Review

Does culture determine mind, or is culture determined by mind?

Alexander Zelitchenko

(Cyprus)E-mail: zelitchenk@cytanet.com.cy.

The observations of motives of activity of big groups (nations, confessions, etc.) as a whole result in discovery of the part of unconscious mind that is common for all members of big group – a collective unconscious. Two parts of collective unconscious may be determined: the collective superconscious known first as a group archetype and the collective subconscious, which manifest itself for example in phenomenon of collective trauma. Depth sociopsychology is a science about the collective unconscious, which emerges on the border between social psychology, cross-cultural psychology, depth psychology, experimental psychosemantics, science of culture and sociology. The article discusses the subject, the tasks and the methods of sociopsychology. In particular, methods originated in the studies of meaning-making structures of individual mind are outlined.

Key words: Collective unconscious, big groups, psychology of nations, collective traumas, group archetypes.

INTRODUCTION

The question in the title of this article is not of the same kind as the famous chicken-or-egg problem. Indeed, as in the case of Aristotle paradox, here it is also impossible to choose one of the proposed alternative answers. However, in the present case this inability results in discovery of new reality, which is responsible for both cultural forming of mind and mental forming of culture.

By definition, cross-cultural psychology studies the imprints of culture on mind, that is, culture-determined forms of mind – behavioral stereotypes, opinions, values, etc. A culture "makes" ("forms", in a little more intellectual language) a mind. This axiom limits philosophical perspective of cross-cultural psychology preventing the question, "What make cultures themselves?"

The answer to this question only seems to be obvious. Of course, cultures are made by the joined works of many individuals, or, in other words, by joined works of many individual minds. However, what does direct these many individual works transforming them into one common work? The answers like "nothing" or "they are self-organized" cannot satisfy exactly the researcher, which observes the strictly defined patterns of the indivi-dual cultures. He clearly sees that each culture has its own idea and that the concept *idea of culture* is not just a theoretical construct but an obvious reality. However, where is the source of this idea? From what is it originated?

One essence with many names

Questions raised in this study like those in the foregoing lead to understanding that behind the complex coordinated work of millions "builders of a culture", which lasts many centuries and which is executed by many generations, there is some reality, which is characterized by following properties:

1. This reality is mental, intrapsychical because it controls and directs individual behavior.
2. This reality is transpersonal because it controls and directs in the same way the behavior of many individuals.
3. This reality is unconscious because most individuals who are subjects of its control are not aware of this force.
4. This reality may become conscious and does become more and more conscious for some individuals who discover its presence in own psyche.

This reality may be named *common mind*, or *collective unconscious* (Jung, 1934–1954), or *collective soul* (*l'ame collective* that was introduced end elaborated by Durkheim, 1895/1938; Tarde, 1899/2000; Le Bon, 1896/1982 and other early sociologists), or *soul of culture*, or *group archetype* (Zelitchenko, 2006).

Reality of the invisible

Adjectives *invisible* and *subtle* do not necessarily mean *weak*. Indeed, observable manifestations of collective unconscious demonstrate the quite powerful force. This force is especially well known for politicians, which try to change deliberately the cultural-determined forms of mind and behavior of the peoples of developing countries in frameworks of global process. Often they meet so strong resistance, which is able to convince in reality of the unconscious even most materialistically and pragmatically thinking practical worker.

Today one may often see the resistances and the aggressiveness as a response on attempts to introduce Western values of democracy and/or of human rights into many non-Western states; and these reactions are based on the mood of significant part of society rather than on political interests of the elite. The same resistance may be observed in Western societies themselves, especially in Europe in form of tensions between European newcomers and "old Europeans". When the analysis of reasons of such tensions is limited by the surface level of mind, for example, level of opinions that may be easily changed by means of education or propaganda, and excludes from consideration the unconscious "variables", such analysis fails to deal with the strong power of resistance to dissemination of Western values in Muslim world or in many of former Soviet republics. For some reasons many people of the Developing World continue to value what their fathers, grandfathers and much more far processors valued, so strongly that often they are ready to sacrifice own (and what even worse, not only own) lives.

This is why today many observers have already started: (a) to overcome the initial surprise, why "they" reject to replace their old "bad" values by our "good" ones; (b) to guess about existence of the forces, which keep old values, beliefs, etc., intact; and (c) to ask, what are these forces?

The search for these invisible but more than real forces, which have the deep roots in mind, demands a researcher answers not only on question of "What (happens)?", but also on question of "Why (this happens)?". This shift directs the cross-cultural psychologists into the border field between cross-cultural psychology, depth psychology, religious philosophy and philosophy of history.

For example, the cross-confessional studies focus usually on differences in content of beliefs. However, people not only have different believes, but they believe differently: the modes of how they believe are different. Moreover, this difference in modes of believing sometimes is more important for understanding cross-confessional relationships than the difference in content of believes. So, Western and Eastern Christians has almost the same content of believes. The differences in dogmata seem to be rather small and insignificant. Besides, they (for example, famous *Filioque*) are simply unknown and incomprehensible for most part of believers. However, all attempts to bridge the gulf between Western and Eastern Christianities even when they were made in extremely favorable political situation (for example, East-West Union reached in Council of Florence, 1439) have always resulted in failures.

The attempts to understand the reasons of these failures lead to the discovery of the great difference between two Christianities, which manifest itself, for example, in the obvious dissimilarity between the architecture of Eastern Churches (for example, Hagia Sophia Church in Istanbul or Saint Basil's Cathedral in Moscow) and the architecture of Western Churches like Notre Dame de Paris. To reveal the reasons of such difference one must go beyond the surface level of content of believes and/or religious opinions to deeper level of religious feelings and semiconscious (mystic) experience on border of the conscious mind and the unconscious one and even deeper to the unconscious roots of these experiences.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COMMON MIND AND INDIVIDUAL MINDS - EMERGING SOCIOPSYCHOLOGY

The common mind is an attribute of a group rather than one of an individual. Hence, in some sense, the common mind is "bigger" than the individual one, which is studied by psychology. Moreover, although a researcher in introspection first observes the common mind inside of his own individual mind, the common mind is not the "part" of the individual mind. A common mind is the different essence (although is not separate essence). And at the same time, the common mind is more "inner", "more behind", more latent, more "implicit", more "ephemeral" than the attributes of the group that is studied by sociology.

