolerance may include such functions as oriented, regulated, adaptive, motivated, felicitological, congruent–empathic as in there nature there is a subject's reaction to another subject and object.

The cognitive functions may attribute tolerance function such as creative, value, gnosiological, prognostic, estimated–prognostic, cognitive, goal–setting, culture–saving, cognitive processes management functions, auto– and hetero–identity, understanding, social development, social distance, transparent thinking, divergence, creativity and etc., resembling more products or results of a subject cogitative processes towards itself, another subject or object.

Such tolerance function as communicative, preventive, oriented–heuristic, sindicative, translational, active, integrated, regulative, peacekeeping, functions of the mediation, cooperation, willingness to innovations, acceptance and etc., are various activities processes of a subject towards itself or environment, i. e. behavior of a certain subject.

All functional features of the tolerance can be divided by three psyche components to: emotional, cognitive and behavioral functions. Tolerance is a subject's reaction, attitude and deed towards inner and outer environment as a complex constituent. Therefore, some functions can be hardly attributed to a certain psyche component (emotion, cognition, behavior), which may be boundary, transitional or integrated. Among them such tolerance functions as acceptance, recognition, esteem, trust and etc.

Thus, the tolerance function is a subject or subjects impulse of certain reaction, attitude and action forms towards itself or other, which are the tolerance characteristic as a phenomenon. Tolerance functions by psyche components may be: emotional, cognitive and behavioral or by its inter–component localization: boundary, transitional or integrated.

Applied aspects of the tolerance are tools influencing upon overcoming and adaptation to continuously changing social environment. Adequate adaptation to changing social environment decreases the possibility of various coexistence tension types, promoting favorable society development. In this regard, these aspects of the tolerance study in philosophy, pedagogics, sociology, psychology and other humanities and related fields.

Philosophers note tolerance necessity as moral attitude related to essential sphere providing peace and harmony to society (J. Locke, I. Kant) [3].

M. Walzer says that tolerance is a fragile, fickle but absolutely essential construction in human, confessional, social relationships facilitating establishment of interreligious, intercultural, interethnic balance in society [30].

For V. Zolotukhin tolerance is a moral ethic regulating human activity by generating particular world–view type and practical tool to resolve efficiently contradictions and conflicts [12].

According to V. Solovyev tolerance is certain condition for mutual normal coexistence of civilization ethnical diversity [22].

V. Tishkov points out association of the tolerance with individual self–determination, its integrity in activity and communication promoting understanding the fact that the world and social environment are multidimensional. Following his opinion tolerance is expressed through two spheres: at psychological level as inner set as well as individual and group attitude; at political level as action or public norm implemented through the law and tradition [27].

From the pedagogues point of view (E. Bondarevskay, I. Krutova, G. Shelamov, D. Elkonin and etc.) tolerance is pedagogical practice strategy aimed at successful organization of interethnic interaction in multicultural educational group [32].

V. Gershunskiy introduces term "tolerance mentality", "tolerance world–view", "tolerant behavior". Following his opinion tolerance is required to address the challenges of development culture of interethnic relations [10].

According to L. Baykova tolerance is a value and social standard result in stable harmony among varied confessions, multiethnic and other social groups, respect the diversity of different

world cultures, civilizations and nations, willingness to understand and cooperate with human beings diverse by appearance, language, faith, habits and creed [5].

As per psychologists tolerance traditionally regarded as position of acceptance different values, views, habits as equivalent to accustomed "own" values, views and habits regardless the consent level (A. Leontyev, D. Leontyev) [15].

A. Asmolov understands tolerance as sustainability norm defining the range of retention the differences of populations and communities in developing reality. As author points out tolerance is a unique evolutionary coexistence mechanism of large and small social groups with various development resources. He thinks that tolerance as a civilized standard ensures sustainable development of particular individual with the right "to be different" and varied social groups promoting balance of individual and social interests in different social life areas, providing opportunity of various world–views, religions and cultures dialogue [1].

