LOOK
ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS

OPEN ACCESS

«Hate speech» and Discriminatory Practices Towards Other People

Valeriya Alperovich[a]

[a]Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

The images of «enemies» and «friends» remain in the focus of attention due to escalating discriminatory practices towards communication partners from different groups that one tends to ascribe negative features based on various stereotypes, social attitudes and representations. In this paper, the problem of metaphorical and narrative foundations of such phenomena as «discrimination» and «hate speech» is investigated. The purpose of this pilot research was studying the influence of «friend» and «alien» metaphors and the ideas of adults about Enemy and Friend on their adopting discriminatory practices towards other people. The author's technique for researching the metaphors of «friends» and «aliens» was developed, as well as one for studying the way discriminatory practices towards other people get adopted. The techniques for studying the characteristics of ideas about Enemy and Friend were applied. The empirical model of «friend» and «alien» metaphors and «enemy» and «friend» images as cognitive predictors of discriminatory practices towards others has been demonstrated. The correlation between «friend» and «alien» metaphors of different kinds, characteristics of personality's ideas about Enemy and Friend were analysed. The results of this research can be of use in solving the applied tasks in psychology of conflicts, in psychological consulting and tolerance trainings.

Introduction

The problems range of construction and dynamics of images of Another person, including those of a «friend» and «alien», Enemy and Friend, is highly relevant, which is determined by the aggravated situation of social and political, interethnic, intercultural conflicts blooming into the battle actions format in various countries of the world. Metaphors are becoming a way for understanding, interpreting the social phenomena, oneself and others, in particular, as «friends» and «aliens», «enemies» and «friends».

As an independent subject matter of research, metaphors are first of all worked out in linguistics. There a metaphor is a literary device, a figure of speech where a name of one class object (a word or word combination) is used to denote another class object. So, D.S. Sknarev (2015) mentions the kinds of metaphors singled out by linguists: 1) anthropomorphic metaphors (personification, parts of body); 2) naturomorphic metaphors; 3) social metaphors; 4) artifact metaphors; 5) spatial-temporal metaphors; 6) precedent name metaphors (fairytale, book, movie characters etc.). He considers the following kinds of metaphors: 1) organism metaphors; 2) architectural metaphors; 3) transport metaphors; 4) metaphors associated with vehicles; 5) magic metaphors; 6) abstract metaphors; 7) aquametaphors; 8) metaphors associated with natural phenomena; 9) scale metaphors; 10) acoustic metaphors; 11) metaphors of quality and significance. The kinds of metaphors are associated with various senses and meanings that are ascribed to them by the society. In anthropomorphic metaphors and organism ones, an object is compared to a person, organism or part of body. Social metaphors describe the object in terms of a social activity sphere (politics, economy, culture, religion and so on). In architectural metaphors, the object is compared to a structure, building, in transport ones – to a vehicle, in artifact ones – to things and objects created by humans. In our point of view, these metaphors highlight the possibility of the object's progressive or regressive development, his process character, complexity, consistency, controllability, his functions, activity stages, and they assume there are certain regularities to his life activity, rational mechanisms for regulating that, and the action of this object on other ones. Social, architectural and transport metaphors render the object into a human work, an object of human activity. These metaphors are considered just like the anthropomorphic ones, having an analytical character; the object is clearly determined, understood and structured. Zoomorphic metaphors compare the object to an animal (hare, wolf, bear, fox etc.). On the one hand, such qualities as «strength», «speed» are stressed in various animals, while on the other hand, so are «aggressiveness», «cunning», «cowardice», «weakness», «instincts», «danger» and the like. In aquametaphors, naturomorphic and zoomorphic ones, the object is compared to natural phenomena that are not man-made and so are capable of being spontaneous, chaotic, uncontrollable or of dominating the subject. This is the environment that has no certain borders. Abstract metaphors, scale metaphors and spatial-temporal metaphors emphasize that the object can be rationally studied but he is not always controllable and created by a human. The magic metaphors associate the object with supernatural powers. As for the metaphors of quality and significance, they show the object's role in one's life.

G. Lakoff and M. Johnson's (2004) linguistic cognitive theory of metaphor has granted to psychology the idea about a metaphor becoming a cognitive, heuristic tool, a mental operation, a way of learning, constructing and interpreting the world, and an integral mechanism of functioning of the human mind. From the standpoint of G. Fauconnier and M. Turner's (2000) linguistic theory of conceptual integration, a metaphor construct the shared mental space for different phenomena, i.e. it creates correlations between different notions thus helping a subject to understand them.

Foreign psychologies study metaphors proceeding from discourse, as a dynamic product of human daily communication and interaction.

