

TYPES OF INDIVIDUALISM AND THE MODEL OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN RUSSIA

Anatoly V. Lubsky^{1*}, Roman A. Lubsky¹, Valeriya P. Voytenko¹,
Anastasiya A. Zaytseva¹

The article examines the Western and Russian types of individualism and various modal individualistic models of behavior in contemporary Russian society. The authors come to the conclusion that in the modern Russian society not so many Russians adhere to the liberal model of individualistic behavior. As a result of the modernization reforms in Russia and the “conservative wave” at the turn of the century, liberal-statist and state-liberal models of social behavior dominated it, in which, respectively, the realization of the values of individualism is associated with a strong Russian statehood, and the statist-paternalistic of the values of Russian conservatism “get along” with certain values of the Russian and Western types of individualism.

Key words: individualism, the Russian type of individualism, the Western type of individualism, social behavior, mental programs of social behavior, modal models of individualistic behavior.

INTRODUCTION

According to the scientific discourse there are two ideal types of social structure, which are based, respectively, on individualism or collectivism. The ideal types, according to M. Weber the axiological and logical aspects of cognition are conjoined, are created by “mentally bringing” of certain elements “to their full expression”, by combining the many existing single phenomena in a “single image” (Weiß, 1975). Therefore, there are individualistic or collectivist models of social behavior in real societies. By its nature Russian society is state-organized, so it formed a special type of regulatory personality, which is characterized by a collectivist model of social behavior (Lubsky, Kolesnykova & Lubsky, 2016). At the same time liberal values and attitudes characteristic of the Western type of individualism are permanently amplified in the Russian society, in the context of its modernization. In addition, a special type of individualism has been formed in the Russian society within the framework of its organic development. The study of Western and Russian types of individualism and individualistic models of social behavior makes it possible to better understand and explain the life styles and practices of people’s everyday life in modern Russian society.

REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE

The national specificity of individualism in Russian society becomes the subject of cognitive interest in the context of opposing religious individualism in Russia

¹ Institute of Sociology and Regional Study, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia,
E-mail: avlubsky@gmail.com

to secular individualism in the West. At the same time, the peculiarities of Russian individualism were associated with the catholic freedom of an Orthodox Christian (Homyakov, 1994), a symphonic personality (Melih, 1999), hierarchical personalism (Lossky, 1991) or personalistic solidarism (Levitsky, 1995).

In the latter half of the 20th century, in scientific research, much attention was paid to a comparative study of individualism in different countries, including Russia. At the same time, some researchers understood individualism as the people's preference for caring only about themselves and their families, adherence to personal independence and self-realization (Hofstede, 1980). Others researchers considered that individualism is the dominance of the interests of the individual over the interests of the group (Trompenaars, 1996); adherence to secular-rational values, and the values of freedom and self-expression (Inglehart & Welzel, 2011); remoteness from the group, preferring individual, not collective, actions (House & Hanges, 1999). Different ideas about individualism and the procedure of empirical studies led to various results regarding the level of individualism in Russian society. Thus, according to the data of H. Hofstede (1980) it was indicated that there is the "intermediate" state of Russia, where the level of individualism is lower than in the West, but higher than in the East (Hofstede, 1980). According to the results of F. Trompenaars, in Russia, as in Western countries, there is a rather high level of individualism, especially in the Russian business sphere, as well as in megacities (Trompenaars, 1996). The results which are obtained by R. Inglehart and K. Welzel (2011), R. Houz and P. Hinges (1991), show a low level of individualism in Russia, which is characteristic of the eastern countries.

At the start of XX century a comparative study of individualism in Russia and in the BRICS countries was conducted by Taiwan researchers, based on the method of G. Hofstede (1980). Their results showed that the highest level of individualism is in India, the lowest - in China, and about the same - in Brazil and Russia, but just above higher than in China (Tu, Lin & Chang, 2011). Some researchers, noting the low level of individualism in China and Russia, emphasize that the level of collectivism in China is much higher than in Russia, in which the national culture is becoming increasingly individualistic (Michailova & Hutchings, 2004).