This is why the common mind demands the separate scientific discipline to study it, or, in other words, constitutes the subject of the separate science, the new science, which for the time being still has to be developed. The author named this science *sociopsychology*.

Depth sociopsychology

The sociopsychology as a science about a group's psyche has mutual overlapping with both social psychology and cross-cultural psychology. However,

inside the subject of sociopsychology there is the field that clearly distinguishes sociopsychology from both social psychology and cross-cultural psychology. This field is the unconscious part of group's psyche, that is, the set of forces that determine the structure of visible manifestations of group's psyche in both the form of group's behavior and the form of cultural products of this behavior.

Here the sociopsychology borders on the analytical psychology of Jung (1934–1954) and the archetypal psychology of Hillman (1997). The unconscious part of group's psyche constitutes the subject of *depth sociopsychology*, subdiscipline of sociopsychology dealing with the common part of the individual unconscious, which is the same for each member of such *big* groups as nations, cultures, confessions, etc.

Necessity of the new science

The impact of insights of analytical psychology and archetypal psychology is limited because of inability to validate these insights in a manner usable and acceptable by academic science. The same reason limits their applied significance: there is no methodology to apply them to the practical issues. For example, for billions of archetypes of different age and of different degree of universality there are more or less limited amount of "differential" archetypes, which are responsible for distinguishing one society (nations, people, culture, etc.) from another. Knowledge of these archetypes would be of great favor for everybody involved in cross-national, cross-cultural or cross-confessional interactions and interrelations. However, in its present state, the depth psychology experiences significant difficulties even when it works with individual unconscious, and of course has no "technology" to work with collective unconscious besides the wise observers' insights when they study societies, cultures and so on.

The central problem here is the insufficient operationalization of the concepts of analytical or archetypal psychologies, and first of all, of the central concept *archetype.*

The subject of sociopsychology and the subject of depth sociopsychology

The subject of sociopsychology consists of the mental – both conscious and unconscious – patterns, which are common for all members of a big group. The conscious patterns include common language, opinions, values, attitudes, some common goals, some behavioral patterns and so on. All these may be named by the word "culture".

Among unconscious patterns, the archetypes must be named first. However, to operationalize the concept *archetype*, its meaning has to be clarified. This is done in terms of philosophical concept *idea*, psychological concept *activity* and computer science's concept

program: the group's archetype is the unconscious form of presence of the idea (or program) of the group's common activity in the mind of the group's members.

There are two types of archetypes: (a) *archetype-what*, that is, the content of the common "programs", which predetermines the character of group's culture; and (b) *archetypes-how*, or *style* of group activity, which is sometimes called *national character* or group psychical constitution, that is, the common mental traits of the members of group.

Philosophical perspective

In general, mental activity may be considered as a system of ideas that are realized by a person. Each idea gives a person some aim and some "system of coordinates" for evaluating relationships between things of world and, in particular, for recognizing the meanings of these things. In addition, each idea "programs" its own activity of person and in this sense controls person's behavior.

Ideas and the corresponding activities differ in their scales – from the very short-term ideas-activities like *to go in the restaurant*, which are recognized by a person more or less completely, to the very long-term ones, which may not be recognized by a person at all, in spite he does realize these big ideas together with millions of collaborators. For example, the person participates in economic development of his country even when he does not guess about this and even when he never heard the words "economic development".

The big ideas-activities consist of smaller ones, and each of small idea-activity may be considered as a part of one or more bigger ones. Only relatively small ideas are individual. More or less big ideas are realized by groups, the bigger ideas are realized by the bigger group. The big collective ideas imprint in individual mind of realizing the group's members in exactly same manner as the small individual ideas do, with only difference that the impression of big idea is bigger. These impressions are common for all members of the group although not everybody or even nobody in the group is aware of the group's idea completely. Thus, each person has his own impressions of ideas, which he realizes together with his society, together with people of his culture, or even together with all humankind. Many hundred pages of Spengler's "The Decline of the West" (1918-1923/1991), where he describes the idea of Antic culture, or the idea of Arabic culture, or the idea of Western culture, illustrate how complex, how "information-rich" such ideas are.

A person may be aware of big-scale long-term ("strategic") ideas-activities in best very partially only. Moreover, from this recognizable part, the conscious-centered "part of part" only is recognized clearly in verbal form, whereas the rest "peripheral" parts are represented in the person's consciousness vague, in form of dim and mysterious, semiconscious feelings. Thus, one may say

that big common ideas "overlap" the conscious mind and root in the unconscious, and what is more important, in such unconscious, which is common for all members of the group, that is, in the collective unconscious. But in spite of their ephemeral appearance, such ideas do have a great motive power, which may be permanently seen in a history and which many people may easily see in themselves when they pay attention on how important their values are and on how big sacrifices they are ready sometimes for some of these values.

DIFFERENTIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND DIFFERENTIAL CROSS-CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY

It is important to realize the difference between individual traits, which constitute the subject of differential psychology of personality, and group traits, which are studied by differential cross-cultural psychology. Many of the lasts, which differentiate big groups but not members inside of a big group, from the point of view of any "ethnocentric" psychology constitute the subject of general psychology, rather than one of differential psychology. In the language of classical maxima "Every man is in certain respects: (a) like all other men, (b) like some other men, (c) like no other man" (Kluckhohn and Murray, 1953: 53). It must be noted that researchers often confuse the items (a) and (b) categorizing as "like all other men" what is indeed is only "like some other men" of their own culture. Say, the specific character of "thinking in English" based on specific traits of English language is not observable without comparison with the group, which "think in French" (it is worthy to note here, the psychology, which is studied in any country, in significant degree focuses on this country's mental specificity).

