

УДК 316.61

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33120/popp-Vol23-Year2020-44>

Губеладзе Ірина Гурамівна

кандидат психологічних наук, старший науковий співробітник лабораторії психології мас та спільнот,

Інститут соціальної та політичної психології НАПН України, м. Київ, Україна

ORCID ID 0000-0001-8023-6408

irynagubeladze@gmail.com

КОЛЕКТИВНЕ ПОЧУТТЯ ВЛАСНОСТІ ЩОДО СВОЄЇ КРАЇНИ: ДЖЕРЕЛО МІЖНАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ НАПРУЖЕНОСТІ ЧИ ФАКТОР ЄДНОСТІ?

Актуальність статті зумовлена можливістю загострення між-національної напруженості і посилення різновекторності зовнішньополітичних орієнтацій України, де поряд з українською етнічною більшістю є доволі великі інші етнічні спільноти. Така загроза може бути тісно пов'язана з актуалізацією національної ідентичності і колективного почуття власності в умовах несформованості єдиної національної ідеї.

Метою статті був аналіз феномену колективного почуття власності щодо своєї країни як чинника внутрішньогрупової згуртованості громадян та посилення міжнаціонального (міжетнічного) протистояння всередині держави. У контексті психології понять «ми» і «наше» показано, що колективне почуття власності перебуває в стані інтерактивної динаміки. Обґрунтовано структуру колективного почуття власності щодо країни та чинники його формування. Визначено соціально-психологічні детермінанти формування, актуалізації чи деактуалізації колективного почуття власності щодо своєї країни, підтверджено його тісний взаємозв'язок з рівнем сформованості і проявом громадянської ідентичності.

На основі **результатів** роботи міжнаціональних фокус-груп, учасниками яких стали магістранти та аспіранти з Норвегії, Німеччини, України, Грузії, Латвії, визначено, що високий рівень наднаціональної (у цьому випадку – європейської) ідентичності формується за умови стабільного національного розвитку, відчуття громадянами безпеки щодо цілісності країни і сформованої громадянської ідентичності. Громадяни країн, які відчувають загрозу втрати територій або реально переживають такі події (Грузія, Україна), натомість демонструють високий рівень актуалізації колективного почуття власності щодо своєї країни, готовності її захищати, відстоювати її національні ідентитети, такі як мова, символіка, традиції тощо. Показано, що актуалізоване колективне почуття власності щодо країни, з одного боку, може бути джерелом єднання однодумців, які утворюють інгрупу всередині країни, з другого – воно може посилювати протистояння як усередині країни (за умови несформованості

громадянської ідентичності та спільної національної ідеї), так і з представниками інших країн на міжнародній арені.

Практична значущість дослідження полягає в можливості використання його результатів для розроблення програм формування відповідального громадянства на основі розвитку та актуалізації колективного почуття власності.

Подяка. Дослідження виконано в межах науково-дослідної роботи «Психологія реалізації особистістю почуття власності в соціальних практиках». Висловлюємо подяку організаторам і учасникам міжнародного проекту Eurasian Peace Study Exchange Networking (2017–2019), завдяки якому було проведено фокус-групи серед іноземних магістрантів та аспірантів на базі Державного університету Іллі (м. Тбілісі, Грузія), Арктичного університету в Тромсо (Норвегія), Американського університету Центральної Азії (м. Бішкек, Киргизстан).

Ключові слова: почуття власності; колективне почуття власності щодо своєї країни; психологічна власність; міжнаціональні загрози; громадянська ідентичність; національна ідентичність.

COLLECTIVE SENSE OF OWNERSHIP OF YOUR COUNTRY: A SOURCE OF INTER-NATIONAL TENSIONS OR A FACTOR FOR UNITY ?

Iryna H. Hubeladze

PhD in Psychological Sciences, senior researcher

Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the NAES of Ukraine,

Kyiv, Ukraine

ORCID ID 0000-0001-8023-6408

irythagubeladze@gmail.com

The **relevance** of the paper is due to the possibility of inter-national tensions escalation and strengthening the diversity of foreign policy orientations of Ukraine, where along with the Ukrainian national majority there are quite large, other national communities. Such threat may be closely linked to the actualization of national identity and collective ownership in the absence of the joint national idea.