G. Bardier demonstrated in her work the relevance of tolerance development and its introduction to society. Author notes that tolerance may be viewed in the context of regulatory elements linked to the universal values, socially acceptable standards in the society. According to her opinion, tolerance application in the society as tool element will ensure social harmony, facilitate development of the negotiation culture, develop the art of compromises, ways of efficient competition and cooperation between heterogeneous social groups and admonish against possible conflict situations. To G. Bardier, tolerance as a preventive element contributes to the development of social strategy to counteract the occurrences of utmost intolerance as terrorism, extremism, ethnic intolerance, xenophobia and etc. [6].

To Betty E. Rierdon, tolerance is a value which is essential and fundamental for human rights implementation and building peace [7].

V. Byzova understands tolerance as a method of social–political solutions, as a technique capable to resolve conflicts, to conciliate conflicting parties. According to her tolerance is indispensable for optimizing interethnic relations and settlement of interethnic conflicts [9]. In this understanding tolerance acts as tool preventing tension, intolerance of relations.

V. Malkova defines tolerance as a norm of public consciousness and human beings behavior [20].

L. Ilchenko considers tolerance as a norm of civilized compromise between cultures and willingness to accept different logics and views, norm which acts as a condition of saving diversity, sui generis historical rights for dissimilarity [14].

T. Skripkina describes tolerance as cultural norm. The author attempts to analyze correlation of the concepts "trust" and "tolerance". She thinks that trust is complex bipolar phenomenon, which associated with synchronous existence of own trust and to that part of the world which subject intends to interact with. At the same time trust is indispensable condition of tolerance, but on the other hand, tolerance is a step, stage to mutual trust as a source of society social and psychological welfare [25].

In N. Astasheva works tolerance analyzed in several aspects: tolerance — *value* understood as inner pivot of the social–psychological being, which sets individual attitude towards itself and the world and also the behavioral benchmark; tolerance — *principle* means involution tolerance into the inner conviction status, defining the nature of individual activity; tolerance — *norm* regulates social behavioral rules developed by the mankind, sets individual attitude in accordance with integrated activity principles; tolerance — *ideal* when individual has perfect sample as a universal stimulus to tolerant behavior [2].

According to A. Ivanova tolerance is society humanism criteria and self–tolerance is an indicator of human in individual. Author notes that tolerance is vision attitude and mechanism which helps to exclude partially from society factors generating irrational behavior, to formulate and to implement optimal behavior and to create for individual psychological comfort and self–confidence and confidence in its right decision [13].

S. Tyagunov defines tolerance as humanitarian tool to develop interpersonal communication and interaction [29].

To G. Gladush tolerance development may decrease aggression particularly in adolescence [11].

N. Fedotova points out that majority of researchers consider tolerance as sacred thing, magic wand, i. e. make a fetish of it [31]. To T. Petukhova tolerance from this perspective, loses its valuable meaning and practical utility is in foreground. Author notes that tolerance may be studied from various positions: as a norm, as a tool, as a human feature, as a moral value, as a right to preserve particular ethnic features [24].

V. Lejnikov defines tolerance analysis in the functionality context as a certain restraint of requirements to a human being, expectations of the behavior set by its social role. Author thinks that in human being socialization process tolerance retains social generalities from outrageous requirements to its members, requirements in different individual life spheres and activities [19].

Conducted analysis shows that applied aspects of the tolerance define various criteria of dimension, condition, accepted principles and norms which correspond to evaluating tools of changes in human being or society (status–quo definition, i.e. current state and prediction of psychosocial phenomena). Applied aspects of tolerance acting as result of social processes with certain consequences are regulatory tools of individual or society changes (prevention, notification and achievement of particular psychosocial phenomena).

Particular evaluating applied aspects result in certain regulatory applied aspects of the tolerance. In turn regulatory aspects affect reevaluation of evaluating applied aspects of the tolerance with corresponding consequences. These two applied aspects of the tolerance have sequentially–reverse dependence and resemble process cycling in a spiral: evaluation–regulation–reevaluation–regulation. In other words the tolerance formation, development and enhancement process is perpetual and always possible to be more tolerant.