As for the Russian psychology, here the cognitive approach to metaphors prevails where metaphors are relatively stable components of a subject's worldview and tools for creating it.

Both foreign and Russian psychology are currently working on various directions of studying the metaphors. Metaphors are considered as representations of a subject's individual experience being a «core» of personal and group identities, «I-image». K. Inkson (2006), L.D. Sargent et al. (2011) draw our attention to metaphors becoming labels that help to perceive objects, events and processes. The authors emphasize that metaphors act as a tool for learning the psychological phenomena. They give sense to various phenomena, meanings to individual experience, they ascribe attributes to it, they take part in categorization of the social world and they express the «I» concept. With regard to this, A.P. Yakunin's (2013) study analyzing the metaphors as a form of objectification of the sense sphere demonstrates the way adolescents metaphorically describe the people who are significant for them in various role positions as well as different spheres of their life activity. A.A. Bochaver (2010) shows that metaphors express value reference points and represent the subject's life path. For instance, the author speaks about the following types of life path metaphors contained in the respondents' answers: «Entertainment», «Path», «Threat», «Moment», «Standard», «Task», «Holiday», «Punishment», «Consumption», «Mystery».

Metaphors are also considered as a way for representing interpersonal relationships. The foreign social psychologists have found that metaphors express the meaning of relationships experience. The «path» metaphors have been studied referring to romantic relationships; they have also revealed «work», «discovery way», «uncontrollable power», «danger», «organism», «economic exchange», and «game» metaphors describing the development of relationships (Kövecses, 2004; Landau et al., 2011).

Metaphors are studied in association with various psychological phenomena and processes. The role of metaphors in career narratives has been investigated. The attention of psychologists is drawn by one's experiencing the retirement period which is metaphorically perceived as a «loss of purpose, idetntity», «liberation», «a new start», a «renaissance» (Inkson, 2006; Sargent et al., 2011).

Metaphors act as a tool for psychotherapist's work, with psychotherapists considering the metaphors to be the «language of the unconscious» and using them for invoking the change in biological, psychological, social and cultural reality of their patients. Cognitive and behavioral therapy applies them as a method of enhancing the information processes during therapy (Vachkov, 2015; Lipskaya, 2013; Smirnov, 2014; Chernyy, 2014).

Both foreign and Russian authors discuss the functions of metaphors as tools for learning and constructing the social world. For instance, metaphors have a part in expressing and understanding the abstract notions, in regulating the subject's perception and motor activity at the physiological level (Inkson, 2006). In particular, K. Inkson points out that metaphors rely on the empirical experience of a subject interacting with material world objects and they give a physical or visual texture to abstract notions (ibid.). The influence of metaphors on understanding the abstract concepts in social perception has also been noticed (e.g., «democracy»).

Metaphors are a means for supporting the social practices and social representations (Avanesyan, 2013; Indurkhya, 2006). B. Indurkhya (2006) mentions that metaphors participate in generation of the new representations. The author stresses that metaphors express the emotional evaluations and the relations of power. Directly or conditionally, metaphors can act as prejudices (ibid.). Metaphors evaluate and understand significant social phenomena. Using an accessible and vivid form, they reflect artifacts and processes, e.g. political events, political leaders, military conflicts, family values, advertisement products etc. This is why many authors keep focusing their attention on metaphors in the discourse of advertisement (Sknarev, 2015) and in the political discourse of various countries as a tool for maintaining the ideological evaluation of the political «enemies» and «friends», competitors, social phenomena, one's own people and peoples of other countries (Kerimov, 2013; Min'yar-Beloructeva, 2014; Ergashev, 2015).

A metaphor is a syncretical image which unites the cognitive and emotional components in relation to another subject or object. It becomes a part of so-called interpretation repertoires of social objects, processes and images of other people, according to N.A. Kutkovoy (2016). The notion of interpretation repertoire implies that people use metaphors as verbal tools for integrating and organizing the experience of interaction with communication partners, for understanding and interpreting various social situations, for registering the main characteristics of social objects, of their own and alien group, of others and interpersonal relationships. In metaphors and narratives, the images of «I» and Another person are created, detailed and understood in various categories. Communication partners are attributed the statuses of «friends» and «aliens», «close ones», «friends» and «enemies». An individual's or group's categorizing the communication partners as «enemies» and «friends», «friends» or «foes» influences the strategies of interaction with them. The images of «enemies» and «friends» remain in the attention focus due to escalation of discriminatory practices towards representatives of various groups that are assumed to have negative and positive properties. The attention of many researchers is attracted by the negative linguistic and behavioral practices of discrimination according to various criteria, the main ones being gender, appearance, including the ethnocultural one, weight, age, the ethnic and national belonging of a subject. V.N. Yarskaya (2012), N.O. Avtaeva (2010) demonstrate that the discriminatory stereotypes and practices in intergroup relationships are in particular conditioned by the linguistic practices of «labeling» the members of other ethnic and gender groups. These linguistic practices, also in metaphorical and narrative forms, including the attribution of negative properties, prejudices and bias, make up so-called «hate speech». N.O. Avtaeva (2010) determines the «hate speech» as «discriminatory, negativist statements, definitions, epithets as applied to ethnos, race, convictions and addressing the conflict character and difference between nationalities or religions, and – in their extreme form – propagandizing hostility and discord» (ibid., p. 811). A.V. Gladilin (2012) studies the «hate speech» as communication based on bias and discrimination. O.S. Korobkova (2009) determines the «hate speech» as a «linguistic expression of intolerance or linguistically expressed intolerance» (ibid., p. 201). The «hate speech» is based on registering the distinctions from «aliens» and «Enemies», on binary oppositions «Us-Them», Friend-Enemy, friend-foe.