Russian researchers, using the methods of G. Hofstede (1980), came to the conclusion that the values of collectivism and individualism were syncreasing in Russian society (Latova & Latov, 2012; Naumov & Petrovskaya, 2010). Accordingly, some researchers believe that the opinion that "collectivism is an innate Russian feature" is erroneous (Hidasi & Lukinykh, 2009). The Russians have another feature - the instinct of individualism, that is, the predisposition to do everything yourself and have your own opinion (Ilyin, 1993).

Thus, in modern scientific discourse there are various ideas about the nature and level of individualism in Russian society. At the same time, researchers do not

distinguish between Western and Russian types of individualism and do not distinguish modal models of individualistic behavior in Russian society.

METHODOLOGY

Social behavior is a subject of study of a number of scientific disciplines within the framework of various paradigmatic grounds. This gives rise to disciplinary fragmentation and the paradigmatic limitations of scientific knowledge about the social behavior of people. The rushing to a holistic study of social behavior as an integral social reality presupposes a transition from one-dimensional interpretations to multidimensional ones. Such a transition is possible on the basis of the creation of a multidimensional methodological construct within the framework of interdisciplinary research which is related to the formulation and solution of scientific problems that takes at the intersection of the subject fields of various scientific disciplines (Lubsky, 2015).

According to the framework of such a construct, social behavior is considered as a reaction of people to the social situation in the form of conscious or unconscious social actions, the repertoire and character of which are determined by the reflexive or non-reflexive structures of their mental programs, which are cognitive, axiological and conative. Cognitive structures of mental programs as representations perform the function of the cognitive motive of social behavior, axiological structures as preferences perform the function of its value motive, the conative structures as mental programs for setting a response to the social situation in a certain way directly determine social behavior.

In mental programs, depending on the social situation, both non-reflective and reflexive structures can become active, which affects the interpretations of actors of this situation and their social behavior, which, accordingly, can be both conscious and unconscious. Social behavior as a set of unconscious actions can be attributed to a normative type, depending on generally accepted cultural values and norms, and social behavior as a set of conscious actions - to a modal, type, the most common in society. Accordingly, the model of social behavior is a cognitive analogue of the practices of social behavior as a response of a person to the social situation in the form of certain social actions which are conditioned by the mental program.

Within the framework of a multidimensional methodological construct, individualism can be viewed, along with collectivism, as a special way of life, the structure of which is the style of thinking and style of everyday life. The style of thinking as a way of organizing cognitive activity can be analytical, which is connected with the division of the whole into parts, and syncretic, which is a holistic, figurative-metaphorical cognition of the surrounding world (Doroginin, 2006). The style of everyday life activity is a way of organizing the daily activity of a person, which is formed under the influence of the paradigm that underlies this or that

style of thinking. In this regard, it is possible to single out the goal-oriented style of everyday life activity, based on the analytical style of thinking, and the value-rational style of everyday life, based on the syncretic style of thinking. The characteristic feature of the goal-oriented style of everyday life activity is the individual's desire for self-development and self-improvement, as well as for the concrete result of social actions. The value-rational style of everyday life activity is characterized by the high importance of human relations, which motivates the individual to sacrifice his goals and desires in favor of the public.

As indicators of individualism, it is possible to single out, firstly, the intention to "be different", secondary, freedom, thirdly, self-reliance and one's own strength (Voytenko, 2014). The intensity of "being different" is the individual's desire for individual-spatial and individual-temporal diversity. Characteristic features of the personality which is motivated by the intention "to be different" are activity, intensity, initiative, a sense of freedom and responsibility, and the desire to bring the surrounding reality into order with the help of its transforming power (Ille, 1994).