Of course, some traits distinguish both individual of the same culture and the groups belonging to different cultures. Moreover, most of the current studies in cross-cultural psychology investigate just such traits. Say, we may determine that IQ of European adolescents is higher than IQ of Australian aborigines. However, it is necessary to remember that these quantitative differences form only subset of the whole set of traits that differentiate cultures. Another (and perhaps, for many research tasks more important) group of traits includes the qualitative differences, that is, the traits that characterize only one culture and cannot be applied to other cultures (like hunting with boomerang in the example above). Today there is tendency to underestimate both the number of qualitative differences between cultures and – what is more important – their significance. However, in comparison with modern cross-cultural psychology, for the depth sociopsychology, qualitative differences are more important because most of the archetypal differences are qualitative. In Appendix A, this study considers one important group of qualitative archetypal traits – the characteristic of metareligious mind.

Superconscious versus subconscious in the collective unconscious: Archetypes and Traumas

Archetypes are not only components of collective unconscious. The part of collective unconscious that is constituted by archetypes may be named *collective superconscious*. However, besides the collective superconscious, there is another "component" of the collective unconscious - the *collective subconscious*, which plays in the life of big group even more noticeable role and which is more known for academic psychology. The phenomenon consists of collective memorizing of negative experience of big group, for example, one nation's painful experience of interaction with other nation, which facilitates cross-national conflicts and is transferred to those members of group that did not experience such collective traumas personally (Collective Trauma, n.d.; Kellermann, 2007).

Ideas that come in the conscious from the subconscious manifest themselves in form of strong negative feelings. Such phenomena in individual mind are studied in psychoanalysis, but they are present also in common mind. The phenomena of collective pain, angry, fears, etc., may be found in connection with all cross-national conflicts even when these conflicts happened ten (and sometimes even several hundred) years ago and no participants of those events live today.

Tasks of depth sociopsychology

Both the structure and the character of tasks of depth sociopsychology are similar to the ones of other psychological disciplines.

Theoretical tasks

The central theoretical tasks of general depth sociopsychology are the investigations of: (a) the composition of collective unconscious and its structure; (b) the relationships between collective unconscious and an individual mind; (c) the relationships between the collective unconscious and visible (conscious) phenomena of individual and group psychology; (d) the dynamic of the collective unconscious, including factors that are responsible for its changes. Among the last group of tasks (the dynamic of the unconscious), there are some problems of special significance, for example, the problem of interaction of two collective unconscious, when they meet in one individual mind – the problem of identification, acculturation, etc., or one of dissemination of collective traumas trough the souls of individual members of big group.

On the border between the theoretical depth sociopsychology and the philosophical depth sociopsychology, there is a very important problem of origination of collective unconscious – how it emerged, and as a result of which factors and/or forces.

Among the theoretical tasks of differential depth sociopsychology, the important place is occupied by the task of determination and operationalization of variables, which distinguish one big group (society, nations, cultures, etc.) from others. For example, what is the psychological content of such concepts as *Europeanness*, *Americanness* and *Russianness* or as *Muslimness*, *Catholicness* and *Orthodoxness* (Zelitchenko, 2009a)? (It is worthy to note that intensity of such "traits" does not necessarily correlate with self-perception: for example, the person with high Europeanness does not necessarily categorize himself as a European). This example demonstrates the need in special language to deal with the differences between big groups, which must be similar to the language of personal traits in differential psychology of personality. Some adoptions from the last are also possible, but they may resolve the problem in best partially only: the differences between nations cannot be described in terms of extraversion or neuroticism.

Applied tasks of depth sociopsychology

Because the collective unconscious is the powerful factor, which motivates and directs the behavior of big groups, the abilities to predict and (when it is possible) to control collective unconscious are priceless for policymakers. This ability would allow them to facilitate cross-cultural dialogue and to make it more smooth and effective.

Why are conflicts emerging? How can peace be achieved? What ways for cultural expansion are optimal? These are just few questions, on which applied depth sociopsychology must answer. What is the psychological base of anti-Western attitudes of the peoples of some developing countries? How do they see such Western values as human rights, peace and democracy? Why do they not accept these values? Is the main reason for such attitude experienced recently by trauma, attributed by a part of the society to Western policy? Or is the main reason as a result of conflict of values, due to the fact that a part of the society sees some Western values as dangerous with respect to their own society's values? Or is the main reason un-articulated to the common feeling of own idea (mission), which must be realized by society and which demand ideological autonomy? And if so, what do they suggest instead, what is their view of justice? Or is the main reason something else? What kind of tolerance may be expected from the members of different cultures and subcultures, that is, what are people of different cultures ready to tolerate and what are they not ready to tolerate in any case? What mental structures are responsible for un-tolerance? Do these structures formed by educational system and propaganda aimed at promoting tolerance?

To deal with all these and many similar questions a researcher needs the new context for consideration of the relationships between cultures – the context of the complex system of interrelations and interactions between trans-individual archetypal ideas-activities. However, such system of mutual interaction demands even broader context – one of meta-historical analysis, which considers interactions of different archetypal ideas as a part of historical process forming the psyche (Zelitchenko, 2006).

The other group of questions relates to acculturation. How long do the cross-cultural differences exist: how many years (or even how many generations) must come until the immigrant or the heir of immigrants will become the member of new society not only legally but also psychologically? How powerful is the force of archetypal ideas that resist acculturation? How stable are mental structures that were created by them, that is, how easy and quickly can they be changed and by what means?

Prediction and control

As in any applied science, two groups of tasks – prediction and control – form the body of applied tasks of depth sociopsychology. In line with all branches of depth psychology and in contrast with common scientific situation, in applied depth sociopsychology, the task of "control" of subconscious (although not of super-conscious) is in some respects simpler than the task of prediction. Of course, one cannot bend subconscious to his will, but in some cases transforming the subconscious into the conscious, it is possible to "discharge" safely its dangerous potential. This idea is basic for all depth psychology and it is equally applicable for depth sociopsychology.