Russian social psychology has studied the social and psychological characteristics of ideas about another person as Enemy and Friend (Znakov, 2012; Labunskaya, 2013; Tulinova, 2005), attribution of positive/negative properties and functions in communication with the subject to «friends» and «enemies» (Znakov, 2012; Labunskaya, 2013; Shkurko, 2013; Tulinova, 2005). The correlations of ideas about other people and personal attitudes system have been worked out and factors conditioning the content of social representations, including those of Enemy and Friend, have been revealed (Emel'yanova, 2006; Labunskaya, 2013; Tulinova, 2005).

We have found some contradictions in the studies of metaphors and «enemy» and «friend» images. The social psychologists have revealed the metaphorical and narrative nature of social representations and attitudes. Nevertheless, the correlations of metaphors and personality's and group's ideas about social phenomena and other people are understudied. Although the influence of social representations about «friend» – «alien», Enemy – Friend on the attitude to communication partners, and conflict or harmonic character of interaction with them has been demonstrated, the correlation of these representations with discriminatory practices are not explored sufficiently. Finally, the metaphorical «hate speech» and discriminatory attitude towards others that is based on the distinction of images «Us-Them», «friends-foes» is studied, but the «friend» and «alien» metaphors in connection with the phenomena of «discrimination» and «hate speech» get little analysis if any.

Materials and Methods

The problem of our research is cognitive predictors of such phenomena as «discrimination» and «hate speech» that are expressed in a personality's ideas about Enemy, their metaphorical and narrative basis.

This paper presents the data of pilot empirical study of correlations between the «friend» and «alien» metaphors, particularities of adoption of daily discriminatory practices in interpersonal communication and social and psychological characteristics of ideas about Enemy and Friend in personality at the stage of emerging adulthood.

The objective of our pilot empirical research consists in revealing the influence of «friend» and «foe» metaphors and ideas about Enemy and Friend on the particularities of a personality's adopting the discriminatory behavior towards others. The subject matter of our work is metaphors of «friends» and «aliens», Enemy and Friend, the expression level of adoption of discriminatory practices towards other people and social and psychological characteristics of ideas about Enemy and Friend.

The pilot research was conducted proceeding from the following hypotheses: 1. «Friend» and «alien» metaphors can influence the particularities of a personality's adopting discriminatory practices towards other people in daily interpersonal communication. 2. The «friend» and «alien» metaphors and social and psychological characteristics of representations about Enemy and Friend can differ in persons having different expression levels of adoption of discriminatory practices towards other people. 3. The particularities of adoption of discriminatory characteristics for Enemy and Friend can be associated with various type metaphors and various characteristics of Enemy and Friend. 4. The particularities of adoption of metaphors of similarity to and distinctions from

«friends» and «aliens» can be associated with various characteristics of Enemy and Friend.

The following methods are used in the research: classification of metaphors, structural and content analysis of representations, mathematical statistics methods (quartiles, multiple regression analysis, Kruskal-Wallis N-criterion, and Mann-Whitney U-test). The following techniques were used. 1. Author's technique «Metaphors of «friends» and «aliens». 2. Modified questionnaire form of D.N. Tulinova «Identification of Another person as Enemy or Friend» (Tulinova, 2005). 3. Author's technique «Diagnosing the discriminatory practices adoption in daily interpersonal communication».

The empirical object of the pilot research became 107 people (17 men and 90 women) at the emerging adulthood stage – aged 20-35 (students of the Southern Federal University in Rostov-on-Don and employees of various companies of Rostov-on-Don).