The **purpose** of the article is to analyze the phenomenon of collective sense of ownership regarding one's country as a factor of intra-group cohesion of citizens and strengthening of inter-national confrontation within the state. Reflecting the psychology of the concepts of «we» and «our», it is shown that the collective sense of ownership arises in the interactive dynamics. The structure of the collective sense of ownership of the country and the factors of its formation are substantiated. The socio-psychological determinants of the formation, actualization or de-actualization of the collective sense of ownership as to own country are determined. Its close connection with the level of formation and manifestation of civic identity is substantiated.

Based on the **results** of international focus groups, which included masters and doctoral candidates from Norway, Germany, Ukraine, Georgia, Latvia etc. (N = 23), it is determined that a high level of supranational (in this case European) identity

is formed under conditions of stable national development, citizens' sense of security regarding the integrity of the country and the established civic identity. Citizens of countries that feel threatened by the loss of territories or actually have such facts (Georgia, Ukraine), instead demonstrate a high level of actualization of collective ownership of their country, willingness to protect it, defend its national identities such as language, symbols, traditions and more. It is shown that the actualized collective sense of ownership of the country, on the one hand, can be a source of unity of like-minded people who form a group within the country. On the other hand, it can intensify confrontation, both within the country (provided that the civic identity and common national idea are not formed) and with the representatives of other countries in the international arena.

The **practical significance** is the possibility of using the research results to develop programs for the formation of responsible citizenship based on the development and actualization of a collective sense of ownership.

Key words: sense of ownership; collective sense of ownership as to own country; psychological ownership; inter-national threats; civic identity; national identity.

The problem statement. The escalation of inter-national tensions within Ukraine and the intensification of the diversity of its foreign policy orientations is due to the fact that, along with the Ukrainian national majority, there are quite large other national communities. Such tensions can be closely linked to the actualization of national identity and collective sense of ownership in the absence of a joint national idea.

The formation of citizens' collective sense of ownership in relation to their country involves ensuring the integration, unity and entirety of society, the development of self-awareness as a responsible citizen of a multicultural society. At the same time, excessive negative actualization of a collective sense of ownership can lead to aggravation of relations between national minorities within the country, increase the stigmatization of immigrants and internally displaced persons, as well as weaken and even level globalization integration strategies.

Together with the active scientific studies in the field of civic identity and the formation of a responsible citizen as one of the key factors in the development of a democratic society, the level of citizens' collective sense of ownership, including Ukrainians in relation to their country and various national minorities. There are few attempts to substantiate the notion of collective ownership as opposed to individual or private, but there is a lack of targeted intelligence on the manifestation of this phenomenon at the level of the territorial community, country and supranational geographical and political associations.

Analysis of recent studies and publications. Over the last decade, the number of socio-psychological studies of intergroup relations has increased significantly, especially with regard to ethnic and national

minorities, immigrants and internally displaced persons. The vast majority of these studies focus on the processes of social categorization, stigmatization, realistic and symbolic threats. During this period, the theory of psychological ownership was actively developed and disseminated (Pierce, Kostova & Dirks, 2001; Pierce, Jussila, 2011). However, the issues of collective ownership for group dynamics, both at the level of local territorial communities and at the state or supranational level, were practically not studied.

Analysis of the psychological literature has shown that a sense of ownership is traditionally considered by scholars as a socio-psychological phenomenon based on an instinctive need for property, the satisfaction of which is closely linked to the formation of personality and the functioning of group consciousness. It is a psychological attribute of personality that distinguishes it from others, and is the basis for categorization and differentiation, which is possible only in social interaction (Бурменко, & Карнышев, 2003; Хазратова, & Луценко, 2011; Пайпс, 2008). Sense of ownership is defined as a concrete-subjective form of existence of the need for property, which is based on the experience of belonging to a person of certain attributes of ownership. It is based on a person's ability to extend his self to everything that belongs to him at least to some extent, to which he is entitled, about which he can say «mine» or «ours» (Хазратова & Луценко, 2011). Being a construct of a person's self-consciousness, a sense of ownership is realized in social practices and acts both as a factor and a result, the consequence of interpersonal interaction is a multidimensional formation, the specificity of which is determined by the organization of its components. The sense of ownership has a meaningful character and acts as a pillar of existence, where things and relationships become a symbol of human stability in the socio-cultural space.

