

## The Typology of Mentality of the Soviet and Post-Soviet Generations

Vlada Pishchik

The Institute of Management, Business and Law  
Russia, Rostov-on-Don, Nagibin's avenue, 33a/47  
E-mail vladaph@yandex.ru, Phone: 89034366076

### Abstract

*The research of types of mentality of the Soviet, transitive and Post-Soviet generations are presented in the South of Russia. The goal of the research: the comparative analysis of types of mentality of generations in a changing society. The typology sights of mentality and methodical approaches to it are analyzed. The typological analysis of mentality is carried out. The nuclear mentalities of generations combined with socially-psychological characteristics and its subsystems, forming its various types are allocated and studied. The results of the research of the valuable bases, social directions, representations about the I, features of relations and types of mentality of the Soviet, Post-Soviet and transitive generations are considered. The essential difference in substantial components and socially-psychological characteristics and their orientation of mentality of the Soviet, transitive and Post-Soviet generations of the South of Russia is found out.*

**Keywords:** mentality, mentality transformation, types of mentality, the Soviet, transitive and Post-Soviet generations, traditional, innovative mentalities.

### 1. Problem statement

In the modern progressive world when the loss of social guidelines of the development of young generation is observed, there is an acute problem of generational dissociation. Therefore the most urgently needed are the comparative researches of types of mentality of generations in a changing society. The problem of typology of mentality has been reflected in early foreign researches of Ф. Броделл, Ф. Граус, Ж. Дюби, Л. Леви-Брюль [5, 7, see on 20], But concerned mainly stable structural elements of mentality and the description of changes of artifacts in past cultures. In modern domestic (К.А. Абульханова, Г.В. Акопов, Г.М. Андреева, А.В. Брушлинский, И.Г. Дубов, Б.А. Душков, З.И. Левин, Т.В. Иванова, В.Ф. Петренко, В.Е. Семенов, В.А. Шкуратов и др.) and foreign researches (J. W. Berri, P.R. Dasen, M.H. Segall, Y.H. Poortingi, H.G. Triandis etc.) [23] are studied mentality structure, but there is no common opinion what to carry to its elements, it shows the influence of conservative elements of mentality on formation of its types, but to a lesser degree its dynamic elements. The given problem has defined the purpose of our research – to reveal and compare the types of mentality presented in the Soviet, transitive and Post-Soviet generations.

### 2. Structure of mentality

Thus we define mentality as difficult system which is integrated by religious, ethnic and social systems of a society. The basis of mentality is coordination of the dominating, material fixed systems of significances, senses and values of the image of the world of the generation, shown in its vital world. It is possible to present mentality as difficult organized system including oversystem (religion, ethnos and society), subsystems (an image of the world and life) and nuclear structures (meanings, senses and values), peripheral structures (socially-psychological characteristics – valuable orientations, social installations, the I-concept, social representations, the form of a discourse, the feature of interaction and relations). The system formative factor of mentality is valuable-semantic combination of its components, caused by domination of religious, ethnic, social system of a society. The system formative function of mentality consists of that brings it into oversystem, nuclear peripheral components and subsystems.

### 3. Typology of mentality

There is a stratum of the works devoted to typology of mentality. The sensual and ideational (П.А. Сорокин) [17, p. 469], ethnic (М.И. Воловикова, Р.А. Додонов, Н.М. Лебедева, Л.Г. Почебут, Е.Н. Резников, А.Н. Татарко) [1], urban, provincial (G.V. Аков, Т.В. Иванова) [8], political (В.Ф. Петренко) [11], polymentality (В.Е. Семенов) [14, 15], construct, secluded, convergent (В.И. Тюпа) [19], preliterate, written and media mentality (В.А. Шкуратов) [18]. In the concept of three mental stages of В.А. Шкуратов [20, 21, 22] mentality is defined as «human measurement of historical macro weights or human activity, objectified in cultural monuments» [20, p. 59]. At the heart of change of mental stages lies the ways of thinking changes, features of communications.

Preliterate mentality of a primitive society which is based on mystical thinking and direct communication. Written mentality assumes coexistence of irrational and rational thinking of subjects. The process of communication is regulated by communicators. Media mentality is characterized by the communication mediated by transmitting terminal. The given approach considers mentality widely without its attachment to a certain society [21].