Thus, tolerance as a phenomenon has its practical application in society as tool of evaluation (regulatory, dimensional, prognostic) and regulation (prevention, notification, undesirable events risk reduction) of psychosocial processes.

Finally it may be concluded that functionally–applied aspects of tolerance are impulse of certain types of reactions, attitudes and actions in subject or subjects towards itself or other, which in turn may be used as tool evaluating or regulating psychosocial processes of society.

Above stated functionally–applied aspect of the tolerance is one of the component of tolerance phenomenon model created by us and will be studied in future works.

References:

1. Asmolov A. G. Psychology of an individual: cultural–historical understanding of human development. Moscow, Smysl, Academy, 2007. 528 p.

2. Astashova N. A. Tolerance education challenges in the system of educational institutions. Moscow, Scientific. Method, 2003, pp. 86–92.

3. Baeva L. V. Tolerance: idea, forms, individuals. Astrakhan, Publishing house “Astrakhan University”, 2009, 217 p.

4. Baybakov A. M. Tolerance education of a teenager under small groups interaction condition: dis. ... candidate of pedagogical sciences. Volgograd, 2003, 149 p.

5. Baykova L. A. Cooperation of internal affairs bodies, educational institutions and public organizations in development tolerance set. Materials of theoretical and practical conference. Edited by professor S. Boronbekov. Ryazan, 2002, 132 p.

6. Bardier G. L. Social psychology of tolerance: author’s abstract… PhD of psychology. St. Petersburg, 2007. 45 p.

7. Betty E. Reardon. Tolerance — way to peace. Moscow, Bonfi, 2001, 301 p.

8. Biekenov K., Biekenova S., Kenjakimova G. Tolerance — way of the World culture values performance. Tolerance, freethinking — basis of the World culture. Materials of international theoretical and practical conference. Almaty, 2006, 194 p.

9. Byzova V. M. Psychology of ethnic differences: mentality, relationship and understanding challenges: author’s abstract.. PhD of psychology, St. Petersburg, 1996.