The validity of the results obtained was ensured by using the mathematical statistics methods in the research (quartiles, multiple regression analysis, Kruskal-Wallis N-criterion, and Mann-Whitney U-test) and the standard software package for statistical processing of data – IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0.

Results

At the first stage of our empirical study, we have compiled a classifier of metaphors. All metaphors cited by our respondents were subdivided into the following groups, according to the authors whose works we have mentioned above:

1. Positive anthropomorphic metaphors (role metaphors) (for example, «relatives», «family», «close ones»).

2. Negative anthropomorphic metaphors (role metaphors) («black mafia», «foes», «opponent», «traitor», «sectarian», «terrorist» etc.).

3. Neutral anthropomorphic metaphors (role metaphors) («passer-by», «classmates», «groupmates», «neighbors», «teachers», «teenagers» and the like).

4. Positive attribute metaphors (e.g. «people I trust», «merry fellows», «warm», «necessary», «pleasant people», «sociable»).

5. Negative attribute metaphors («insincere», «evil», «the one who wants to do harm», «aggressive», «dishonest», «cheats», «idlers», «drunkard», «drug addict» and such).

6. Neutral attribute metaphors (e.g. «they breathe», «they can talk», «of my age», «ones I do not know about», «unfamiliar», «unknown», «strangers»).

7. Metaphors of similarity («kindred spirits», «similar to me», «of the same dough», «shared interests, life, behavior models» etc.).

8. Metaphors of distinctions (e.g. «unlike me», «ones who speak another language», «people having other value reference points», «foreigners»).

9. Positive abstract metaphors (for example, «the good», «happiness»).

10. Negative abstract metaphors («the evil», «pain» etc.).

11. Positive precedent name metaphors (including positive fairytale and real characters) (for example, «Winnie the Pooh»).

12. Negative precedent name metaphors (including negative fairytale and real characters (e.g. «the Trojan horse»).

13. Ambivalent precedent name metaphors (characters having various interpretation) (for example, «people who are like Dostoevsky's characters», «people who resemble the 19th century Bohemia»).

14. Positive zoomorphic metaphors (pets, small ones) («fluffy kind little animals», «devoted dogs», «kind cats» and such).

15. Negative zoomorphic metaphors (beasts of prey) («unpredictable tigers», «wicked dogs», «snakes», «sharks» and so on), the accent being made on the animal's aggression.

16 Neutral and ambivalent zoomorphic metaphors («bears», «birds», «beavers», «ants» etc.)

17. Positive artifact metaphors (useful objects associated with positive emotions) (for example, «a warm plaid», «colorful crayons», «a soft blanket», «a life ring»).

18. Negative artifact metaphors (harmful objects or ones associated with negative emotions) (e.g. «prickle», «thorn», «needles», «sandpaper», «manure»).

19. Neutral and ambivalent artifact («books», «elementary particles having different charge», «riddle», «coins» and so on).

20. Positive naturomorphic metaphors (natural objects and phenomena, associated with positive emotions) («rays of the Sun», «columns of light», «fresh herbs», «home flowers» etc.).

21. Negative naturomorphic metaphors (natural objects and phenomena, associated with negative emotions or harmful ones) (e.g. «stormy sky», «ice-cold wind», «thick clouds»).

22. Neutral and ambivalent naturomorphic metaphors («shadows», «stones», «a remote planet» and such).

23. Organism metaphors (for example, «a part of me», «a reliable strong shoulder»).

24. «Magic» metaphors («an angel», «a caring wizard» etc.).

25. Metaphors of quality and significance (e.g. «a pattern of communication»).

We have also classified the role range metaphors of «friends» and «foes». We have also classified the metaphors of interaction between «friends» and «aliens».

Further on, the coefficient of adoption of discriminatory practices towards other people was calculated for each respondent using the following formula: M = the total of points for each situation / total quantity of situations. We used quartiles for all discriminatory practices adoption coefficients in order to break down the sampling of respondents into groups differing by ones. As it was determined, quartile of 1,5 coefficient equals 25, quartile of 1,875 coefficient – 50, that of 2,25 value – 75. Thus, we have subdivided the respondents sampling into four groups differing by the discriminatory practices adoption level. Group 1 included the respondents having a low discriminatory practices adoption level $(0 \leq M \leq 1,5)$, group 2 – ones having the average discriminatory practices adoption $(1,5 < M \leq 1,875)$. Group 3 was formed for the respondents who feature an average discriminatory practices adoption level which is yet closer to the high one

(1,875<M≤2,25), and group 4 – for ones having a high said level (2,25<M). In order to determine if «friend» and «alien» metaphors and Enemy and Friend characteristics influence the particularities of adoption of discriminatory practices towards other people by the survey participants, multiple regression analysis of the variables has been performed. Its results are brought down in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Results of multiple regression analysis of «friend» and «alien» metaphors, Enemy and Friend characteristics, and the expression level of adoption by the survey participants of discriminatory practices towards other people