From the concept of polymentality of В.Е. Семенов [14, 15], supposing that there is a big variety of mentalities in culture. В.Е. Семенов defines mentality as historically developed group long-term unity (alloy) of conscious and unconscious values, norms, installations in them cognitive, emotional and behavioral expression of certain levels of population [14]. He allocated collectivistic -social, West capitalistic, orthodox, criminal- mafia-controlled and mosaic-conformist mentality in Russia. In his opinion they are supported by cultural-historical sociopsychological realities and facts. In our opinion the author has most approached a question of communication in a social situation of the development of levels of population and mentality.

The next typologies of mentalities cover the following phenomena, in which mentality is represented: consciousness, perception, interpretation, identification, valuable orientations, installations, ways of thinking and communication, social representations, strategy and character of interaction of collective subjects. Two poles of mentality in П.А. Сорокин [17] were transformed in multilateral typologies in other authors. We suppose that it must be two initial poles, those are – traditions as the form of social inheritance, communication and an innovation as «the form of a deviation, nonconformist» (С. Московичи), and others are as their continuations. Thus, the basis of contrasts lies in С. Московичи influence process as actions and counteractions [18].

In our typology of mentality the criteria of distinctions were parameters of the I-concept, significances of an image of the world, values of a way of life, a discourse [12]. Their combination has defined traditional, transitive, innovative and postinnovative mentalities. The name «traditional mentality» was accepted by analogy with confirmed in cross-cultural psychology by the name of «traditional culture». In traditional culture the transfer of traditions, well-established experience of the way of life is passed on generations on direct transmission. «Innovative mentality» as opposed to traditional is innovative culture in which the transmission of tradition is already "indirect" and tradition is leveled. The tradition is multiplied, stops to be definite and homogeneous in the period of innovations. Transitive and post innovative mentality is transitive types of mentality. During various epochs these types of mentality have various substantial filling. Based on the previous researches, it is possible to suppose that today we observe a transitive epoch in an orientation of transformations of mentality from collectivism to individualism.

#### **4. The methodical bases of research of types of mentality**

The various methodical bases are presented in works [1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19]. The “Annales” School in the beginning of XX century offered their methods of historic-cultural reconstruction of mentality of last epochs [4, 5, 7], developed by modern writers [3, 20]. Г.М. Андреева, Г.Г. Дилигенский, Т.Г. Стефаненко, etc., recreate «psychological character» of big social groups [2], investigating customs, manners, activity products, language, social representations, applying methods of ethnography, sociology, linguistics, history. The similar methodical bases for carrying out of socially-psychological research of big groups suggest imposing by Г.В. Акопов, Т.В. Иванова [8]. The writers allocate mentalities of different levels of subjectivity. Proceeding from this, they suggest to compare different mentalities of one subjectivity level (horizontal cuts).

The following possible methodical basis is application of psychosemantic methods (Е.Ю. Артемьева, В.Ф. Петренко) [11].

Nowadays the solution of a problem of a mentality affirmed psychosocial, typological and cross-cultural approach (К.А. Абульханова, А.Л. Журавлев, М.И. Воловикова, 2005) [1, 13]. The psychosocial approach is based on the mental phenomena on social and mental levels, thus they are considered in all their difficult interrelation and relations, as system, multidimensional formations. К.А. Абульханова represents the typological approach as a procedural way of its construction when the next stage suggests the set of methodological and theoretical questions. It suggests two strategy of the research of integrity of mentality: from within – partial research of its components and from without – comparative research of mentality of other societies [1, p.40]. В.Е. Семенов by means of mass polls defines a part of this or that type of mentality among the population [15]. Г.Л. Воронин has presented a writer's technique of measurement of mentality [9]. As the primary empirical data estimated reactions of respondents on aphorisms, maxims, proverbs. It is the sociological approach in research. The basis of methodical problem in studying of mentality is that the phenomenon of mentality is complicated and studied mainly its separate making (installations, values, representations), its separate phenomena. But the system integrity of mentality is lost.

## 5. Empirical facts

There was a research conducted in Rostov-on-Don, Salsk (June, 2006 – May 2010). The empirical base of research was presented by the big social groups differentiated concerning significant social-cultural event – reorganization during the course the social order, pattern of ownership were changed. The sampling was represented by following groups of generations: Post-Soviet 1990-95 of a birth (750 people); transitive 1980-85, 1960-65 (745 people) and Soviet 1940-1945 (740 people). The Post-Soviet generation born after reorganization- is basic, experimental group. The Soviet and transitive generations born on border between two epoch – control group.