Experiencing a sense of ownership, according to N. Khazratova and M. Lutsenko, contributes to the values system formation of the target of ownership (i. e., individual or community), their self-esteem, belief in their own strength, the ability to achieve a certain result. It helps to express oneself in the outside world, to self-determine in relations with others (Хазратова & Луценко, 2011). A sense of ownership is formed on the basis of the need for property, but depending on various socio-psychological factors can vary in levels, forms and ways of manifestation at different stages. Belonging to a person is experienced as a subjectively significant connection with the target of ownership, the ability to control and influence it. According to R. Pipes, a sense of ownership develops in a person a sense of self-worth and faith in their own strength (Пайпс, 2008).

A sense of ownership is manifested not only on a personal level («mine»), but also on a collective level («ours») (Pierce & Jussila, 2011;

Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2017). A community of people who perceive themselves as «we» may have or form a common meaning of things. According to the theory of self-categorization (Turner et al., 1987), people spontaneously unite according to certain criteria and categories: personal features determine one's personal identity («Me») and social or collective self-determination form their group or collective identity («We»). Self-esteem is inextricably linked to the groups or communities to which it belongs, and vice versa (Васютинський, 2010).

However, there are few studies examining the nature and relevance of the collective sense of ownership, based on a sense of «ours», for intergroup relations. Collective psychological ownership is an important source of tension between groups (Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2017) and may be of interest to experts in different fields and can be studied by integrating theories and research from different social sciences, and have implications for future socio-psychological studies of intergroup relations. It is promising to consider the collective sense of ownership through the prism of the psychology of ownership, marking and personalization, intergroup threats, external exclusion, and group responsibility. Such socio-psychological processes can be applied to a number of ownership and different intergroup settings, including international, national and local conditions, as well as organizations and communities.

The purpose of the article is to analyse the phenomenon of collective sense of ownership as to own country as a factor of intra-group cohesion of citizens and strengthening of inter-national confrontation within the state.

The statement of the main research material. When we talk about a collective sense of ownership, we rely on the definition of Pierce and Jussila (2010). They defined collective psychological ownership as a feeling of collective possessiveness and attachment to group, joint objects, that can be measured at the individual or group level. It is the shared sense that an (tangible or intangible) object is a possession of and belongs to the group and can be marked as «ours». These are the processes of internal regulation of human activity, which reflect the content and significance that the state has for it as a target of ownership.

It is important to distinguish property rights as a normative structure that relates to social relations between individuals and communities regarding the object of ownership, from the sense of ownership as a subjective experience of belonging to certain objects of property, which may exist even in the absence of social and legal recognition.

The collective sense of ownership is based on an instinctive nature, the so-called «territorial instinct» and involves social acceptance and recognition (Beaglehole, 1931; Джеймс, 1991; Пайпс, 2008; Хазратова, & Луценко, 2011; Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2017). Ownership issues underlie the

functioning of societies, and the collective sense of ownership has strong influences on how people behave (Ye, & Gawronski, 2016). This experience helps to organize the social and physical environment, regulates social interactions, and provides for normative and moral rights, privileges, and responsibilities. It helps to simplify the way people interact to understand and predict their behavior, in particular regarding moral violations, thefts, intrusions, annexations or vandalism specific to property.

Reflecting the psychology of the concepts «we» and «our», it is important to realize that the collective sense of ownership arises in the interactive dynamics. Its emergence and development leads to the formation of stable emotional relationships and is based on the experience of a person's interaction with the state as an object of ownership. Due to the fact that this experience can be contradictory, to have both positive and negative episodes, feelings about the target of psychological ownership are ambivalent. The same feeling can be lived and manifested in different ways, depending on the emotional state in which the person is at the moment. Sense of ownership can accompany emotions of joy, pride, interest, envy, resentment, shame and anger, and so on at different times. Social institutions have a significant role in the formation and development of a sense of ownership as one of the highest human feelings, in particular social symbols that support their stability, some traditions, norms and social practices.

The psychological experiencing of a sense of ownership regarding a state can be especially important depending on the life and social situation, acquiring a personal meaning for the subject, and begins to be protected by all physical and psychological means. Over time, the development of a sense of ownership begins to differentiate and its connection with such concepts as «money», «value», «social inequality», «justice», etc. appears.

