
© NIKOLAY N. GUBANOV

*Bauman Moscow State Technical University
gubanov48@mail.ru*

UDC 140.8

TYOLOGY OF MENTALITY FORMS

SUMMARY. The issue under consideration in this article is special mental characteristics of individual and group subjects, determining their specific patterns of perception of the world, thinking, speech, self-identification, behavior and activity. The goal is to create a typology of mentality forms and to reveal peculiarities of a new globalist mentality. The planetary civilization fate may depend on this globalist mentality performance. According to the subject composition, individual and group mentalities are distinguished. Class, national, ethnic, professional, regional, party, historical (antique, medieval, modern), criminal types of mentality pertain to group mentality. Depending on the field of existence, represented in the mentality, the following partial mentality types are distinguished: political, legal, economic, religious, esthetic and philosophical. Sensory-perceptual, intellectual, emotional, characterological mentalities are defined in accordance with the subject's psychic parts. Generation of the globalist mentality on the planet has turned to be one of the adequate responses on the part of the humankind to history challenge in the form of global problems. Its content comprises the totality of intensive constructive similarities of various civilizations and countries. The new mentality type is directed towards establishing harmonization in relationships, firstly, between peoples, countries and regions and, secondly, between society and nature. This mentality formation is one of the necessary conditions of solving the problem of potential clash of civilizations and other global problems.

KEY WORDS. Mentality, globalist mentality, mentality types, global problems, history challenges, anthropogenic crises.

Development of philosophy is performed first of all due to the new problem statement and introduction of new categories, revealing uninvestigated problematic fields, and sometimes new trends of philosophical thought. For the last two decades Russian philosophers and scientists have been using the category of mentality, which is a comparatively new one for social and humanitarian perception. This category has supplementary epistemological possibilities as compared to traditional categories which describe spiritual life. It allows discovering new aspects of socio-cultural dynamics related to solving a contradiction between mentality and social relations as one of public development forces [1]. It was discovered that if changes in mentality, as a result of anthropogenic crisis, are adequate to history challenges, the crisis is solved and the given social medium rises to a higher level of its development. If, however, the required mental changes do not occur, this society abandons the historical stage. With respect to interaction of social groups and civilizations, the notion

of mentality allows revealing the reasons of the fact that in some cases such a liaison is efficient for interacting parties; and in other circumstances owing to destructive mental discrepancies of social groups, this interrelation has negative consequences [1; 2]. Nevertheless, a number of problematic aspects of mentality have not yet been fully developed. Specifically, mentality types are not distinguished; whereas a prerequisite for thorough investigation of any socio-cultural phenomenon is the establishment of typology of its forms and the revelation of the prospects for the emergence of new types.

We shall take into account the following definition: *mentality is a system of qualitative and quantitative social-psychological characteristics of a human being or social community which has emerged on the basis of a genotype under the influence of natural and social environment and as a result of people's spiritual creative work; this very system determines a specific pattern of the world perception, thinking, emotional response, speech, behavior, activity, self-identification of the subject; it ensures unity and succession of the social community existence and stimulates social progress using production of cultural innovations* [2; 24]. From the perspective of general philosophical categories, identification of a mentality is based on the revelation of something particular on the basis of something singular. Such revelation acts as a procedure for specification different from generalization, that is, separation of the general from the singular.

We include into mentality those social and psychological attributes which are exposed to intersubjective differentiation. Among these are the following peculiarities: 1) sensory and perceptual statements, including the ones of goal perception and the idea of significant values and behavioral norms; 2) motivational characteristics expressed by specific needs, interests, ideals and value systems; 3) sensuous and emotional properties, including believing; 4) strong will and peculiarities showing the attitude of an individual toward oneself, people, behavior and activities; 5) mnemonic characteristics, characterizing the distinctiveness of the subject's memory; 6) cognitive-intellectual features, that is, peculiarities of the system of capabilities, skills and knowledge; 7) cogitative or rational peculiarities, including the style and level of thinking; 8) special features of temperament. It is assumed that motivational peculiarities compose the core of mentality which determines the nature of its other components to a considerable extent [1, 2].

Let us move on to the point of the mentality types' identification. Their selection may be performed according to a number of grounds, but on condition that the methods of selection correspond to the general philosophical category of the special. The first ground for mentality identification is the composition of its bearers. In accordance with this, we distinguish individual and group mentalities. Group mentality types are established on the basis of typical characterization. The latter combines all components into one group according to the feature common for all of them; at the same time it is typical characterization that differentiates this specific set from any other groups.

Group mentalities may have a various degree of generality. Depending on the social group composition and the characteristic of its differentiation, the following mentality

types may exist: class (peasant's, entrepreneurial), national (French, Russian), professional (engineer's, doctor's, teacher's, officer's), age-related (infant, juvenile, senile), regional or territorial and geographical (Scandinavian, Latin American, West European, provincial, metropolitan), party (democratic, totalitarian), historical (ancient, medieval), and criminal. It seems natural that these types intersect in a variety of ways. In general, the society is polymental, and every individual, being a member of several social groups, carries components of a number of mentality types.