For the analysis of freedom as a sign of individualism, it was used the methodological ideas of I. Berlin, who offered two concepts: positive freedom, or "freedom for ...", and negative freedom, or "freedom from ..." (Berlin, 1996). Positive freedom, or "freedom for ..." is a concept of freedom, which is characterized by the individual's desire to independently realize the internal potential without interference of external factors and determine his fate in accordance with his capabilities and resources. Negative freedom, or "freedom from ..." is a concept of freedom, which is characterized by the individual's perception of reality as a set of constraints that prevent him from realizing conscious desires.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Russian society by its nature is state-organized, within the framework of which a special type of normative person («Homo politicus») has been formed, given to shift the solution of social problems, including private ones into the political sphere. Etatist-paternalistic ideas, values and attitudes in the mental program of this type of personality, which are non-reflexive character, determine the anti-personal model of normative behavior in Russian society (Lubsky, 2014). In this regard, individualism in Russia is possible only at the reflective level of mental programs that determine the various modal models of individualistic behavior.

In modern Russian society, we can detach two types of individualism - organic Russian and imported from the outside of the West, the general grounds of which are the intention "to be different", and also the reliance on yourself and your own strength. Therefore, the style of thinking, the style of everyday life, as well as a unique understanding of freedom, determine the specific features and specific features of the Russian and Western types of individualism. Features of the Western

type of individualism as a special way of life are the analytical style of thinking and the goal-oriented style of everyday life. Specific features of the Western type of individualism make it possible to single out in its framework activist, egocentric and Downshift forms, whose mental programs determine the corresponding modal models of individualistic behavior

The subject of activist individualism is an extrovert, a social transformer. Specific features of activist individualism are a positive understanding of freedom as “freedom for ...” creative social activity and transformative activity in all spheres of public life, and tolerance to other styles of life, views and values, the desire and ability to borrow “alien” for the purpose of further transformation. The subject of egocentric individualism is the actor-introvert, the consumer. Specific features of egocentric individualism are a negative understanding of freedom as “freedom from ...” social obligations which are imposed by society, egocentrism, consumerism as dependence on acts of consumption, and hostility (intolerance) to other styles of life, views and values. The actor-introvert is the subject of Downshift individualism. Specific features of Downshift individualism are a negative understanding of freedom as “freedom from ...” the ideals and values of the consumer society and consumerism, passivity, indifference to other styles of life, views and values, the desire to live in pleasure. The Russian type of individualism, unlike the Western one, is characterized by a syncretic style of thinking and a value-rational style of everyday life activity. Specific features of Russian individualism allow us to detach within its framework dissident, desert and intellectual species. Mental programs of these types determine the corresponding modal models of individualistic behavior in Russian society.

The subject of dissident individualism is an extrovert figure, a social critic. Specific features of dissident individualism are positive freedom as “freedom for ...” expressions of protest and criticism of prevailing values and norms in society or of the state system in general, as well as rigorism. This Russian type of individualism takes origin in the Old Russian tradition of foolishness. Fools in Ancient Rus were mentally healthy and intellectually well-educated people who expressed their protest (“swearing to the world”) through various forms of demonstrative behavior, ignoring public norms and decorum. Such phenomena as dissidence in the USSR, as well as various kinds of protest movements in modern Russia, connected with the activities of opposition organizations which are aimed at criticizing the regime, are closely connected with foolishness.

The subject of desert individualism is an activist-introvert. Specific features of desert individualism are a negative understanding of freedom as “freedom from ...” social obligations, rigorism, the individual’s desire for spiritual self-improvement by abandoning social ties. This kind of Russian individualism is associated with the spiritual tradition of religious non-covetousness, suggesting the severance of social relations with those who remained in the world. In this

regard, the desert individualism in Russian society is analogous to its Western type as Downshifting.

The subject of intellectual individualism is an extrovert figure, a social servant. The specific features of intellectual individualism are a positive freedom, or "freedom for ..." self-realization in the service of serving the people, as well as rigorism. This kind of Russian individualism is connected with such a phenomenon as the Russian intelligentsia, the characteristic feature of which was social messianism, which is aimed at the liberation of the people in pre-revolutionary Russia. In modern Russian society, this kind of individualism translates into service to the Motherland, not to the state.