An important aspect of understanding the collective sense of ownership is the sense of justice in the distribution of common goods and responsibilities. Researchers have found that perceptions of justice determine citizens' behavior and influence: the desire to perform their civic duties; the nature of interaction with other people, willingness to help them or participate in joint activities; desire to take revenge on the offender, determining the punishment for him; willingness to apply to a particular organization or work in it; quality of activity; deviant, including illegal behavior. Experiences of justice are individual (intimate experience), group (practice of direct settlement of relations) and social (declared and protected by morality and law) nature and are determined by the severity of the conflict between «just-for-me» (for me more than for others) and «just-for-all» («all equally») in the position of the subject (Слюсаревський, 1998). Assessing the situation from an individual, subjective point of view, the main principle and

criterion of which is «I should get the most for my own realization» is rooted in the instinct of self-preservation and is manifested in competition.

Collective sense of ownership can be manifested at the local, regional, national and supranational levels. When we talk about the national level, it can often be expressed in such statements as «this is our country», «we must regain control over our territories», «we are the proprietors here and we can determine the future vector of the country's development», «we will not allow the enemy to enter our home», etc. The consequences of collective ownership requirements at the local and especially at the national level can be far-reaching and at the same time tense, jeopardizing social cohesion and international relations in general.

The image of the state is a complex multilevel formation. It can take place in both the individual and the mass psyche (Хазратова, 2004). The collective sense of ownership regarding a country is manifested through national identities, such as language, state symbols, national culture and traditions, state institutions, and so on.

Verkuyten M. identifies three important principles on which the manifestation of a collective sense of ownership is based, including in relation to one's own country: *the principle of the first possession* (the first user of a natural resource is its owner), *the principle of labor and investment* (persons involved in the creation or formation of the target of ownership are its owners) and *the principle of formation* (forming the meaning of a certain territory for collective identity) (Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2017).

The structural components of the collective sense of ownership regarding a country are power and control; knowledge; self-investment; self and collective efficacy; self and collective identity; perceived usefulness. It can be manifested in a sense of territoriality (passive sense of ownership), commitment to the state as an object of ownership and responsibility, both individual and collective (active sense of ownership) (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2002). The formation of a sense of ownership is due to the involvement in the activities of the group and the use of resources and opportunities. Ostrom E. spoke about the peculiarities of collective ownership as opposed to individual, emphasizing the importance of responsible attitude, use and restoration of resources. When ownership is collective, then the responsibility for it is shared between different people. The less understanding and awareness of how a particular citizen can influence the country as a target of own collective ownership, the less involving and recognizing (Остром, 2011).

A collective sense of ownership as to own country is closely connected to the level of formation and the manifestation of civic identity. A sense of attachment or group identification does not always mean a collective sense of ownership, but a collective sense of ownership means a sense of «ours» and

social identification (Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2017; Карась, 2015). A collective sense of ownership can be in basic and reinforce the development of a sense of «who we are» and «what we have». In turn it can increase claims to ownership and tensions with outgroups. Members of the majority group are often accused of exploiting and appropriating the cultural values of minorities (Scafidi, 2005). A sense of ownership can provide a sense of collective, shared value, positive difference from others, belonging, meaningful existence, empowerment, and continuity of identity (Vignoles, 2011).

Petrovs'ka I. argues that a higher level of Ukrainian civic identity increases the desire of citizens to stay in Ukraine, teach their children in Ukrainian high educational institutions, honestly perform civic duty, work for the benefit of Ukraine. Such citizens are more focused on limiting actions and motivations that can harm others and violate social expectations and norms. The more they are focused on stability, security and harmony of society, family and themselves, the more they are focused on maintaining customs and improving well-being of people with whom they are in constant contact, as well as seek to realize their abilities, talents and achieve personal success through the exercise of competence in their country. Ukrainian civic identity in the perception of the studied citizens is associated with patriotism, active citizenship, opportunities for personal and professional realization in their country (Петровська, 2016).

Citizens use material objects that are common (eg, historic buildings, domestic products) as symbols of their group identity and to demonstrate their civic identity to others (Gineikiene et al., 2016). Collective sense of ownership promotes self-determination, a sense of home, understanding of the purpose and direction of life as a citizen, a sense of the self and community stronger, which is manifested in a sense of collective continuity throughout (Brylka et al., 2015; Nijjs et al., 2020).