Of course, the methods of collective recognition of a big group early differed from the ones of depth psychotherapy because they are based on special large-scale information policy rather than on relatively compact meetings of therapist with client or with small group of clients. Nevertheless, the raise of both policymakers and general public's awareness of the invisible psychological roots of common negative attitudes, which potentially are able to result in confronting policy or even in open conflicts, is the main applied tasks of depth socio-psychology as well as a similar task which is the central one for depth psychotherapy. Thus, the investigation of collective traumas, which discloses their presence and makes them the subject of common awareness by all parts involved, opens the way to heal cross-national and cross-cultural conflicts.

What is about control of the collective superconscious, here the problem of control itself has to be reformulated. Neither the group's mental constitution (national character), nor the program of the group's lives can be changed by deliberate efforts of this or neighboring groups. This does not mean that the problem of control of superconscious is completely meaningless. However, the meaningful task here may be to accelerate deliberately

realization of the group's program that is "ciphered" in the group's archetype, what, in turn, results in the acceleration of both development of the group and the realization of the idea of the group's archetype-what.

The prediction of the behavior of collective unconscious is based on the understanding of its nature, its functions, its "living cycle" and its current state inside this living cycle. Attempts to answer some of these questions made this study to discover the limits of depth sociopsychology (in narrow meaning of term) into the field of metahistory and philosophy of history, what, in turn, leads to even more general ontological considerations.

Methods of depth sociopsychology

The natural way to develop the methodology of depth sociopsychology seems to be combining the methods of depth psychology with the ones of cross-cultural psychology. The problem is, however, that both parent methodologies are different in too many important aspects to be amalgamated easily.

Methods of cross-cultural psychology are brief, standardized techniques aiming to be administrated on big samples to extract a rather surface descriptive data about the respondents' consciousness. Usually these are the standardized surveys based on self-reports with all their limitations.

In contrast to them, most methods of depth psychology are rather time-consuming techniques with poorly structured procedure. Moreover, the assessment of the unconscious often is not the primary goal of these methods, whereas their primary goal is the rise of clients' awareness of their unconscious: they were elaborated not as research methods, but as the methods of treatment. None of these allow the use of the methods of depth psychology (as they are, without principal modifications) in mass studies (This impossibility was one of the reasons of severe criticism in address of Jung's ideas: the absence of objective means to validate his insights resulted in an inability to study collective unconscious and/or imprints of culture on individual mind experimentally).

Actually, the compact and relatively standard assessment methods in depth psychology are known also. Luscher Color Test (Luscher, 1971), or Wagner Hand Test (Wagner, 1962), or Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Test (Rosenzweig, 1978) (although it may be in less degree) are examples of such tests. However, in spite of seemingly attractiveness of non-verbal projective tests for cross-cultural psychologists, the attempts to use projective tests (DuBois, 1961; Allen and Dana, 2004; Sarason and Gladwin, 1953) have resulted in rather skeptical attitude of the cross-cultural community in respect of such tests (Vijver, 1999). Although the reasons of such scepticism were different, at least one of them must be mentioned here: the absolute majority of projective test was elaborated to study the traits which

seemed to their author as universal and culture independent ones, and, hence, the test themselves from the very early stages of their development did not aim to investigate the cultural-determined human traits. Thus, depth sociopsychology does need its own methods, which are quite different from the methods of both cross-cultural psychology and depth psychology. The development of such methods begins at the operationalized definition of the object of study, that is, at determining the set of empiric (observable and measurable) traits, in which the collective unconscious manifests itself.

There are three big classes of such traits. The first class is the system of individual meanings, which constitute the subject of *psychosemantics*. The second class is the new mental and/or behavioral traits, which were created in the course of history by the specific culture. The methods, which disclose these "cultural formations", may be named *historical-psychological analysis*. The third class consists of characteristic of culture, that is, the total culture product, which was created by the members of the big group sharing common archetype.

Psychosemantic analysis in sociopsychology

Even poorly recognized big idea nevertheless determines the process of making sense because this is big idea what determines the meaning of small ideas. Archetypal ideas are very big ideas, and different members of the community, which realize such ideas, often have very different activities: do very different things, decide very different tasks. However, all these different activities nevertheless are the parts of one meta-activity realizing the same archetypical idea. When one teaches people for the well-being of his country, whereas the other does work of hangman for the same well-being of the same country, they hate one another, but nevertheless they are workers of one idea, servants of one lord. And as a result, the "upper parts" of the subjective meanings of their rather different activities (or *super-objectives* in the language of Stanislavski, 1936/1988) are the same.

This circumstance allows reconstructing the big "invisible" ideas, which cannot be described in compact manner and which unites the big group, through the study of systems of meanings of this group's members. For example, if somebody evaluates many events from the point of view how they affect on human rights, it may be concluded that this person realizes the idea of humanism even if he does not guess about own humanism and even if he does not use this word at all.

The methods of experimental psychosemantics were elaborated by the group of Moscow psychologists (Artemieva, 1980; Petrenko, 1983; Shmelev, 1983) in further development of ideas that originated from G. Kelly's theory of personal constructs in 1955. These methods allow the disclosure of deeper, meaning-making

patterns of consciousness using simple standard procedure consisting of: (a) collecting of matrix of closeness between the objects of some nature from standard or individual set, and (b) processing this matrix by methods of either factor analysis (Gorsuch, 1983), or cluster analysis (Romesburg, 2004).

However, "geometric", "spatial" philosophy of both factor analysis or cluster analysis resulted in just criticism of some disadvantages of these methods (Factor analysis, n.d.) including, for example, a limitation of interpretation. In fact, both groups of methods in best allow only to establish the existence of "latent variables" with disputable ontological status and to formulate some hypotheses about the character of these variables, which is difficult to verify.