In modern Russian society, on the one hand, there are modal models of behavior of the Western and Russian types of individualism, and on the other hand, hybrid models of social behavior have emerged, in which the features of both these types are intertwined. At the same time, it should be noted that no more than 10% of Russians demonstrate adherence to the values and attitudes characteristic of the liberal model of individualistic behavior of the Western type. In the mental programs of this model, the basic values in the economic sphere are private property, market relations, in the social sphere - human priority, tolerance, in political and legal spheres - human and civil rights and freedoms, democratic political regime, rule of law, and participation in the political life of the country, in the spiritual sphere - freedom as an opportunity for individual and responsible choice. The bulk of representatives of this model of social behavior are followers of Western activist individualism.

This model of social behavior relative to Russian downshifters, the cause of their growth is, on the one hand, flight from the difficulties, which are associated with careers, administrative and criminal obstacles in doing business, the desire to avoid professional stress, on the other hand, following fashion as a form of demonstration of its individuality and originality. In addition, according to the researchers Downshifting in Russia has acquired a national specificity: the Russian downshift runs away not from good, but to good, and therefore most Russians perceive Downshifting as moving to another country or renting an apartment for a livelihood (Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009). The number of downshifters, who are striving for peace and will and wishing to live for themselves and for their own purpose and abandoning the ideals of consumer consumption, is much less than in the countries of the West.

In the Russian society, there are more supporters of the hybrid - liberal-statist - model of social behavior, in the mental program of which the development of Russian society is associated with the strengthening of state power as the main forcer of economic liberalization and integration of society from above on a stable basis, and its future - with a strong legal statehood which provides the principles of personal freedom. Supporters of this model of social behavior, on the one hand,

give priority to market economy, law and respect for human rights, and on the other hand, they are ready to give up freedom of speech if the state guarantees them a normal salary and decent pension, and consider that they are not able to provide any influence on the political and economic life of the country. In modern Russian society there are about 25% of representatives of this model. Most of them adhere to the values and attitudes of individualism, which is a “mix” of Western activist individualism and ideas about the special role of the state in all spheres of Russian public life.

The majority of Russians (55%) adhere to the state-liberal model of social behavior, whose representatives, on the one hand, support the existing state power and believe that the country needs a “firm hand” for putting society order, and also believe that Russia should be a great power, and on the other hand, they believe that Russia needs democracy, not all large enterprises in the country should belong to the state, the activities of entrepreneurs bring society benefits. The rest of Russians adhere to a conservative, or statist model of social behavior, in the mental program of which the basic values are state property, and also the state that must take care of people.

The spread in modern Russian society of various modal models of social behavior is associated with the modernization processes in it. So, within the framework of understanding Russian reforms over the past ten years, Russian sociologists detach two periods in context of the dynamics of mass consciousness and the transformation of models of social behavior. The first period (1990s) is characterized by the Russians’ enthusiasm for Western experience, which was accompanied by persistent attempts to transfer various models and models of foreign origin to the Russian science. The legitimacy of Russian specifics was often questioned, or even rejected at all, as something retrograde. This was the period of the formation of individualistic models of social behavior of the Western type in the Russian society. The second period (the late 1990s) is characterized by the fact that as a result of the reaction to the same interests in Western experience, according to the researchers, a conservative wave shows the state of mass mentality of Russians at the turn of the century. “The main dominant of the conservative wave was the return from the Western interests of the period when democracy was being formed as “primordially Russian” ideas, moral principles and way of life” (Gorshkov, 2016).