According to Pierce and Jussila (2011, p. 827), a sense of «we» and «our» arises as a result of joint events and actions that are collectively experienced and recognized by a group of people who feel like «we». This feeling is able to unite people and control their behavior in achieving a common goal (for example, marking and protection of the territory). The feeling of «ours» is fundamentally important in intergroup relations, but, as a rule, it is not taken into account in social psychology. There are many socio-psychological works on social categorization and related causes and consequences of thinking in the categories of «we-they» and «our-their». However, there is a lack of systematic theorizing and research of the nature and consequences of thinking in terms of «our» and «their» as a collective psychological ownership. However, such searches can play an important role in group dynamics and the processes of community and nation formation. On

the one hand, a sense of collective ownership is often involved in intra-group processes of cooperation and solidarity, but on the other hand, it can exacerbate inter-group tensions and conflicts.

At the level of countries and ethnic groups, collective sense of ownership and affiliation are strong justifications for territorial and nationalist sovereignty, and disputes over ownership of objects, cultural artifacts, and territories are frequent and tend to escalate into violence between groups (Toft, 2014). At the same time, collective sense of ownership plays a role in the isolation and exclusion of different minorities at the same time as opposed to unity.

An integral part of a sense of ownership is the ability to lose control and be deprived of property (Rochat, 2014), which leads to protective behavior and the restoration of property claims. Theft, invasion, encroachment and annexation (e.g. Crimea, Abkhazia and South Ossetia by the Russian Federation) lead to property disputes and conflicts. Collectively recognized cultural traditions, practices, norms and values may be threatened by the intensification of migration processes, or by the spread of European rules and norms. Outgroups that have a worldview and values other than intragroup, threaten the unity and common way of group's life. The symbolic threat is related to the fear that the difference, value and continuity of intragroup identity will be undermined by others. It anticipates the need for a positive and distinct sense of collective self-management and leads to identity management strategies, including positive intergroup differentiation, worldview protection, and discrimination against others (Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2017; Toft, 2014; Turner et al., 1987).

In order for ownership to be recognized by others, it must be marked and personalized. Marking as a form of behavior in relation to the target of ownership allows not only to claim and justify control, but also to determine the identity of the group. Instrumentally, group members are involved to maintain or protect the identity and value of their group. Identification marking of collective ownership not only expresses group identity, but also provokes reactions from members of the group and outside the group, and thus can work to clarify or rethink the individual. Management labeling informs community members that a particular ownership or territory is «ours» and therefore «we» have the right to control access to or use of the facility. Marking symbolizes that the object exists and there is a need to prevent interference, misappropriation, violation of rights by «others». Depending on how clear and unambiguous the ownership and boundaries of the target are, there may be different ways of management marking. Greater ambiguity will lead to stronger behavior of owners with a higher level of management marking. Ambiguity may arise from a lack of border markers (e.g., blurring of national borders in the European Union) or from

institutional, organizational or social changes (e.g., increasing cultural diversity in the regions), which include restructuring requirements and rights. Under such conditions, community members will want to emphasize and restore their collective ownership by participating in control-oriented marking, such as distributing items, (re)emphasizing historical requirements, placing signs and boundaries, and strengthening patrols and border controls.

Sense of ownership, including collective, is not a static and inert formation, which is formed once and for all. There is a constant process of formation, reconstruction, actualization / de-actualization, reduction or increase of valence, etc. depending on specific social circumstances, intra-group processes and relevant threats.

It can change depending on a number of socio-psychological factors: the experience of common collective emotional states, internal and external realistic, symbolic and proprietary threats, reconstruction of civic identity, including related to its activities and implementation of the person in the community. A person's belonging to a particular community presupposes his identification with the values and guidelines of its other members. Consequently, the approving or negative attitude of the community to property and various methods of appropriation will affect the corresponding attitude of the individual. The higher the level of identification with a community, the stronger the influence of its collective guidelines.

Self-investment increases the level of collective ownership of a target, through the investment of strength, energy, and effort. The more a person has invested both moral and material resources to acquire, increase and maintain this psychological sense of ownership, the higher the level of its manifestation.

Self-determination of a person in the space of social relations is based on intergroup and ingroup comparison. A person's belonging to a particular community determines his self-determination, including through the actualization of a collective sense of ownership of his country. Accordingly, the change of the community or its status in it certainly affects the reassessment and transformation of the sense of ownership, its valence and intensity of manifestation.

Another important factor in the actualization of ownership is the threat (real or imagined) of loss of ownership or control over it. Citizens are beginning to actively defend their collective sense of ownership, protecting and strongly marking it, which can manifest itself even in aggressive behavior and categorical rejection of the so-called «others».