The following methodical instrument was applied: the Technique of cultural-valuable differential (Г.У. Солдатова, И.М. Кузнецов, С.В. Рыжова) [16]; the Scale of measurement of social installations (H.G. Triandis, 1995) [24], the test of twenty statements (M. Kun, T. MakPartland) [24]; the Technique of research of representation of the person about itself and other people (T. Liri, 2005); the Technique of research of various kinds of tolerance (М.С. Жамкочьян, В.С. Магун, М.М. Магупа, 2000) [10]; the Technique of diagnostics of characteristics of generations' mentality (В.И. Пищик, 2006) [12]. By us it has been revealed that at transitive generations in cultural-valuable differential presented horizontal individualism with parameters: hearfulness, dissociation, independence, individualism, mistrust to the power, traditionalism, a collectivism, willfulness, love of freedom, anarchy, coldness, rivalry, propensity to risk ( $p < 0,05$ ). In group of the Soviet generations is revealed a construct of the horizontal collectivism, characterized by: mutual assistance, fidelity to traditions, an openness, tendency in the past and in the future, warmth, discipline and respect of the power ( $p < 0,05$ ). Measurement of social installations (G.K. Triandis's scale), has shown that in group of transitive and Soviet generations the installations focused on a collectivism, and in group of Post-Soviet generations on individualism.

Representations about the "I" were studied. It is revealed that the majority of statements: 35 % at transitive generations and 40 % at the Soviet generations – possess signs of interdependence from group (social answers on H.G. Triandis). Ethnic and religious representations are less presented in them. The conclusion about domination of social up system of mentalities. In group of Post-Soviet generations there are 60 % of statements independent of group. It follows from this that representations about the "I" in group of the Soviet and transitive generations of a collectivist orientation, and in group of Post-Soviet generations – an individualistic orientation ( $p < 0,05$ ).

Tolerance/intolerance degree in relations between generations is defined. Ethnic tolerance in transitive generations has got the lowest points. Above an average has received tolerance to complexity and uncertainty of world around. Mean points has received tolerance to different views, tolerance of deviation from the standard norms and non authoritarianism. In group of the Soviet generations low points have been received on tolerance of deviation from the standard norms. Very low tolerance is revealed to different views and non authoritarianism. Mean points have been received on ethnic tolerance. Above an average points on tolerance to complexity and uncertainty of world around are got. As a whole the results of measurement of kinds of tolerance in group of transitive and Soviet generations, significantly differ ( $\alpha < 0,05$ ). That can indirectly be their precondition intolerance relations. By results of T. Liri's method the transitive generation in relations is characterized by authoritativeness, obstinacy, incomppliance and coldness in relations that confirms results of research of their cultural-valuable differential. Representatives of the Soviet generation are more exacting, self-confident, more sympathetic, and obstinate.

As a result of application of an writer's method, it has been revealed that in group of transitive generations innovative mentality is found out in 47 %, transitive in 27 % and traditional in 23 % of the person, post innovative in 3 %. In group of the Soviet generation the majority has traditional mentality. Thus, the deviation from traditions in the environment of young generation is observed. As a result of research it has been revealed that at the Soviet generations prevails traditional mentality with following socially-psychological characteristics: interdependent representations about the "I", collectivist values, an orientation on social stabilization, prevalence of conformism in relations, discursive homogeneity. At Post-Soviet generations prevails innovative mentality with following socially-psychological characteristics: independent representations about the "I", individualistic values, with an orientation on social changes, discursive heterogeneity. The typological analysis of mentality was carried out. The nuclear components of mentality of generations combined with socially-psychological characteristics and its subsystems, forming its various types were allocated and studied. It is defined that combination of a traditional image of the world and life with special nuclear and peripheral structures and domination in relations of generations of tradition generates a traditional mentality. Combination of innovative image of the world and life with special nuclear and peripheral structures and innovation domination in relations of generations generates innovative mentality.