To overcome this criticism, inside the same paradigm the spatial model of individual semantics may be replaced by the structural (or graph) one, creating the richer formal language for describing meaning and, hence, opening the broader possibility for interpretation. The data of scaling a number of objects by some respondent forms the matrix of relationships between these objects and determines the respondent's system of meanings of the scaled objects. These individual matrices (graphs) of meanings being quite different for different members of the group may nevertheless keep some common traits. The search for these traits creates the new field in psychometric – the study of collective meanings. Appendix B illustrates such approach.

OPERATIONALIZATION AND STUDY OF THE COLLECTIVE TRAUMAS THROUGH THE INVESTIGATION OF COMMON ATTITUDES

Important particular case of studies of the systems of collective meanings is the studies of common attitudes of big group's members and, in particular, the collective traumas.

Usually it is not difficult to detect the fact itself which is the presence of trauma. Such fact is almost self-obvious: nobody tried to determine whether 9/11 or tsunami resulted in traumas in USA and Indonesia, respectively, or not. However, what is much more complex is to measure the severity of trauma, in particular, because the collective trauma may manifest itself in a quite different mode than individual traumas do, for example without any symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Posttraumatic stress disorder, n.d.).

A collective trauma does have one distinctive feature – the common negative attitude in respect of the group, to which the victims attribute the reason of traumatic event. This feature allows to devise the method of assessment of the severity of collective trauma based on comparing intensity of negative attitude toward the "worst" (for studied group) group with intensity of their attitudes toward other groups - neutral or favored ones.

In the first stage, the respondents were asked to name few (for example, two or three): (a) friendly big groups (nations), which made the biggest favor for their group (nation); (b) hostile groups (nations), which made the biggest evil; and (c) neutral groups (nations). In the second stage, the respondents were asked to estimate all these nations in accordance with several bipolar scales, for example, "Cruel (-10) / kind-hearted (10)", "Positive influence in the world (-10) / negative influence in the world (+10)", "Charming (-10) / loathsome (10)", "Beasts (-10) / Angels (10)", "Is worthy of compassion (-10) / Is not worthy of compassion (10)", and so on. The analysis of results consists of detecting the vector space of such scales of the limited area that is remote from the zone of "average" attitudes.

HISTORICAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF NEW MENTAL FORMATIONS

Zelitchenko (2006) shows how the archetypes emerge in the course of history and how each consequence archetype differs from previous one by the broader consciousness of its men. For example, the European (Western) culture became the world cultural leader of last centuries because this culture created new human mentality and in this sense created new human beings. "European man" possesses not only new values and new culture, but also such new mental traits, which past, pre-European people did not know. Moreover, dissemination of these mental structures is necessary for dissemination of European culture itself. The European man's consciousness is broader than that of his predecessors, people of other cultures. In phenomenal level, this means conscious mind can be "divided" into five "spheres": emotions, self-consciousness, social intelligence, practical intelligence and theoretical intelligence. In each of these spheres, one can see quantitative changes and/or arising new European formations. Table 1 provides some examples of such changes.

SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF CULTURE - DESIGNATION OF THE PROBLEM

Oswald Spengler (1918-1923/1991) was a pioneer of reconstruction of psychological portrait of the people of one culture through an analysis of this culture's products. His results in respect of many cultures (for example, of Apollonian and of Faustian ones) were more than impressive and many of his "methodological" ideas, as for example, accent on importance of analysis of mathematics that was created by the culture still needed to be recognized by the scientific community. Nevertheless, his intuitive method although quite powerful "in proper hands", does need more standardization or at least more methodological reflection.

The core of the sociopsychological analysis of a culture is formed by the work of experts in this culture. This means that two main problems here are the selection of "right experts" and the concordance of experts' opinions. To approach these problems, the elaboration of both

Table 1. Directions of expanding consciousness in European culture.

"Scope" of consciousness	Quantitative changes	New formations
Emotions	Rise of "subtleness" of emotions	High aesthetic feeling (emotional reactions on gothic architecture, Rafael, Bach, Goethe among others)
Self-consciousness	Rise of volume of self-consciousness and self-reflectiveness	Inner conflicts (awareness of both plurality and conflicts of motives, cognitive dissonances) Need for meaning
Social intelligence	Rise of reflectiveness, that is, ability to reconstruct mental realities of other people. Size of the rise the group's person identifies himself with	Empathy - ability to put myself in place of other person and experience this person's feelings (not be confused with emotional contamination, and similar phenomena)
Practical intelligence	Rise of scale and complexity of activities the person is able to manage	Ability of entrepreneurship
Theoretical intelligence	Rise of cognitive complexity	Ability to analyze, that is, decompose mentally complex things (in philosophical meaning of world) in more simple ones

Note: From "Psychological roots of cross-cultural and cross-confessional conflicts" by A. Zelitchenko, 2009: 10. Copyright 2009 by A. Zelitchenko.

common language for work with experts and the procedures of selection of experts, seems to be most urgent. Zelitchenko (2006: 59-72) suggests some approaches to these problems. However, because of both huge scale of these problems and the limitations of volume of journal article, I have to limit myself just this brief designation of the field of further work.

REFERENCES

Allen J, Dana R (2004). Methodological issues in cross-cultural and multicultural Rorschach research. J. Person. Assess., *82*(2): 189-206.

Artemieva E (1980). *Psikhologiya sybektivnoy semantiki [Psychology of Subjective Semantics].* Moscow: Izdatelstvo MGU.

Avila TO (2004). *The Interior Castle.* West Valley City, UT: Waking Lion Presss.

Bonaventure S (1978). *The Soul's Journey into God, the Tree of Life, the Life of St. Francis.* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Collective Trauma (n.d.). Retrieved March 22, 2009, from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collective_trauma.

DuBois C (1961). *Rorschachs of Alorese men and women .* New York: Microcard Foundation .

Duin J (2008, September 19). Half of Americans believe in angels. *Washington Times* .

Durkheim E (1895/1938). *The Rules of Sociological Method.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eysenck HJ (1947/1997). *Dimensions of Personality.* Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Factor analysis. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2009, from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Factor_analysis

Goldberg LR (1992). The development of markers for the Big-five factor structure. J. Person. Soc. Psychol., 59(6): 1216-1229.