Multiple correlation coefficient (R)	Multiple determination coefficient (R square)	Corrected multiple determination coefficient (Adjusted R square)	Fisher F-test	Significance level
0,953	0,909	0,600	2,943	0,002

The results of regression analysis performed give evidence about 60% of the dependent variable dispersion being due to the influence of independent variables having a high significance level (0,002). This means that change in values of discriminatory practices adoption level with the respondents is conditioned by the influence of «friend» and «foe» metaphors and Enemy and Friend characteristics. The greatest influence on the discriminatory practices adoption level is produced by the Enemy and Friend characteristics, «friend» and «foe» and Enemy and Friend metaphors the coefficients of which in the regression model are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. *Characteristics of Enemy and Friend and «friend» and «alien» metaphors having the greatest influence on the discriminatory practices adoption level*

Variables	Standardized Beta coefficients	Significance level
A person who supports you and on whom you can rely in a difficult moment	0,612	0,001
A person who is likeable and pleasant for you	0,420	0,008
A person sharing your viewpoints	0,451	0,002
A person who is older than you	0,772	0,003
A person sharing your interests	0,712	0,001
A person for whom you are an example to look up to	0,547	0,010
A person devoted to you	0,378	0,009
A person who does not like to communicate with you	0,831	0,002
A person you do not like to communicate with	0,564	0,002
A person not belonging to your social and cultural group	1,029	0,007
A person you are unpleasant to	0,938	0,002
A person you envy	1,787	0,005
A person who is dangerous	0,468	0,002
A person you feel as «alien», «stranger»	0,469	0,005
A person you do not like	0,364	0,005
Magic «friend» metaphors	0,456	0,005
Anthropomorphic negative «alien» and Enemy metaphors	0,447	0,002

| Distinction metaphors | 0,215 | 0,003 |
| Negative attribute metaphors ascribed to «aliens» and Enemies | 0,323 | 0,009 |

The data obtained can be interpreted as follows. For the survey participants to categorize their communication partners as «friends», it is crucial that the partners were up to such criteria as «rendering emotional support», «having similar viewpoints and values», i.e. the emotional, cognitive and value-related unity with friends. Devotion of Friend, the subject's affection for him and socially desirable behavior of Friend are not less important. The use of magic «friend» metaphors points to hyperbolization of positive role and positive qualities of the said partners in the subject's life. For the respondents to categorize their communication partners as «enemies», it is very important that the partners were up to such criteria as being mutually unwilling to communicate, being mutually hostile, the subject being envious towards the partner, and ascribing of a danger to the partner. The partners' belonging to other social groups also matters, which aggravates the subject's attributing distinctions to the partners. Negative social roles are ascribed to the «enemy»; distinctions with communication partners qualified as «enemies» and their negative qualities are hyperbolized.

In order to highlight the differences in «friend» and «alien» metaphors and Enemy and Friend images with respondents having different discriminatory practices adoption levels, we compared the metaphors of various kinds and Enemy and Friend characteristics in respondents of different groups using Kruskal-Wallis criterion. Table 3 shows the metaphors and characteristics that are different with respondents who have a low, average and high discriminatory practices adoption level.

Table 3. The differences of «friend» and «alien» metaphors and Enemy and Friend characteristics in the respondents having different discriminatory practices adoption levels

«Friend» and «alien» metaphors, characteristics of Enemy and Friend	Respondents having a low discriminatory practices adoption level (Mean Rank)	Respondents having an average discriminatory practices adoption level (Mean Rank)	Respondents having a high discriminatory practices adoption level (Mean Rank)	Significance level
A person with whom you are sincere and frank	68,06	50,12	47,25	0,005
A person you consider «your», a social position or status peer	60,22	50,79	48,88	0,029
A person who likes you and feels affection for you	53,72	59,35	41,83	0,027
A person who is sincere and frank with you	56,15	59,58	38,56	0,003
A person you envy	53,98	52,00	58,69	0,027

A person of about the same age as you	56,94	51,00	57,69	0,031
A person not belonging to your social and cultural group	53,48	51,50	60,42	0,005
A person not belonging to your religious group	51,98	50,96	63,38	0,001
A person who envies you	51,36	51,42	63,10	0,016
A person having a lower social position and status than you have	52,48	51,46	61,65	0,006
Zoomorphic positive «friend» metaphors	49,91	60,06	44,46	0,015
Artifact positive «friend» metaphors	46,96	59,24	49,69	0,030
Naturomorphic positive «friend» metaphors	67,70	47,46	53,83	0,003
Artifact positive «alien» and Enemy» metaphors	58,44	52,50	52,50	0,011
Quality and significance «alien» and Enemy» metaphors	52,00	52,96	58,69	0,035
Negative role «alien» and Enemy» metaphors	44,50	60,57	49,35	0,025