Transfer from tradition to innovation occurs through transitive types of mentality. We researched the comparison of components of mentality in Post-Soviet generations of Southern region of Russia and the Soviet generations. As a result in the Soviet generation prevails the traditional type of mentality, and in Post-Soviet generations – innovative type of mentality. The comparative analysis of components of mentality of the Soviet, transitive and Post-Soviet generations were carried out. It is shown that in the kernel of mentality of the Soviet generations values and senses of socially useful work, formation, a family and health are presented, on the periphery friendship, mutual assistance, courage, honesty and responsibility are fixed. In a kernel of mentality of transitive generations we meet cognitive values and senses, self-realization and a family, on the periphery the vigorous activity and creativity. In a kernel of mentality of postinnovative generations values and senses of happy family lives, independent judgments and pleasures are fixed, on mentality periphery cheerfulness, responsibility self-checking and courage in upholding of the opinion is marked.

## References

1. Абульханова, К.А. (1999). Психология и сознание личности: избранные психологические труды. М.: МПСИ; Воронеж: НПО МОДЭК.
2. Андреева, Г.М. (2000). Психология социального познания. М.: Аспект Пресс.
3. Барская, А.Д. Особенности мышления гомеровского человека // Вестник МГУ. Сер. 14. Психология. 1997. С. 23–32.
4. Блок, М. (1973). Апология истории или ремесло историка. М.: Наука.
5. Бродель, Ф. Материальная цивилизация, экономика и капитализм XV–XVIII вв. В 3 Т. Структуры повседневности: возможное и невозможное. Т. 1. М.: Прогресс. 1986.
6. Воронин, Г.Л. Типология ценностно-нормативных ориентаций // Социологический журнал. № 3, 1995. С. 151–158.
7. Дюби, Ж. История ментальностей // Историческая антропология: Зарубежные исследования в обзорах и рефератах. М.: РАН, Ин-т всеобщ. Истории и Рос. Гос. Гуманитарный ун-т. 1996.
8. Менталистика: проблемы, решение, перспективы исследований (ментальность поволжского социума в научных проектах). Самара: СНЦ РАН – СамГПУ, 2001.
9. Методика "Менталитет" (С. Балабанова и Г.Л. Воронина) // Процессы идентификации российских граждан в социальном пространстве «своих» и «несвоих» групп и сообществ (1999-2002 г.г.) Мастер-класс профессора В.А. Ядова Методологический практикум для студентов социологов Москва, 2004 г. С.37–38.
10. На пути к толерантному сознанию / Отв. ред. А.Г. Асмолов. М.: Смысл, 2000.
11. Петренко, В.Ф. (1997). Основы психосемантики. М.: Изд. МГУ.
12. Пищик, В.И. (2007). Трансформация ментальности: Системный подход. Ростов-на-Дону: Изд.-во СКНЦ ВШ ЮФУ.
13. Российский менталитет: вопросы психологической теории и практики / Под ред. К.А. Абульхановой, А.В. Брушлинского, М.И. Воловиковой. М.: «Институт Психологии РАН», 1997
14. Семенов, В.Е. Современная российская полиментальность и ментальные типы молодежи // Ментальность россиян провинции. Сборник материалов IV –ой Всероссийской конференции по исторической психологии российского сознания. 1–2 июля 2004 г. Самара: Изд-во СГПУ. 2005. С.159–163.
15. Семенов, В.Е. Типология российских менталитетов и имманентная идеология России // Вестник СПбГУ. Сер. 6. 1997. Вып. 4. № 27. С. 59–67.
16. Солдатов, Г. У. (1998). Психология межэтнической напряженности. – М.: Смысл.
17. Сорокин, П.А. Кризис нашего времени // Человек. Цивилизация. Общество / Общ. Ред., сост. и предисл. А.Ю. Согомонов: Пер. с англ. М.: Политиздат, 1992. С. 427- 488.
18. Социальная психология / Под ред. С. Московичи. СПб.: Питер, 2007. С. 64.
19. Тюпа, В.И. Диагностика ментального кризиса // Мир России № 1, 2002. С. 153-165.
20. Шкуратов, В.А. (2006). Искусство экономной смерти. Сотворение видеомира. Ростов-на-Дону: Наррадигма.
21. Шкуратов, В. А. (1994). Историческая психология. Ростов-на-Дону.: Горд N.
22. Шкуратов, В.А. Провинциальная ментальность десять лет спустя // Ментальность российской провинции. Сборник материалов IV –ой Всероссийской конференции по исторической психологии российского сознания. 1-2 июля 2004. Самара: Изд-во СГПУ. 2005. С. 82–92.
23. Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., Dasen, P. R. (2002). Cross-cultural psychology research and applications. Cambridge University Press.
24. Triandis, H. C. (2005). Culture and social behavior. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., New York.