Gorsuch RL (1983). *Factor Analysis.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hardy A. (1983). *The Spiritual Nature of Man: A Study of Contemporary Religious Experience.* New York: Oxford University Press, USA.

Hillman J (1997). *Archetypal Psychology: A Brief Account.* Putnam, CT: Spring Publications.

Hood R (1975). The construction and preliminary validation of a measure of reported mystical experience. J. Sci. Stud. Religion, 14: 29-41.

Hood R, Ghorbani N, Watson PJ, Ghramaleki AF, Bing MN, Davison HK (2001). Dimensions of the Mysticism Scale: Confirming the Three-Factor Structure in the United States and Iran. J. Sci. Stud Religion *, 40* (4): 691-705.

Huxley A (1954-1956/2004). *The Doors of Perception and Heaven and Hell .* New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.

James W (1902/1997). *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature.* New York: Touchstone.

Jung CG (1934–1954). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious.* Princeton, N.J.: Bollingen.

Kellermann PF (2007). *Sociodrama and Collective Trauma.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Kelly G. (1955). *Principles of Personal Construct Psychology.* New York: Norton.

Kluckhohn C, Murray HA (1953). Personality Formation: the Determinants. In Murray H. A., Kluckhohn C., Schneider D.M. *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture* (53-70). New York, NY: Knopf.

Le Bon G (1896/1982). *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind.* Atlanta, GA: Cherokee Publishing Company.

Luscher M (1971). *The Luscher Colour Test.* New York: Pocket Books.

(n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2009, from European Social Survey: http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/

(n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2009, from World Values Survey: http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/

Otto R (1932/2003). *Mysticism east and west: A comparative analysis of the nature of mysticism.* New York: Kessinger Publishing.

Otto R (1923/1957). *The Idea of the Holy, An inquiry into the non-rational factor in the idea of the divine and its relation to the rational.* London: Oxford University Press.

Petrenko V (1983). *Vvedenie v ksperimental'nuyu psikhosemantiku: issledovanie form reprezentatsii v obydennom soznanii [Introduction in Experimental Psychosemantics: Investigation of Form of Representation in the Common Consciousness].* Moscow: Izdatelstvo MGU.

Posttraumatic stress disorder. (n.d.). Retrieved April 1, 2009, from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post-traumatic_stress_disorder

Rokeach M (1973). *The Nature of Human Values.* New York: Free Press.

Romesburg C (2004). *Cluster Analysis for Researchers.* Lulu.com.

Rosenzweig S (1978). *The Rosenzweig Picture Frustration (P-F) Study.* St. Louis: Rana House.

Sarason S, Gladwin T (1953). *Truk: Man in paradise.* New York: Viking Fund Publications in Antropology.

Schwartz SH (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. New York: Academic Press. Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol. 25: 1-65.

Shmelev A (1983). *Vvedenie v eksperimentalnuyu psikhosemantiku: teoretiko-metodlogicheskie osnovaniya i psikhodiagnosticheskie vozmozhnosti [Introduction in Experimental Psychosemantics: Theoretical Foundations and Psychodiagnostic Potential] .* Moscow: Izdatelstvo MGU.

Spengler O (1918-1923/1991). *The Decline of the West.* (A. H. Werner, Ed., & C. F. Atkinson, Trans.) New York: Oxford UP.

Stanislavski C. (1936/1988). *An Actor Prepares.* London: Methuen.

Stark R (2004). *Exploring the Religious Life.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tarde G (1899/2000). *Social Laws: An Outline of Sociology.* Kitchener: Batoche Books.

The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi (1998). New York: Random House.

Vijver FV (1999). The Nature of Bias. In *Handbook of Cross-cultural and Multicultural Personality Assessment* (pp. 87-106). Mahwah, NJ; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wagner E (1962). *The Hand Test: Manual for administration, scoring, and interpretation .* Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Zelitchenko A (2009a). *Psychological roots of cross-cultural and cross-confessional conflicts.* n.d.: Proposal of project for FP7 Program of European Commission. (Available from the author, zelitchenk@yahoo.com).

Zelitchenko A (2009b, February 28). *Spirituality and dukhovnost.* Retrieved March 12, 2009, from http://russkiysvet.narod.ru/eng/spiritu-dukho.mht

Zelitchenko A (2006). *Svet Zhizni [Light of Life, History of Humankind in Psychosphere of Earth (or History and Developmental Psychology of Nations) Vol.1 Fundamentals and beginnings, Vol.2 Our era; Vol.3 Search for the sun in the cloudy sky].* Moscow: Otkrytyy Mir.

APPENDIX A

Religious mind and metareligious mind from the point of view of differential depth sociopsychology

The character of common semiconscious feelings ranges from very positive, which root in the superconscious, to very negative, "low" feelings of fear and/or hate, which roots in the subconscious. However, irrelative to their origins, all of them have "mystic" character and high motivational potential and direct the significant part of individual's activity.

The totality of semiconscious common emotions together with the common cognitive structures that categorize them (for example, values) forms the scope of *metareligious mind*. The reason for this name is that among the concepts, which categorize high semiconscious emotions, one may often see such concepts as "Feeling of God", "Will of God" and so on. However, metareligious mind may include not only the concepts of institutional religions but also any other concept of high subjective importance, which captures (in almost literal meaning) the person making from him "the slave of idea" and becoming itself "the god of person". Thus, even when the "gods-ideas" have no direct connections with conventional religions, "their" part of mind may be called *religious in wide meaning*, or metareligious. Romantics, atheists, pop-lovers possess own metareligions, forms of which have nothing in common with any conventional religion, although their essence is the same: the passions of all these men are their real gods. For one his love may be his real god, for other money may be his god, whereas for the third his hate may be his real god.