According to the data obtained that are given in Table 3, the respondents having a high expression level of discriminatory practices adoption may trust their «friend» status communication partners less than those having a low and average discriminatory practices adoption level, and they also ascribe less positive properties to the said partners. The different Kruskal-Wallis criterion values for the characteristics of Enemy point to the fact that the respondents having a low and average discriminatory practices adoption level may envy the «enemy» status communication partners less and perhaps ascribe to the latter the envy towards them to a smaller extent. The respondents who feature a high discriminatory practices adoption level register their distinctions from their «enemy» status communication partners and their belonging to other social and cultural and religious groups to a greater extent rather than the respondents having a low and average discriminatory practices adoption level. This gives evidence of their discriminatory practices towards representatives of the groups.

The differences in the use of zoomorphic, artifact and naturomorphic «friend» metaphors testify to the «friend» images in the respondents who have a higher discriminatory practices adoption level being less positive and more complicated and differentiated rather than in those having a low and average discriminatory practices adoption level. The differences in the use of positive artifact metaphors speak for the images of «enemies» being more positive in the respondents who have lower discriminatory practices adoption rather than in

those having a high discriminatory practices adoption level. The differences in the use of quality and significance «alien» and Enemy metaphors testifies to the respondents who have a high discriminatory practices adoption level tending to hyperbolize the images of their «enemies», negative properties of the latter, to generalize and not to differentiate the images of the latter to a greater extent rather than the respondents having a low and average discriminatory practices adoption level. The higher the discriminatory practices adoption level is, the more the respondents tend to register the scale of the «enemies» role in their life.

The next stage of our research involved subdivision of the total respondent sampling into two groups: ones who adopt the characteristics marking the Enemy or Friend's belonging to an ethnic, social and cultural, religious group to which the subject belongs or does not, and the respondents who reject the said characteristics. We used Mann-Whitney U-test for comparing the adoption level of discriminatory practices towards representatives of other ethnocultural groups (the average for each group) in each group of the respondents. The differences between two groups (at the trend level) have been determined. The group of respondents for whom the characteristics matter demonstrates a higher level of adoption of discriminatory practices (60,85) as compared to the ones who do not opt for these characteristics (48,84) (p-level of significance is 0,046). The differences in «friend» and «alien» metaphors with respondents who adopt or reject discriminatory characteristics for Enemy and Friend are given in Table 4 below.

Table 4. *The differences in «friend» and «alien» metaphors with respondents who adopt or reject discriminatory characteristics for Enemy and Friend*

«Friend» and «alien» metaphors, characteristics of Enemy and Friend	Respondents who adopt discriminatory characteristics for Friend and Enemy (Mean Rank)	Respondents who reject discriminatory characteristics for Friend and Enemy (Mean Rank)	Significance level
Attributes (neutral and ambivalent) of Friend	51,50	55,89	0,048
Precedent name (ambivalent) metaphors of Friend	52,00	55,51	0,078
Zoomorphic (negative) «alien» and Enemy metaphors	60,10	49,40	0,026

The differences in using the attribute metaphors (neutral and ambivalent ones) and precedent name metaphors of «friends» point at the fact that the less adoption of discriminatory Enemy and Friend characteristics (as for their belonging to ethnic and religious groups) is, the more significant their universal social and psychological properties (ones that do not depend on their group belonging) are, and the more positive and more generalized (less differentiated) «friends» images are. The differences in using the zoomorphic negative «alien» and Enemy metaphors (i.e. comparing them to aggressive beasts of prey) reveals the fact that the respondents who adopt discriminatory characteristics for Enemy and Friend are biased and prejudiced towards «enemy» status communication partners, they tend to hyperbolize the negative properties, to be guided by stereotypes, and to make more schematic images of the latter. Thus,

the respondents who reject the discriminatory characteristics for both Enemy and Friend tend to polarized perception of images of the latter to a smaller extent; they also register the negative properties of «enemies» less.

At the next stage of our research, we compared the differences of «friend» and «alien» metaphors and Enemy and Friend characteristics in respondents who listed and who did not list the Enemy and Friend similarity and distinction metaphors, according to Mann-Whitney U-test. The results are given in Table 5 below.