Speaking of group mentality, it should be certainly remembered that group mentality does not exist independently, outside individual mentalities, in the same way as the public conscience of any level of complexity does not exist outside individuals' consciousness. Group mentality represents those common traits which are intrinsic to the mentalities of the given social community members. It is embodied in a variety of these individual mentalities, being their invariant. The group mentality is inextricably connected with culture. A definite mentality type corresponds to each cultural type. National mentality corresponds to national culture; the mentality of minor social groups, smaller than nations (for example, infant mentality, juvenile mentality and senile mentality, rural, urban, professional and other mentality types) corresponds to subcultures. The mentality of one social group may influence the mentality of another group, as well as the mentality of a larger social community.

Sometimes, a relationship between individual and group mentalities is improperly stated using the categories of the part and the whole, like, for example, a relation between a cell and a body. As a matter of fact, the relationship between individual and group mentalities is different, that is, a relation between the singular and the general. The singular is richer in content than the general. It represents the general plus the particular. An individual mentality comprises a totality of special features, inherent in a definite person, for example, Mr. Ivanov. Those particularities typical of the members of this social community constitute the group mentality. If such a group as an element is included into a larger community (for example, a territorial group is a part of an ethnic one), the mentality content of the larger community will have common features inherent in all smaller groups. The larger the group is, the smaller number of particularities will be included into its mentality. For example, the mentality content will be subsequently decreasing in the following row: mentality of the Russian resident of Moscow Ivan Ivanov, mentality of a Russian resident of Moscow, Russian mentality, Slavonic mentality.

There are bilateral relationships between individual and group mentalities. The mentality of every individual is formed in the course of introducing it to the given social group. In this case the existing mental peculiarities of a group are acquired by an individual and become his/her own peculiarities. In turn, individual mental features (cultural innovations), whose positive social values are proved or they seem to be proved, may be included into the group mentality and may have an impact on social group behavior. At the same time the influence of individual mentality on group mentality is particularly significant when individual mentality has already come to its maturity. The impact of the group mentality on the individual one is especially

considerable during the establishment of the latter in the course of teaching and education.

A specific field of existence and corresponding mental images as well as related emotions and other psychiatric experiences may act as the second ground for distinguishing mentality types. Such mentality types may be called partial, or private. Political, legal, economic, religious, artistic (esthetic) and philosophical mentality types may refer to them. The French scientist M. Bloch, one of the pioneers of the mentality theory development, in his work "Feudal society" highlighted a special section under the title "Religious state of mind" [3]. The notion of "Political mentality" has become part of scientific, academic and even reference literature [4]. The category of "philosophical mentality" is used for the purpose of comparative analysis of the philosophical way of thinking [5]. The concept of "Moral state of mind" is applied by Yu. M. Khrustalev in the process of grounding the necessity to introduce humanist ideals of bioethics into all spheres of the society [6]. V. N. Osin points out that it is necessary to study juridical or legal mentalities [7].

The above-mentioned mentality types may represent special features of the subject's reflexion of the relevant existence aspects and explain the subject's activity in this sphere of life. This typology is similar to the typology of public consciousness forms. Such term application is admissible since its meaning preserves the most substantial mentality attribute, notably: taking into account the peculiarities of various constituents of human spiritual world (peculiarities of political, religious and esthetic perceptions). The idea of common mentality may be used for the purpose of integral characterization of human spiritual world, whereas the notions of partial mentalities for its partial characterization. Common mentality comprises all social and psychological peculiarities that distinguish this subject from others, and partial mentality includes only those mental special features that are significant, determinative in the process of the subject interaction with the range of events related to the specific section of existence.

The third ground of mentality identification is extracting the parts of the subject's spiritual world. This will allow presenting another typology of partial mentalities. Apparently, it seems possible to figure out the ideas of "sensory-perceptual mentality", "mental state of mind", "emotional mindset", and "characterological set of mind". Introduction of the term "intellectual mentality" may be admitted. It is designated for defining specific features of the subject's system of potential and capabilities. There is a considerable difference between the mentality of an ordinary man and the mentality of a talented person, to say nothing of a genius. This difference will be fixed in this presupposed notion. It would seem that a diversity of concepts will not be an empty word creation, for it contains a generic indicator of the mentality concept, namely: compliance of all these notions with the general philosophical category of the particular. Conceptual variety may promote a more complete comprehension of such a complicated socio-cultural phenomenon as a set of mind.

According to A.J. Toynbee, the society develops conforming to the following rule: "Challenge — Response" [8; 99]. The strongest challenge represents global problems.