The dominance of hybrid models of social behavior in modern society is due to the fact that, on the one hand, as a result of the information impact and life experience, which were acquired by Russians in the course of reforms, the concepts and values of the market economy and democracy have firmly embedded in their mental programs of social behavior, the goal-oriented style has become stronger in everyday life of Russians. On the other hand, as a result of the “conservative wave” which is associated with the disappointment of Russians because of reforms

and unfulfilled social hopes in their mental programs, the reflexive structures activated that arise from the value-rational style of their everyday life. This was reflected, in particular, in the dreams of Russians, which are dominated by a rather specific image of the future of Russia, based, on the one hand, on the ideas of human rights and freedom of expression, on the other hand - on the image of Russia as a strong state, caring for its citizens and ensuring equal rights for all in the context of social justice.

The results of the research of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS and “Levada-center” show that a sharp “surge” of Western individualistic values in Russian society was observed in the mid-1990s, and a gradual loss of interest of Russians to the liberal values of individualism – in the late the 20th and early the 21st century. According to the data of “Levada-center” in 1995, 53% of respondents believed that “to stand out among others and be a bright personality is better than living like everyone else” (Political views of Russians, 2013), but in 2015 the number of those was reduced to 41%. If in 2001, 47% of respondents believed that “the main thing is initiative, enterprise, the search for a new job and life, even if you are in the minority”, in 2011 the number of these respondents was dropped to 42% (Russians about freedom, democracy, state, 2013). However, in 2014 the number was increased again to 56% (Political views of Russians, 2013). This was due primarily to the disappointment of Russians in the social and paternalistic capabilities of the Russian state in times of crisis.

Over the past ten years, the attitude of Russians towards private property has changed. So, in 2005, according to the data of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS, 52% of respondents rated a private property in Russia as a positive phenomenon, in 2011 only 35% of respondents gave a positive assessment (Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2011). In 2001, 7% of Russians were supporters of the market economy. In 2011, this indicator fell to 5%, and in 2014 it increased to 8% (Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2011). In 1994, 13% of Russians advocated minimal state intervention in the Russian economy, giving maximum freedom to private initiative. In 2011, there are 9% of such Russians, and in 2014 - 13% (Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2011). “Levada-center” has got another results but quite comparable with the data of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS. According to these results, in 1994 32% of Russians advocated an economic system based on private property and market relations, and in 2016 such indicator fell to 26% (Russians about state property and industry, 2011).

According to the data of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS, only 2-3% of Russians support the complete independence of the social sphere from the state, more than 50% believe that the state should provide a certain social minimum for all citizens, 41% decide that the state must ensure full social equality in the society (Gorshkov, 2016). According to the dilemma of “society of individual freedom or

society of social equality”, Russians prefer the society of social equality. At the same time, the number of supporters of such principals increased from 67% in 1998 to 73% in 2011 (Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2011). The number of Russians who believe that people should solve their own problems, not rely on the state, declined from 7% in 1996 to 4% in 2014 (Gorshkov, 2016). According to the results of “Levada- center”, in 1990 25% of respondents in Russia believed that they should independently take the initiative and take care of themselves (Russians about freedom, democracy, the state, 2013). In 2016 only 7% of citizens stated that the state should interfere as little as possible in the life and economic activity of its citizens, and 49% of the respondents decided that the state should take care of all its citizens equally, providing them with an adequate standard of living (Russians about freedom, democracy, the state, 2013).

As for the political sphere, the following data should be cited. Thus, the results of the study of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS show that the proportion of those who agree with the proposition that “democratic procedures are very important for organizing a normal life in society, they cannot be dispensed with” fell from 51% in 2001 to 44% in 2014 (Gorshkova & Petukhova, 2015). The results of “Levada-center research indicate that in 1996 28% of Russians were convinced of the need for democracy in Russia, modeled in Western countries, and in 2014 this indicator fell to 21% (Wearable democracy, 2013).

According to the spiritual sphere, it should be noted that the data of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS shows that a part of Russians who agree with the thesis “freedom is something without life loses meaning” decreased from 71% in 1995 to 64% in 2011 (Gorshkova & Petukhova, 2015). According to the data of “Levada-center” in 1990 38% of respondents believed that they had too little freedom, in 2013 the share of Russians who agreed with this thesis fell to 15%. In 2016 the most unpopular answers to the question “What is important to you?” were the answers “Freedom” and “Democracy”, while 54% of citizens spoke for “Stabilization of the political and economic situation in the country” (Russians about proud and free, 2013).