10. Gershunskiy V. S. Mentality and education. Moscow, 1997.
11. Gladush G. V. Teenagers tolerance development as condition to reduce their aggression. Journal Theory and practice of public development. Issue 5.
12. Zolotukhin V. M. Two concepts of the tolerance. Kemerovo, Kuzbass State Technology University, 1999. 63 p.
13. Ivanova A. V. Ethno–psychological aspects of tolerance education among young people. Tolerance in modern society: interdisciplinary studies: collection of scientific articles. Edited M. V. Novikova, N. V. Nijegorodtseva. Yaroslavl, Publishing company YaGPU, 2011, pp. 222–224.
14. Ilchenko L. P. Development of interethnic tolerance among students: author's abstract. ... PhD Pedagogical sciences, Moscow, 2005, 47 p.
15. Karpova E. A. Individual development in the context of tolerant behavior problems. Tolerance in modern society: interdisciplinary studies: collection of scientific articles. Edited M. V. Novikova, N. V. Nijegorodtseva. Yaroslavl, Publishing company YaGPU, 2011, pp. 281–282.
16. Kleptova E. Y. Tolerance psychology and pedagogics. Moscow, 2004.
17. Korableva A. A. Tolerance definition axiological approach. Yaroslavl Pedagogical bulletin, 2012, no. 2, v. II, (Psycho–pedagogical sciences).
18. Kukushkin N. V. Tolerance development among students of specialized secondary schools: author abstract. … candidate of pedagogical sciences. Kursk, 2004.
19. Lejnikov V. P. Tolerance: Methodological aspects of accession to spiritual integrity. Tolerance in modern society: interdisciplinary studies: collection of scientific articles. Edited M. V. Novikova, N. V. Nijegorodtseva. Yaroslavl, Publishing company YaGPU, 2011, pp. 62–64.
20. Malkova V. K. Ethnicity and tolerance in modern Russian mass media. Ethnic overview, 2003, no. 5.
21. Mirimanova M. S. Tolerance as the education system. Individual development, 2002, no. 2.
22. Patsukevich O. V. "Tolerance" concepts evolution. Tolerance in modern society: interdisciplinary studies: collection of scientific articles. Edited M. V. Novikova, N. V. Nijegorodtseva. Yaroslavl, Publishing company YaGPU, 2011, pp. 72–74.
23. Petritskiy V. A. Tolerance — universal ethnic concept. Izvestiya JV forestry engineering academy, St. Petersburg, 1993.
24. Petukhova T. N. Theoretical–methodological analysis of the "tolerance" concept. South–Ural State University Bulletin, Series: Law, 2012, no. 20 (279).
25. Skripkina T. P. Trust and tolerance: do borders exist? Intercultural dialogue: research and practice. Edited by G. U. Soldatova, T. Yu. Prokofeva, T. A. Lyutaya. Moscow, Centre Mass Media Moscow State University named M. V. Lomonosov, 2004.
26. Stepanova I. A., Dongauzer E. V. Tolerance as professional feature of a teacher. Journal Volga University named V. N. Tatisheva, Bulletin, 2012, no. 3.
27. Tishkov V. A. About tolerance. Ethnopolis, 1995, no. 5, 23 p.
28. Turova A. S. Certain continuity aspects of interpersonal tolerance education in the system "DOU–primary school". Isvestiya Russian State Pedagogical University named A. I. Gertsin, 2008, no. 67.
29. Tyagunov S. I. Tolerance and mutual understanding as hermeneutical problem. Tolerance in modern society: interdisciplinary studies: collection of scientific articles. Edited M. V. Novikova, N. V. Nijegorodtseva. Yaroslavl, Publishing company YaGPU, 2011, pp. 82–84.
30. Walzer M. About tolerance, Moscow, 2000.
31. Fedotova N. N. Tolerance as the world–view and instrumental value. Philosophical sciences, 2004, no. 4.
32. Cherstvaya O. E. Tolerance education issue in family. Tolerance in modern society: interdisciplinary studies: collection of scientific articles. Edited M. V. Novikova, N. V. Nijegorodtseva. Yaroslavl, Publishing company YaGPU, 2011, pp. 92–94.

Список литературы:

1. Асмолов А. Г. Психология человека: культурно–историческое понимание развития человека. М.: Академия, 2007. 528 с.
2. Асташова Н. А. Проблема воспитания толерантности в системе образовательных учреждений. М.: Научный метод, 2003. С. 86–92.
3. Баева Л. В. Толерантность: идея, образы, персоналии. Астрахань: Астраханский университет, 2009. 216 с.
4. Байбаков А. М. Воспитание толерантности у старших подростков в условиях взаимодействия малых групп: дис. … канд. пед. наук. Волгоград, 2003. 149 с.
5. Байкова Л. А. Сотрудничество образовательных учреждений и общественных организаций деле формирования установок толерантности // Теоретическая и практическая конференция (21 мая 2002 г.): материалы / предисл. и науч. ред. проф. С. Боронбекова. Рязань, 2002. 132 с.
6. Бардиер Г. Л. Социальная психология толерантности: автореф. дис. … д–ра психол. наук. СПб, 2007. 45 с.
7. Риэрдон Бетти Э. Толерантность — дорога к миру. М.: Бонфи, 2001. 301 с.
8. Биекенов К., Биекенова С., Кенжакимова Г. Толерантность — способ функционирования ценностей культуры Мира // Международная научно–практическая конференция «Толерантность, веротерпимость, свободомыслие — основа культуры мира»: материалы. Алматы, 2006. 194 с.
9. Бызова В. М. Психология этнических различий: проблемы менталитета, отношений, понимания: автореф. дис. ... д–ра психол. наук. СПб.,1996.
10. Гершунский В. С. Менталитет и образование. М., 1997.
11. Гладуш Г. В. Формирование толерантности подростков как условия снижения их агрессивности // Теория и практика общественного развития. 2013. №5. 118–121.
12. Золотухин В. М. Две концепции толерантности. Кемерово. 1999. 63 с.
13. Иванова А. В. Этнопсихологические аспекты воспитания толерантности в молодежной среде // Сб. научн. ст. / под научн. ред. М. В. Новикова, Н. В. Нижегородцевой. Ярославль: Изд–во ЯГПУ, 2011. С. 222–224.
14. Ильченко Л. П. Формирование межэтнической толерантности у школьников: дис. ... д–ра пед. наук. М., 2005. 469 с.
15. Карпова Е. А. Развитие личности в контексте проблемы толерантного поведения // Сб. научн. ст. / под научн. ред. М. В. Новикова, Н. В. Нижегородцевой. Ярославль: Изд–во ЯГПУ, 2011. С. 281–282.
16. Клепцова Е. Ю. Психология и педагогика толерантности: учеб. пособие для вузов. М.: Академ. проект, 2004.
17. Кораблева А. А. Аксеологический подход к определению толерантности // Ярославский педагогический вестник. 2012. Т. 2. №2. С. 42–46.
18. Кукушкин Н. В. Формирование толерантности у студентов средних специальных учебных заведений: автореф. дис. … канд. пед. наук. Курск, 2004.
19. Лейников В. П. Толерантность: Методологические аспекты присоединения к духовной целостности // Сб. научн. ст. / под научн. ред. М. В. Новикова, Н. В. Нижегородцевой. Ярославль: Изд–во ЯГПУ, 2011. С. 62–64.
20. Малькова В. К. Этничность и толерантность в средствах массовой информации // Этнический обзор. 2003. №5.
21. Мириманова М. С. Толерантность как система воспитания // Развитие личности. 2002. № 2. 154 с.
22. Пацукевич О. В. Эволюция представлений о понятии «толерантность» // Толерантность в современном обществе: опыт междисциплинарных исследований // Сб.

научн. ст. / под научн. ред. М. В. Новикова, Н. В. Нижегородцевой. Ярославль: Изд–во ЯГПУ, 2011. С. 72–74.

23. Петрицкий В. А. Толерантность — универсальный этический принцип // Известия СП лесотехнической академии. СПб., 1993. С. 139–151.

24. Петухова Т. Н. Теоретико–методологический анализ понятия «Толерантность» // Вестник ЮУрГУ. Серия: Право. 2012. №20 (279). С. 18–23.

25. Скрипкина Т. П. Доверие и толерантность. Существуют ли границы? // Межкультурный диалог. Исследования и практика. М., 2004.

26. Степанова И. А., Донгаузер Е. В. Толерантность как профессиональное свойство личности педагога // Вестник Волжского университета им. В. Н. Татищева. 2012. №3. С. 175–185.

27. Тишков В. О толерантности // Этнополитический вестник России. 1995. №5. С. 23.

28. Турова А. С. Некоторые аспекты преемственности воспитания межличностной толерантности в системе «ДОУ начальная школа» // Известия Российского государственного педагогического университета им. А. И. Герцена. 2008. №67. 490–494.

29. Тягунов С. И. Толерантность и взаимопонимание как герменевтическая проблема // Толерантность в современном обществе: опыт междисциплинарных исследований / Сб. научн. ст. / под научн. ред. М. В. Новикова, Н. В. Нижегородцевой. Ярославль: Изд–во ЯГПУ, 2011. С. 82–84.

30. Уолцер М. О терпимости. М.: Идея — пресс; Дом интеллектуальной книги, 2000.

31. Федотова Н. Н. Толерантность как мировоззренческая и инструментальная ценность // Философские науки. 2004. № 4. С. 5–27.

32. Черствая О. Е. Проблема воспитания толерантности в семейном укладе // Толерантность в современном обществе: опыт междисциплинарных исследований / Сб. научн. ст. / под научн. ред. М. В. Новикова, Н. В. Нижегородцевой. Ярославль: Изд–во ЯГПУ, 2011. С. 92–94.

Работа поступила
в редакцию 20.06.2016 г.

Принята к публикации
23.06.2016 г.