At the same time, the adepts of such "unreligious religion" besides metareligious mind possess also religious mind (in narrow meaning), that is, opinions about conventional religious matters: they operate with the concepts like "God", "Christ", "divine", "holy" and so on. However, for them all these concepts often reflect not semiconscious emotional experience, but experience of quite different nature – something similar to Tom Sawyer's experience of attending Sunday sermon.

Thus, one may see that metareligious mind coincide with religious mind only in the rarest cases of few religious devotees, whereas in psyche of almost all people there is just some intersection between them. The properties of metareligious mind and of relationships between metareligious mind and religious mind allow formalizing some archetypes-how, which distinguish different cultures.

Theoretical versus empiric

Like any other ideas, religious ideas in individual mind may be of different "sizes". They may overlap conscious parts of the mind and manifest themselves on the border

between the conscious part of the mind and the superconscious one in a form of very high, very mysterious and very valuable feelings of God. Such religious ideas belong to both religious mind and metareligious mind and, hence, form the intersection of these two parts of an individual's mind. However, there are also the religious ideas that are completely inside of the conscious part of the mind or even inside of its verbal part. In this case, the religious concepts like *God*, *Christ*, *Divine*, *Holy*, etc., have the status of abstract concepts or, more often, the status names of some images. Thus, one may see two types of religious mind: (a) *empiric religious mind*, which are based on high-emotional experience (like a feeling of God); and (b) *theoretical religious mind* devoid of such foundation. These two types of relationships between religious mind and metareligious mind (two types of religiosity) correspond to two types of archetypes-how and, in particular, to two types of Christian faith.

The analysis of religious mind in its relations with metareligious mind discloses for example that Russian, Muslim and Eastern Christian archetypes belong to the empiric group, whereas some of the Western archetypes belong to the theoretical group. This difference would explain a great deal of the contradiction between Western and Eastern Christianities, for example, why the secular values meet quite different resistances from Protestants and Catholics on the one hand, and from Orthodox Christians and Muslims on the other. It is relatively easy to overcome the resistance of the abstract concept *God*, which does not base on heavy empirical foundation. However, to overcome the resistance of the idea that has strong empirical base is much more difficult. To convince a Swede of the truth of absence of snow in Sweden in winter is much more difficult than to convince him that there is life on Mars.

"Vertical" versus "horizontal" metareligious mind

Although the studies of mystic experience have a long history (James, 1902/1997; Hardy, 1983; Hood, 1975; Huxley, 1954-1956/2004; Otto, 1932/2003, 1923/1957; Stark, 2004 among others), they do not differentiate usually "vertical" and "horizontal" experience – that is, the feeling of God from the "feeling of demons" (Zelitchenko, 2009b). Thus, they ignore a great difference between the mystic experience of Francis of Assisi (The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi, 1998), or the one of Bonaventure (Bonaventure, 1978), or the one of Teresa of Avila (Avila, 2004), which sometimes resulted in many years of hard spiritual works and in creating prominent masterpieces on the one hand, and mystic experience of hearing God speaking to him, which modern researchers found in about 20% of their American sample (Duin, 2008) on the other. Meanwhile, this difference is of great explanatory potential for understanding what distinguishes European spirituality from the American one.

Methods of analysis of the metareligious mind

In spite of long interest of psychologists to mystic experience, there were few attempts only (Hood et al., 2001) to apply known methods of assessment of mystic experience like Hood Mysticism Scale (1975) in cross-cultural studies. Moreover, even in such studies usually the mystic experience is implicitly considered as invariant and culture-independent trait of psyche. Thus, elaboration of methods aiming to distinguish different types of mysticism is a relatively new problem.

It is difficult to hope to resolve this problem by the questionnaire-based standardized self-reports, which either provide only very generalized picture or do demand from respondents extremely high level of self-awareness, only. The methods of indirect scaling, which disclose the content of mind that is poorly recognized or is not recognized at all by respondent, may be more useful here. One pole of the typical scale for scaling the central religious and moral concepts is intimate for respondent, that is, corresponds to respondent's personal experience, feelings, etc., whereas the other pole is a distant, theoretical concept. For example, the instruction may ask a respondent to put the answers on the question "What is God for you?" on the scales ranging from 1 (*Friend* or *Joy*) to 4 (*Philosophical Idea* or *Lord*, correspondingly), or – the answers to the question "Where is God?" on the scale ranging from 1 (*In my soul*) to 4 (*Above World*).

APPENDIX B

Method used to study the structure of meaning making and counteraction relationships between values

Introduction

In principle, information about archetypal ideas may be mined from the systems of relationships between any cognitive (opinions, views, etc.) or cognitive-motive (values, goals, desires and so on) "elements" of the conscious, which are represented in form of matrix like {"opinion i makes sense for opinion j"} or {"goal i is necessary for goal j"}. However, most elaborated and most compact inventories make values the most natural material to demonstrate a general approach.

What is valuable for the member of a given metaculture? And - what is even more important - why is this valuable for him? Is the given value valuable "in itself", that is, is it *terminal*? Or is this value *instrumental*, that is, its meaning is to help other values to be realized? In other words, is this value connected with others, which make meaning for its realization? Or, on the other side, is some value(s) hostile to a given value?

During the last twenty years, values have become one of the most popular objects of cross-cultural studies. The theory of values created by S. Schwartz (1992) inspired

dozens of comparative studies which brought a huge mass of data collected sometimes in frameworks of large-scale and well-established multinational projects as, for example, "World Values Survey" (World Values Survey, n.d.) or "European Social Survey" (European Social Survey, n.d.). However, usefulness of these data for understanding the national archetypes is rather limited because of the two main reasons.