CONCLUSION

Individualistic models of social behavior exist not only in anthropocentric societies in the West, but also in state-centrist society in Russia. Individualism is a special way of life; its structure consists of the style of thinking and style of everyday life. Indicators of individualism are the personal intention to “be different”, freedom, and self-reliance. Indicators of individualism are the personal intention to “be different”, freedom, and self-reliance. Common grounds for the Russian and Western types of individualism are the intention of “being different” and reliance on yourself and your own strengths. In turn, the style of thinking, the style of everyday life, and a unique understanding of freedom, determine the particularities

and specific features of the Russian and Western types of individualism. The peculiarities of the Western type of individualism are the analytical style of thinking, the goal-oriented style of everyday life, the understanding of freedom as a responsible individual choice and “freedom for ...”. The specific features of Western individualism allow us to identify activist, egocentric and Downshifter types in it. The Russian type of individualism, unlike the Western one, is characterized by the syncretic style of thinking, the value-rational style of everyday life activity and the understanding of freedom as “freedom from ...”. Specific features of Russian individualism allow us to detach within its framework dissident, desert and intellectual species.

In modern Russian society, it is possible to single out various modal models of social behavior that are characteristic of Western and Russian types of individualism. “Splash” of the values of Western individualism was observed in Russian society in the mid-1990s. Then, within the “conservative wave” that swept Russian society at the turn of the century, interest in Western values and a liberal model of individualistic behavior began to fall.

As a result, liberal-statist and state-liberal models of social behavior dominate in Russian society, where the realization of individualistic values is associated with strong Russian statehood, and the statist-paternalistic values of Russian conservatism “get along” with certain values of Russian and Western types of individualism.

In modern Russian society, 2% of Russians adhere to the liberal model of individualistic behavior, 10% - in the social sphere, 10% - in the political sphere, 10% - in the legal sphere, and 10% - in the spiritual sphere. Supporters of the liberal-statist model of social behavior are 25% of Russians in the economic sphere, 10% - in social sphere, 25% - in political sphere, 30% - in legal sphere, 30% - in spiritual sphere. 60% of Russians in the economic sphere are held the state-liberal model of social behavior, 60% - in social sphere, 60% - in political sphere, 50% - in legal sphere and 50% - in spiritual sphere (Lubsky, 2016).

Acknowledgments

The article is prepared within the framework of the grant of the Russian Science Foundation No. 16-18-10387 “Mental programs and models of social behavior in Russian society”.

References

- Berlin, I. (1998). Two concepts of freedom. In: *Modern liberalism* (19-43). Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya.
- Doroginin, Yu.V. (2006). *Styles of thinking in Russia and in the West (socio-philosophical aspect)*: Ph.D. abstract thesis. Rostov-on-Don.
- Gorshkov, M.K. (2016). *Russian society as it is: (experience of sociological diagnostics)*. In 2 vol. Vol. 2. Moscow: New chronograph.