For the successful realization of the collective sense of ownership, it is important to recognize the right of an individual or community to such psychological possession or the psychological legitimization of ownership of the target of ownership. It can be implemented not only through legal rights,

but also through verbal agreements and even through non-interference. Thus, the collective sense of ownership is an important but largely unexplored phenomenon and a factor in intergroup dynamics.

In order to determine the characteristics of the collective sense of ownership as to own country, we conducted three focus groups among master students and doctoral candidates in Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Germany, Norway, Italy, Ukraine and other countries. All participants specialize in the study of political science, anthropology, and international relations on peacebuilding and security policy. The total number of participants is 23 people. The first group ($N_1 = 8$) was conducted at the American University of Central Asia (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, June 2019). The second focus group ($N_2 = 7$) took place at the Illia State University (Tbilisi, Georgia, September 2019). And the third focus group ($N_3 = 8$) was conducted on the basis of the Arctic University in Tromso (Norway, November 2019). All groups were international and included representatives from many countries in both Europe and Asia.

Participants were invited to discuss the formation of a collective sense of ownership in various spheres of human activity, including the civic sphere and relations with the state, markers of collective ownership, its difference from civic identity. The next step was to discuss situations where participants felt their national and civic identity particularly acutely, the reasons for this feeling, markers, emotional experiences, reasons, ways out. In particular, participants answered the following questions:

- What was the reason for such a sharp and painful experience?
- What exactly did you feel?
- What threat did you feel to your national identity?
- What have you done (could have done) to overcome this situation and feelings?

During the focus-group working, it was determined that a high level of supranational (in this case European) identity is formed under conditions of stable national development, citizens' sense of security regarding the integrity of the country and the established civic identity. This position was expressed by participants from Germany, Norway, Italy, who demonstrated a high level of European landmarks, without threatening their national identity. At the same time, citizens of countries that feel threatened by the loss of territory or actually have such facts (for example, Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia), instead demonstrate a high level of actualization of collective ownership of their country, willingness to protect it, defend its national identities, such as language, symbols, traditions, etc. Their answers were brightly emotional, full of determination to defend their rights and identity.

During the discussion, the participants concluded that the actualized collective sense of ownership as to the country, on the one hand, can be a

source of unity of like-minded people who form a group within the country. On the other hand, it can intensify confrontation, both within the country (provided that the civic identity and a common national idea are not formed) and with the representatives of other countries in the international arena.

In particular, the main manifestations of interethnic tension may be: increasing inter-national aggression; blurring of the borders of the national group; interdependence. The stronger the manifestation of group favoritism, the stronger and more stable the boundaries of this group and the higher the level of rejection of members of the outgroup. The higher level of collective ownership as to own country and national majority is due to a less positive attitude towards national minorities who do not accept the values, culture and traditions of the majority. At the same time, they demonstrated a high level of European integration trends without fear of blurring national borders within. The level of formation of a collective sense of ownership as to own country affects the level of social and civic activity of the individual and the community and the choice of appropriate life strategies.

Practical significance of the scientific intelligence is the possibility of using research results to develop programs for the formation of responsible citizenship based on the development and actualization of collective ownership and forecasting civic activity.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. The actualization of national identity and collective sense of ownership in the absence of a common national idea can contribute to the unity of the national majority, and can escalate inter-national tensions and increase the diversity of foreign policy orientations of the country. We understand the collective sense of ownership of our country as an affective-cognitive residence of joint appropriation and attachment to the state as an object of property, which can be described as «our».

As a result of the work of international focus groups, it was determined that a high level of supranational identity is formed under conditions of stable national development, a sense of security of citizens regarding the integrity of the country and the established civic identity. In conditions of feeling the threat of loss of territories or real facts, citizens demonstrate a higher level of actualization of the collective sense of ownership of their country, readiness to protect it, defend its national identities, such as language, symbols, traditions etc. It is shown that the actualized collective sense of ownership of the country, on the one hand, can be a source of unity of like-minded people who form a group within the country. On the other hand, it can intensify confrontation, both within the country (provided that the civic identity and a common national idea are not formed) and with the representatives of other countries in the international arena.