The first reason is that the universal character of Schwartz's 2-dimensional model results in ignoring of national-specific values, for example some important dimensions of religious, aesthetic and ethic values, which possess a great explanatory potential for some nations. For example, for Russian culture, there is a big difference between two types of pleasure – pleasure of physical exercise and pleasure from classical music, which both belong to Schwartz's category "Hedonism". This reduction is quite obvious when somebody compares the list of values in Schwartz's model even with the list of values, which was composed by S. Schwartz's scientific predecessor, Rokeach (1973). In fact, corresponding cross-cultural studies "project" real multidimensional set of values on 2-dimensional plane of Schwartz's model "Conservation versus Openness to Change × Self-Enhancement versus Self Transcendence", like Hans Eysenck (1947/1997) "projected" on 2-dimensional plane "Extraversion × Neuroticism" of all diversity of personal traits which was later demonstrated not to have less than 5 independent dimensions (Goldberg, 1992). Such "projection" of cultural-specific values on foreign for the culture scales masks rather than reveal specifics of culture. The situation is rather close to the hypothetical one when somebody measures the richness of languages in, say, Mongolia, estimating the level of Mongolians' mastering English, or studies the role of literature in culture of Ukraine through familiarity of Ukrainians with Waugh or Thackeray. To overcome this problem, the culture-specific values must be included into consideration together with universal values. Besides, sometimes the culture-specific values point directly at the society' common idea.

The second reason is that studies of the subjective importance of isolated values – what is a common place in all cross-cultural values surveys – are able to reveal relatively small-scale ideas only. To disclose the ones of bigger-scale – the "underwater" archetypical ideas which determine the psychological life of society – the relationships between values must be studied. This system of relationships is represented by the matrices of both meaning-making relationships ({value i makes the sense for value j}) and counteraction relationships between values. Some of the contents of these matrices have invariant (in framework of a culture) patterns, for example, the ratio of the number of "terminal" values to the number of "instrumental" values. Are there many values independent from others ("polytheistic" structure), or is there some subordination with one of the most

important values and many others which helps to realize the main value ("monotheistic" structure)? This difference is important to distinguish, for example, the European and American archetypes in common frameworks of common Western culture.

Procedure

The first step is to form the list, which includes both universal and culture-specific values. To determine the values which are culture-specific for the studied society, interviews are conducted with experts.

In the first stage, the group of experts in national and cross-national psychology must be selected. There are serious methodological aspects, some of which are subsequently discussed.

In the second stage, each expert in vis-à-vis interview is asked to name some (say, 5-10) of the most distinctive values, which he considers as most important for his people beside the universal values (from Schwartz's list).

In the third stage during the meeting of all experts, the investigator tries to reach common agreement compressing the overall list as possible. The lists, which were created in that way, become the base of the methodology. It is assumed that the list consists of 15 values: "To be healthful", "To be rich", "To be loved", "To be wise", "To be free", "To be powerful", "To enjoy life", "To be successful", "To be self-respected", "To be devoted, dutiful", "To realize own abilities", "To be with God", "Happiness of my family", "Happiness of my nation", and "Happiness of humankind".

In the beginning, the respondent is asked to range this list partially, for example, to choose the most important value, after which he chooses the most important from the rest and so on. This is done for five times.

After he completes the procedure of partial ranging, the respondent executes procedure of partial pair comparison. For each of the 15 values, the respondent is asked to choose one of the 18 variants to finish the phrase of following common type: <Value i> is important because only <the persons with realized value i> may <realize><value k>, where $k \in \{1, \dots 15\}, k \neq i$. For

example, for i=1, the respondent is asked to finish the phrase "To be healthful is important because only a healthy person may…" Besides the 14 variants of answers (from "be rich" to "be part of happy humankind"),

there are four additional options of response: (a) "<value i> (in the above example 'to be healthful') is important in itself"; (b) "Other, write your own variant"; (c) "<value i> is important, but it is difficult for me to describe why"; (d) "<value-i> is not important for me".

After the respondent chooses first variant of response he is asked to choose one more variant from the rest alternatives and so on until he says that he cannot choose more (another option is to repeat choice not more than the fixed number of times, that is, not more than 5 times).

After finishing the first pair comparison, respondent repeats the same procedure but with different formulation of question. For each of the 15 values, the respondent is asked to choose one of the 17 variants to finish the phrase of the following common type: <Value i> prevents <realize><value k>, where $k \in \{1, \dots 15\}, k \neq i$. For

example, for i=1, the respondent is asked to finish the phrase "To be healthful prevents…" Besides the 14 variants of answers (from "be rich" to "be part of happy humankind"), there are three additional options of response: (a) "<value i> prevents nothing"; (b) "Other, write your own variant"; (c) "<value i> prevents something important for me, but it is difficult for me to describe what exactly".

Analysis of results

The answers of respondents form two matrices: the matrix of meaning-making relationships between values, which determines the respondent's meaning-making *graph of values*, and the matrix of counteraction relationships between values, which determines their counteraction graph of values.

In the pilot study, classification of these graphs must be done. The graphs of meaning-making relationships differ from one another by the number of terminal values (that is, values which make sense for other values but have no values, which make sense for themselves). The information about the number of terminal values as well as information about their degrees constitutes the base for determination of the types of graphs of values. If to determine the degree of vertex as the number of values for which it makes meaning directly or indirectly (that is, through a number of edges

$$"k_1 \text{ make sense for } k_2", "k_2 \text{ make sense for } k_3" \dots "k_{n-1} \text{ make sense for } k_n"$$

), then the graph of meaning-making relationships between values may be described as vector-of-degrees $(d_1, \dots, d_m)$, where m is the number of values, and d_i is

a degree of i-th value.

The analysis of the results is based on the recognition of the type of respondents' graph. For example, one may find that in one population, magnitudes of their vectors-of-degrees are bigger than in another, or that in one population distribution, the values are distributed by their degrees more uniformly than in other populations.

The analysis of counteraction relationships aims to discover what "foreign" values are perceived by the members of society as most harmful for their important values. The measure of harmfulness may be established by different ways, for example, as $H(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} h(i,j)I(j),$ where

$H(i)$ is harmfulness of $<$ value $i >$,

$h(i,j) \in \{0,1\}$ is the harmfulness of <value i> in

respect of <value j>, $I(j)$ is the importance of <value j>, and n is the general number of values.