- Gorshkova, M.K. & Petukhova, V.V. (eds.) (2015). *Russian society and the challenges of time. First book*. Moscow: Publishing house "Ves Mir".
- Hidasi, J.Y. & Lukinykh, V. A (2009). *Comparison Of Russian and Hungarian business*. Budapesti Gazdasági Főiskola – Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe, 2-3.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: Intern Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Homyakov, A.S. (1994). *Works in 2 volumes*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Medium.
- House, R. & Hanges, P. (1999). Cultural influences on Leadership and Organizations. Project GLOBE. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 1: 171-233.
- Ille, M. E. (1994). On the subject of sociology. *Socio-political journal*, 11-12: 101-112.
- Ilyin, I. (1993). *About future Russia: Selected Articles*. Moscow: Voenizdat.
- Inglehart, R. & Welzel, K. (2011). *Modernization, cultural changes and democracy: The sequence of human development*. Moscow: Novoe izdatelstvo.
- Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. (2009). *Russian everyday life in a crisis: the view of sociologists*. URL: http://www.isras.ru/doclad_povsednevnost.html.
- Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. (2011). *Twenty years of reforms through the eyes of Russians (the experience of many years of sociological measurements)*. URL: http://www.isras.ru/analytical_report_twenty_years_reforms.html.
- Latova, N.V. & Latov, Yu.V. (2012). *Mental maps of the world*. URL: <http://do.gendocs.ru/docs/index-174171.html>.
- Levitsky, S.A. (1995). The tragedy of freedom. In: *Works in 2 volumes*. Vol. 1. (246-247). Moscow: Canon.
- Lossky, N.O. (1991). Free will. In: *Selection* (528-529). Moscow: Pravda.
- Lubsky, A. V. (2015). Interdisciplinary research: cognitive "fashion" or social "challenge". *Sociological research*, 10: 3-11.
- Lubsky, A.V. (ed.) (2016). *Mental programs and models of social behavior in Russian society*: Monograph. Rostov-on-Don: Foundation for Science and Education.
- Lubsky, R.A. (2014). Statehood and models of social behavior in modern Russia. *Scientific thought of the Caucasus*, 1: 32-40.
- Lubsky, A.V., Kolesnykova, E.Y. & Lubsky, R.A. (2016). Normative Type of Personality and Mental Matrix of Social Behavior in Russian Society. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(36). URL: <http://www.indjst.org/index.php/indjst/article/viewFile/102023/73517>.
- Melih, Yu.B. (1997). Philosophy of Karsavin's Unity and the concept of the unitary in Plotinus. In: *Historical and Philosophical Annals* (169-182). Moscow: Nauka.
- Michailova, S. & Hutchings, K. (2004). Knowledge Sharing and National Culture: A Comparison between China and Russia. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(3): 383-406.
- Naumov, A. I. & Petrovskaya, I. A. (2010). Tendencies in changing the national culture of Russia from the perspective of its influence on business management in 1996-2006. *Eurasian Review*, 3: 67-88. URL: http://www.econ.msu.ru/cmt2/lib/a/1176/file/4_NaumovAI_National_Culture.pdf.
- Political views of Russians. (2013). *Yury Levada Analytical Center*. URL: <http://www.levada.ru/23-09-2013/politicheskie-vzglyady-rossiyan>.

- Russians about freedom, democracy, state. (2013). *Yury Levada Analytical Center*. URL: <http://www.levada.ru/25-09-2013/rossiyane-o-svobode-demokratii-gosudarstve>.
- Russians about proud and free. (2013). *Yury Levada Analytical Center*. URL: <http://www.levada.ru/21-11-2013/rossiyane-o-gordosti-i-svobode>.
- Russians about state property and industry. (2011). *Yury Levada Analytical Center*. URL: <http://www.levada.ru/30-11-2011/rossiyane-o-gosudarstvennoi-sobstvennosti-i-promyshlennosti>.
- Trompenaars, F. (1996). Resolving International Conflict: Culture and Business Strategy. *London Business School*, 7(3): 51-68.
- Tu, Y.-T., Lin, Sh.-Y. & Chang, Y.-Y. (2011). A Cross-Cultural Comparison by Individualism. *Collectivism among Brazil, Russia, India and China, International Business Research*, 4(2): 179-180.
- Voytenko, V. P. (2014). Essence, types and kinds of individualism in Russia and in the West. *Humanitarian, socio-economic and social sciences*, 6-1: 11-14.
- Wearable democracy. (2013). *Yury Levada Analytical Center*. URL: <http://www.levada.ru/25-09-2013/opekaemaya-demokratiya>.
- Weiß, J. (1975). *Max Webers Grundlegung der Soziologie*. München: Verlag Dokumentation.