One of the humankind adequate responses was originating a new type of mentality that had not existed before [1]. Until now ethnic (folk), national (nation-wide) and regional mentalities have had the greatest number of bearers on Earth. Currently, a generation of a fundamentally new type of group mentality, namely, a globalist mentality is observed. The previous group mentalities comprised social and psychological features inherent in all the members of the given group differentiating it from other groups. These mentalities determined in each group distinctive methods of the world perception, thinking, behavior and activities. Their function was to ensure self-reproduction of groups and protection of their interests. Mental orientations of the groups could contradict one another, and this resulted in conflicts. A new type mentality may provide for ways of perception and behavior of various social representatives, which are uniform within the required frames. This mentality is able to include mental particularities necessary for all social communities, namely: ethnic, national, regional, confessional, professional — for a charitable goal, that is, arranging the behavior and activity directed to solving global problems and preservation of the terrestrial civilization. It is opposed to ethnic, national and regional mentalities, although it was established on the basis of the above-mentioned mentalities. In our opinion, it plays a tremendous role in preservation of human civilization. Formation of this very mentality constitutes the quintessence of people's response to the challenges of history in the form of global problems. The planetary mentality is of international nature; its bearers are the most advanced people representing a variety of ethnicities and countries.

A sense of globality or all-human identity, that is self-identification as an integral part of humankind, may be considered as the core of the general civilization mentality. V.I. Vernadsky pointed out that “A human being for the first time realized he was a resident of the Planet. He can and must think not only in relation to an individual personality, a family or a clan, the state or commonwealth, but on a planetary scale as well” [9; 24]. Other globalist mentality components are such qualities of a personality as intolerance to violence, love for justice not necessarily in relationships between individuals but also in terms of countries; environmental friendliness and rational attitude to nature, commitment to norms of sustainable or reasonable consumption of material benefits. A system of education is destined to play a great role in establishing a new type of mentality. One of the system's functions is developing universal human identity [10].

The globalist set of mind is free from national and regional egoism. Such selfishness, at present, regretfully, is displayed by western countries during wars in Serbia, Iraq, Libya and Syria inculcating puppet governments there and defalcating billions of dollars of the overthrown dictators. The general civilization mentality bears no relation to politics currently being conducted by western countries in implementation of unjust economic and political globalization. On the contrary, it is intended to humanize their policy and globalization processes in general; where necessary — to restrain, remodel, make useful for any country. Particularly dangerous for the global civilization are such atmospheric components of the Occidental mentality as a tendency to hypertrophied consumption and uncontrollable rush for commodities (cars,

household appliances, telephones, etc.) and also an attitude oriented at unpunished spread of violence using NATO all-powerful weapons and military equipment to the benefit of economic and political purposes.

National and regional sets of mind solve problems of countries and regions, whereas the globalist mentality is aimed at tackling issues of the whole mankind and at assuring its survival potential. The general civilization mentality mission is to build up a spiritual basis for solving global contemporary challenges. This new type of mentality is directed towards establishing harmonization in relationships, firstly, between peoples, countries and regions and, secondly, between society and nature. The content of the globalist mentality will include a totality of constructive similarities of various civilizations and countries. When the state of mind comprises an adequate part of the Earth population, it will become one of the necessary conditions for solving the problem concerning a potential clash of civilizations and other global challenges.

REFERENCES

1. Gubanov, N.N. Formation of globalist mentality and education. *Sociologija obrazovanija — Sociology of Education*. 2011. № 6. Pp. 74-82. (in Russian).
2. Gubanov, N.I., Gubanov, N.N. Mentality: essence and social functioning. *Voprosy filosofii — Philosophical magazine*. 2013. № 2. Pp. 22-32. (in Russian).
3. Bloch, M. *La société féodale*. Paris: Decouverte, 1968. 134 p.
4. Mentality // *Sociologicheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar' [Sociological encyclopedia]* / Ed. by Osipov G.V. Moscow, 1998. P. 175. (in Russian).
5. Shohin, V.K. Nyaya Vaisheshika about non-being and its varieties. *Vestnik Rossijskogo filosofskogo obshhestva — Bulletin of the Russian Philosophical Society*. 2005. № 3. Pp. 123–126. (in Russian).
6. Hrustalev, Ju.M. Morality as an imperative of demographic safety. *Vestnik Rossijskogo filosofskogo obshhestva — Bulletin of the Russian Philosophical Society*. 2006. № 4. Pp. 128–133. (in Russian).
7. Osin, V.N. Widely recognized social values (freedom, law, rights and freedoms, state) and legal mentality. *Voprosy filosofii — Philosophical magazine*. 2012. № 9. Pp. 46-54.
8. Toynbee, A.J. *Postizhenie istorii [A Study of History]* / Transl. fr. Eng. by E.D. Zharkova. Moscow, 1996. 608 p. (in Russian).
9. Vernadskij, V.I. *Razmyshlenija naturalista. Kn. 2 [A natural scientist's speculations. Book. 2]*. Moscow, 1977. 192 p. (in Russian).
10. Kashuba, Je., Galjan, S., Gubanov, N. About the system of education at a higher education institution. *Vysšee obrazovanie v Rossii — Higher Education in Russia*. 2004. № 6. Pp. 12-16. (in Russian).