Manifestation of a collective sense of ownership as to own country may depend on a number of socio-psychological factors: the experience of common collective emotional states, internal and external realistic, symbolic and proprietary threats, feelings of dominance or dependence, intergroup and group comparison, threat of loss of ownership, self-investment, psychological sense of ownership, social competition, reconstruction of civic identity, including those related to its activities and the realization of the individual in the community.

Prospects for further research are in the empirical study of the level of collective ownership of Ukrainians in relation to their own country and representatives of different ethnic minorities lived in Ukraine, determining the relationship between ownership and the level of civic and ethnic identity, tolerance for other smaller, different ideological orientations. Also, future areas of research may be a systematic study of the factors and intergroup consequences of the actualization of the collective sense of ownership of their country. In our opinion, systematic attention to the issues of collective sense of ownership is important and very promising. It can promote social psychological thinking and research and can increase the field's contribution to understanding intergroup tensions and conflicts in different contexts and situations around the world.

Gratitude. The study was performed within the scientific study «Psychology of personal sense of ownership realization in social practices». We thank the organizers and participants of the international project Eurasian Peace Study Exchange Networking (2017–2019), which included focus groups among foreign master students and doctoral candidates at the Illia State University (Tbilisi, Georgia), the Arctic University in Tromso (Norway), American University of Central Asia (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan).

Bibliography

Бурменко, Т. Д., Карнышев, А. Д. (2003). *Собственность: психолого-экономический анализ*. Иркутск: БГУЭП.

Васютинський, В. О. (2010). *Психологічні виміри спільноти*. Київ.

Джеймс, У. (1991). *Психологія*. Москва.

Карась, А. Ф. (2015). Цивілізаційний проект розгортання громадянської ідентичності в контексті «утіленого розуму». В *Філософія фінансової цивілізації: людина у світі грошей* (с. 70–93). Київ.

Остром, Э. (2011). *Управляя общим. Эволюция институтов коллективной деятельности*. Москва.

Пайпс, Р. (2008). *Собственность и свобода*. М. : Московская школа политических исследований.

Петровська, І. Р. (2016). Громадянська ідентичність: міждисциплінарний аспект наукових досліджень. *Проблеми політичної психології*, 3 (17), 49–58.

Слюсаревський, М. М. (1998). *Люзії і колізії*. Київ.

Хазратова, Н. В. (2004). *Психологія відносин особистості й держави*. Луцьк.

Хазратова, Н. В., & Луценко, М. Ю. (2011). Потреба у власності як соціально-психологічний феномен. *Психологія особистості*, 3, 113–121.

Beaglehole, E. (1931) *Property: A Study in Social Psychology*. London.

Brylka, A., Мдхцен, Т. А., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2015). National identification and intergroup attitudes among members of the national majority and immigrants: Preliminary evidence for the mediational role of psychological ownership of a country. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1), 24–45. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i1.275>

Furby, L. (1980). The origins and early development of possessive behavior. *Political Psychology*, 2, 30–42. doi:10.2307/3790969

Gineikiene, J., Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Auruskeviciene, V. (2016). «Ours» or «theirs»? Psychological ownership and domestic products preferences. *Journal of Business Research*. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.11.003

Nijs, T., Martinovic, B., Verkuyten, M., & Sedikides K. (2020). «This country is OURS»: The exclusionary potential of collective psychological ownership. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12386>

Pierce, J. L., & Jussila, I. (2011). *Psychological ownership and the organizational context: Theory, research evidence, and application*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T. & Dirks, K. T. (2002). *The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research*.

Rochat, P., Robbins, E., Passos-Ferreira, C., Oliva, A. D., Dias, M. D., & Guo, L. (2014). Ownership reasoning in children across cultures. *Cognition*, 132, 471–484.

Scafidi, S. (2005). *Who owns culture: Appropriation and authenticity in American law*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Toft, M. D. (2014). Territory and war. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51, 185–198. doi:10.1177/0022343313515695

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

[Verkuyten, M.](#), & [Martinovic, B.](#) (2017). Collective Psychological Ownership and Intergroup Relations. *Perspect Psychol Sci*, 12(6), 1021–1039. doi: [10.1177/1745691617706514](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617706514)

Vignoles, V. L. (2011). Identity motives. In Luycke K., Schwartz S. J., & Vignoles V. L. (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research*. New York, NY, pp. 403–432.