Table 5. The differences of «friend» and «alien» metaphors, those of Enemy and Friend and characteristics of Friend with respondents who register and who do not the similarity to and distinctions from the Enemy and Friend

«Friend» and «alien» metaphors, characteristics of Enemy and Friend	Respondents who list metaphors of similarity and metaphors of distinctions (Mean Rank)	Respondents who do not list metaphors of similarity and metaphors of distinctions (Mean Rank)	Significance level
A person you are devoted to	59,80	48,91	0,024
«Friend» metaphors of a positive role	51,83	36,24	0,002
Zoomorphic positive «friend» metaphors	48,56	58,77	0,026
Metaphors of a positive role of «aliens» and Enemy	47,99	41,17	0,024
Metaphors of a negative role of «aliens» and Enemy	49,31	39,47	0,035
Ambivalent artifact metaphors of «aliens» and Enemy	47,73	41,50	0,015
Negative attribute metaphors –of «aliens» and Enemy	59,19	49,45	0,029

According to the data obtained that are given in Table 5, the respondents for whom their similarity to and distinctions from «friends» and «aliens» are important tend to ascribe the negative characteristics and an ambivalent role in their life to Enemies, as compared to the respondents who do not register their similarities and distinctions against «friends» and «foes». For these participants of our survey, devotion to friends is also more significant and they value the role of «friends» in their life in a more positive manner rather than the respondents who do not list similarity and distinction metaphors.

Therefore, the more relevant for a subject it is to categorize the people around him into «friends» and «aliens», the more significant communication partners for him the «enemies» and «friends» are.

Discussion and Conclusions

The pilot research results obtained within this sampling enable us to make the following conclusions.

The «friend» and «alien» metaphors and characteristics of Enemy and Friend influence the level of a person's adopting the discriminatory practices towards others. For the survey participants to categorize the communication partners as friends, the emotional, cognitive and value-related unity with friends is important. A friend is attributed both socially desirable behavior, a

positive role in the subject's life and positive qualities. In order for the respondents to categorize the communication partners as enemies, the partner's belonging to other social groups is crucial, which furthers the attributing of distinctions from the subjects to him. Negative social roles and negative qualities are ascribed to an enemy.

The «friend» and «alien» metaphors, social and psychological characteristics of Enemy and Friend are different in people having a different expression level of adopting the discriminatory practices towards others. The lower the expression level of adopting the discriminatory practices is, the more the subjects trust their communication partners who have the «friend» status, the more they ascribe positive properties to them, and the less they register their distinctions from communication partners who have the «alien» and «enemy» status, their belonging to other social, cultural and religious groups, and the less negative properties are ascribed to the latter. The higher the expression level of adopting the discriminatory practices is, the less positive the zoomorphic, artifact and naturomorphic «friend» metaphors and the more negative «alien» and Enemy metaphors are. Meanwhile, the lower the level of adopting the discriminatory practices is, the less the respondents tend to use metaphors of quality and significance for «aliens» and enemies, i.e. the less the subjects tend to hyperbolize the role of «enemies» in their life.

The particularities of adopting the discriminatory characteristics for Enemy and Friend are associated with metaphors of various types and with various characteristics of Enemy and Friend. The less the respondents adopt discriminatory characteristics for Enemy and Friend, the more positive their images of «friends» are – as reflected in positive attribute metaphors and precedent name ones. The more the respondents adopt discriminatory characteristics for Enemy and Friend, the more negative zoomorphic «alien» and Enemy metaphors they use (thus comparing them to aggressive beasts of prey). This testifies to the subjects' bias towards «enemy» status communication partners, to hyperbolizing the negative properties and schematic character of images of the latter.

The particularities of using the metaphors of similarity to and distinctions from «friends» and «foes» can be associated with various metaphors and characteristics of Enemy and Friend. Their similarities to and distinctions from «friends» and «aliens» being significant for subjects aggravates their attributing to «enemies» of negative characteristics as well as of an ambivalent role in life. The more vital it is for a subject to categorize the people around him into «friends» and «foes», the more significant communication partners «enemies» and «friends» are, and the more positively the subjects evaluate the role of «friends» in their life.

The results obtained confirm the hypotheses proposed. An empirical model of relationships between «friend» and «alien» metaphors and subjects' adopting daily discriminatory practices, of metaphors as a cognitive predictor of discrimination was created. It has been determined that adoption of discriminatory characteristics for communication partners, the significance of similarity and distinctions with one's «friends» and «aliens» polarizes the categorization of other people, the perception of images of friends and enemies, and promotes the attribution of negative qualities to «enemies» to a larger extent rather than that of positive qualities to «friends». The results of the pilot

research conducted can be used within the context of solving the applied tasks in psychology of conflicts, psychology of bodily security, and psychology of countering the terrorist activity. Studying the «hate speech» within the context of discriminatory attitudes promotes working out and implementing the programs for developing tolerance in youth towards neighboring representatives of other religious, cultural, ethnic and other groups.

Acknowledgements

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Valeriya Alperovich is Candidate of Psychology, Associate Professor of the Department of Social Psychology and Personality Psychology at the Academy of Psychology and Pedagogy in Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia.

References

Avanesyan, M. O. (2013). *Psychological mechanisms of comprehension and creation of a metaphor:* PhD Abstract. Saint-Petersburg, 22 p.

Avtaeva, N. O. (2010). Hate speech in modern media: gender approach. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I. Lobachevskogo*, *4(2),* 811–813.

Bochaver, A. A. (2010). *Metaphor as a way of internal representation of human life line* (Doctoral dissertation). Moscow. 220 p.

Chernyy, E. V. (2014). Technique of metaphorical cross modeling in psychotherapy and psychological counseling. *The Future of Clinical Psychology-2014, collected works*. Perm: Perm State National Research University Publ., 128-133.

Emel'yanova, T. P. (2006). *Constructing the social representations in conditions of the Russian society transformations.* Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ., 400 p.

Ergashev, A. A. (2015). Reflection of social and political processes in the USA in war metaphors of Barak Obama. *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*, *393,* 48-54.

Gladilin, A. V. (2012). Hate speech as communication. *Modern studies of social problems (a digital scientific journal), 11(19),* 114-125.

Indurkhya, B. (2006). Emergent representations, interaction theory and the cognitive force of metaphor. *New Ideas in Psychology, 2,* 133-162.

Inkson, K. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers as metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69,* 48-63.

Kerimov, R. D. (2013). Conceptualization of the social reality in Germany by ethological metaphor. *News of Volgograd State Pedagogical University*, *6 (81),* 97-101.

Korobkova, O. S. (2009). Hate speech markers in the ethnicity categories: sociolinguistic aspect. *News of the Herzen Russian State Pedagogical University*, *111,* 200-205.

Kövecses, Z. (2004). Emotion, metaphor and narrative. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 8,* 154-156.

Kutkovoy, N. A. (2016). *Psychosocial features of the surprise emotion*: PhD Abstract of a doctoral dissertation. Moscow, 24 p.

Labunskaya, V. A. (2013). The image of the enemy in interpersonal communication. *Social psychology and society*, 3, 52-64.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2004). *Metaphors we live by*. Moscow: Editorial URSS Publ., 256 p.

Landau, M. J., Vess, M., Arndt, J., Rothschild, Z. K., Sullivan, D. & Atchley, R. A. (2011). Embodied metaphor and the «true» self: Priming entity expansion and protection influences intrinsic self-expressions in self-perceptions and interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47(1),* 79-87.

Lipskaya, T. A. (2013). *Metaphor as a means of studying the school fears in young school age children*: PhD Abstract. Moscow, 28 p.

Min'yar-Belorucheva, A. P. (2014). Functioning features of foreign policy metaphors. *Bulletin of Southern Ural State University, 2*, 34-41.

Sargent, L. D**,** Bataille, C. D., Vough, H. C. & Lee, M. D. (2011). Metaphors for retirement: Unshackled from schedules. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *42(3),* 225-230.

Shkurko, T. A. (2013). Relationship to "friendly/alien", "close/far" residents of different type cities. *Social psychology and society, 4*, 81-94.

Sknarev, D. S. (2015). Metaphor as a means of creating image in the advertising discourse.*Fundamental research*, *7*, 1550-1555.

Smirnov, D. O. (2014). Mythological metaphor in the space of psychotherapy. *The Future of Clinical Psychology-2014, collected works*. Perm: Perm State National Research University Publ., 109-116.

Tulinova, D. N. (2005). *Representations of Enemy and Friend in connection with one's attitude to life in various periods* (Doctoral dissertation). Rostov-on-Don, 288 p.

Turner, M. & Fauconnier, G. (2000). Metaphor, Metonymy, and Binding. *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: a cognitive perspective*, *2*, 133-145.

Vachkov, I. V. (2015). Metaphor potential in fairytale therapy work with adults. *Clinical and special psychology*, *1(13),* 75-88.

Yakunin, A. P. (2013). The study of metaphors as objectification forms of semantic sphere in the views of teenagers. *News of the Herzen Russian State Pedagogical University*, *161*, 256-267.

Yarskaya, V. N. (2012). My language - my enemy: racist discourse in the Russian society. *Sociological research*, *6*, 46-53.

Znakov, V. V. (2012). The image of the enemy as a psychological foundation for understanding of Muslim terrorists by the Russians. *Questions of psychology, 2*, 23-35.