Ye, Y., & Gawronski, B. (2016). When possessions become part of the self: Ownership and implicit self-object linking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 64, 72–87. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2016.01.012

References

Beaglehole, E. (1931) *Property: A Study in Social Psychology*. London. (in English)

Brylka, A., Мдһunen, T. A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2015). National identification and intergroup attitudes among members of the national majority and immigrants: Preliminary evidence for the mediational role of psychological ownership of a country. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1), 24–45. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i1.275> (in English)

Burmenko, T. D., & Karnyshev, A. D. (2003). *Sobstvennost: psikhologo-ekonomicheskii analiz* [Ownership: psycho-economic analysis. Irkutsk. (in Russian)

Furby, L. (1980). The origins and early development of possessive behavior. *Political Psychology*, 2, 30–42. doi:10.2307/3790969 (in English)

Gineikiene, J., Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Auruskeviciene, V. (2016). «Ours» or «theirs»? Psychological ownership and domestic products preferences. *Journal of Business Research*. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.11.003 <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12386> (in English)

James, W. (1991). *Psikhologiya* [Psychology]. Moscow. (in Russian)

Karas, A. F. (2015). Tsyvilizatsiynyi proekt rozhortannia hromadianskoi identychnosti v konteksti «utilenoho rozumu» [A civilizational project of unfolding civic identity in the context of the «embodied mind»]. *Filosofia finansovoi tsyvilizatsii: liudyna u sviti hroshei* [Philosophy of Financial Civilization: Man in the World of Money], Kyiv, pp. 70–93. (in Ukrainian)

Khazratova, N. V. (2004). *Psikhologhiya vidnosyn osobystosti i derzhavy*. [Psychology of the relationship between the individual and the state]. Lutsk. (in Ukrainian)

Khazratova, N. V., & Lutsenko, M. Yu. (2011). Potreba u vlasnosti yak sotsialno-psykholohichnyy fenomen [Need for a property as a social and psychological phenomenon]. *Psikhologhiya osobystosti* [Psychology of personality], 3, 113–121. (in Ukrainian)

Nijs, T., Martinovic, B., Verkuyten, M., & Sedikides, K. (2020). «This country is OURS»: The exclusionary potential of collective psychological ownership. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 1–25. (in English)

Ostrom, E. (2011). *Upravlyaya obshchim. Evolyutsiya institutov kollektivnoy deyatel'nosti* [By managing shared. Evolution of institutions of collective action]. Moscow. (in Russian)

Petrovska, I. R. (2016). Hromadyanska identychnist: mizhdystsyplinarnyi aspekt naukovykh doslidzhen [Civic identity: an interdisciplinary aspect of the research]. *Problemy politychnoi psikhologii* [Problems of Political Psychology], 3 (17), 49–58. (in Ukrainian)

Pierce, J. L., & Jussila, I. (2011). *Psychological ownership and the organizational context: Theory, research evidence, and application*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar. (in English)

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T. & Dirks, K. T. (2002) *The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research*. (in English)

Pipes, R. (2008). *Sobstvennost i svoboda* [Ownership and freedom]. Moscow: Moscow School of Political Studies. (in Russian)

Rochat, P., Robbins, E., Passos-Ferreira, C., Oliva, A. D., Dias, M. D., & Guo L. (2014). Ownership reasoning in children across cultures. *Cognition*, 132, 471–484. (in English)

Scafidi, S. (2005). *Who owns culture: Appropriation and authenticity in American law*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. (in English)

Slyusarevskyy, M. M. (1998). *Iliuzii i kolizii* [Illusions and collisions]. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

Toft, M. D. (2014). Territory and war. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51, 185–198. doi:10.1177/0022343313515695 (in English)

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. (in English)

Vasiutynskyi, V. O. (2010). *Psychologichni vymiry spilnoty* [Psychological dimensions of community]. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[Verkuyten](#), M., & [Martinovic](#), B. (2017). Collective Psychological Ownership and Intergroup Relations. *Perspect Psychol Sci*, 12(6), 1021–1039. doi: [10.1177/1745691617706514](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617706514) (in English)

Vignoles, V. L. (2011). Identity motives. In Luycke K., Schwartz S. J., & Vignoles V. L. (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research*. New York, NY, pp. 403–432. (in English)

Ye, Y., & Gawronski, B. (2016). When possessions become part of the self: Ownership and implicit self-object linking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 64, 72–87. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2016.01.012 (in English)