NATIONAL MENTALITY UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF DIGITALIIZATION

Elena Andriyenko, PhD of Philosophical Sciences

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2342-2404

e-mail: elena_andrienko8@mail.ru

Academy of Higher Education of Ukraine, Ukraine, Kyiv

The article is devoted to the philosophical analysis of the role of national mantality and cultural codes in the development of digital society. The article explores various approaches to the definitions of the concepts of mentality and national cultural code. The main features of mentality have been analyzed. Among them are the following: 1) the mentality is historically and culturally determined; 2) mentality is a structural part of individual consciousness; 3) mentality is changeable and transforms along with changes of the cultural field. The emphasis is placed on the synergetic approach which most fully takes into account the variability of various elements of culture and the relationship between them. The national code of culture is defined as a system of representations, images and stereotypes of consciousness and behavior, which has a non-hierarchical historical character, reflects national values, and also serves as the basis of national identity. It is emphasized that the national cultural code is closely related to the national value system, reflects it, but is not identical to it, since, unlike the value system, the elements of the cultural code are not hierarchical. Despite its ideal nature, the cultural code influences the material aspects of culture through the motivation of the behavior and activities of its carriers. Along with the national cultural code, the concept of the "cultural code of personality" is being formed in modern scientific

literature. The cultural code is not something immutable. It can change under the influence of various factors. The article highlights such trends in the transformation of national cultural codes under the influence of digitalization as universalization, localization and individualization. Today the national cultural code serves as a launching pad for the formation of innovation and individual creativity that transcends national cultural boundaries. It has been concluded that the national cultural code provides a kind of "worldview immunity" against the "dark" side of digitalization without hindering the use of its positive possibilities.

Key words: *Mentality, Cultural Field, Cultural Code, Values, Consciousness, Economy, Digitalization, Society.*

Digitalization and the formation of a digital society are connected not only with changes in the global economy and political processes, but also in the sphere of public consciousness. The most important challenge for modern society is the preservation of national identity, which is based on a national mentality. Digital technologies in the modern world acquire the status of a new social ontology, replacing traditional practices of interaction, behavior and communication. The external manifestations of digitalization are closely related to deep internal transformations of the ideological nature that occur both at the level of personal consciousness and at the level of national consciousness. The most important trend determining the development of today's social and cultural existence is the change of orientation of social development from human-centered, humanistic to information-centered one (or IT-orientation). The information age outlines new contours of national consciousness often destroying the former ideological foundations of national cultures. Regardless of the estimates this trend is objective and requires a thorough systematic study.

The interest of researchers in the issues of digitalization and the impact of this process on public life and public consciousness has led to the emergence of extensive scientific literature devoted to this issue. In this context, it should be noted the works of Ye. Babosov [1], J. Baudrillard [2], S. Davlierova [3], Ye. Diener and N. Lopatina [4], O. Gordiyenko, Simonova and A. Sokolova [6], P. Feierabend, B. Jacobi, N. Khudolei [8], T. Kuznetsova [9], N. Mammedova [10], T. Medok [11], I. Mikailova [12], S. Sanders and E. Scanlon [13], A, V. Styopin [14], Ye. Volkova [15], N. Volokhova and A. Ogurtsova [16], et al.

At the same time the issue of the impact of digitalization on the national mentality and the peculiarities of spiritual culture remains insufficiently disclosed which indicates the need for research in this subject field.

The aim of this work is to identify the main features of the impact of digitalization on the national mentality.

The concept of "mentality" (from Lat. *mentalis* – "mental") is synonymous with the concept of cultural identity and denotes a certain type of thinking and feeling that determines an individual's or a community's understanding of social and cultural reality. The origins of this concept should be sought in the works of L. Lévi-Bruhl, L. Fevre, M. Blok and other authors who in the first half of the 20th century explored the commonality of collective psychology, worldview and attitude in the context of one cultural space. It is important to note that the term "mentality" originally had a local geographical connotation.

Mentality manifests itself in the form of a mental field as a unique cultural spirit, which is felt by representatives of other cultures. Mentality is a projection of the mental field of culture on the public consciousness. The characteristic features of the mentality are the following:

Firstly, mentality is historically and culturally determined. It reflects the peculiarities of a certain type of culture, depends on its content, natural and historical conditions of formation.

Secondly, mentality is a structural part of individual consciousness [3, 42]. Enculturation as a process of assimilation of cultural norms, values, ideas is inextricably linked with the socialization of the individual.

Thirdly, mentality is changeable and transforms along with changes of the cultural field. Previously, these changes occurred relatively slowly under the influence of changing historical circumstances. Nowadays the transformation of mentality has accelerated significantly due to the increasing intensity of cultural, economic and political changes under the influence of digitalization.

On the one hand, it is difficult to distinguish the individual and social parts of national mentality since the general cultural attitudes that form the mentality often pass into the unconscious part of the individual psyche and can only be realized through special efforts. On the other hand, in the general mental field of culture various types of group activities associated with ethnic, class and other social groups can be distinguished. The mentality of a personality represents the transpersonal layer of its spiritual world. The universal mentality is something that is still being formed under the influence of globalization and digitalization.

The mentality of humanity will manifest itself when human culture can be compared with another (for example, extraterrestrial). So, today the concept of the mentality of humanity remains rather a mental abstraction and not a real phenomenon.

Ye. Volkova points out that initially this concept included not only the cognitive sphere but also the hierarchy of values, stereotypes of thinking and behavior from which the researcher concludes that mentality is "a

system of social values that cannot be described by logical constructions but which allows a representative of this society to think and feel in a special way, to evaluate what is happening in the surrounding world" [15, 250]. In other words, the national mentality includes both rational and irrational elements, knowledge and emotions. The national mentality forms a sense of national identity and a unique cultural code. To analyze the concept of cultural code it is necessary to turn to the methodological foundations of the interpretation of the concept of culture itself.

Culture is an environment of development, both for an individual and for a social group. There are many definitions of culture, and the synergetic definition of culture deserves special attention among them, which, in particular, was adhered to by V. Styopin who defined culture as a self-organized developing system of supra-biological programs of human activity that ensures the development and reproduction of the human community [14, 124]. The synergetic approach makes it possible to study culture most fully taking into account the wide variability of its constituent elements and the interrelationships between them. Culture is a living text filled with many meanings. As in any text in the text of culture information is encoded in certain symbols and signs.

Each culture is based on one or another worldview system that contains a unique cultural code. Initially the concept of code appeared in the context of information theory under the influence of which in the second half of the 20th century culture was often viewed as collective knowledge, historically formed information that stores and transmits human experience in various ontological spheres. This experience can be read by each new generation as a cultural text (a system of texts). The symbolic aspect of the cultural text is based on codes containing basic cultural meanings.

The cultural code today is the basic concept of cultural semiotics in the context of which culture is understood as a system of signs and symbols

that function according to certain rules and form the specifics of national consciousness and behavior. The national cultural code correlates with values, reflects them but at the same time is not an axiological system since it is devoid of a value hierarchy it is formed spontaneously under the influence of various cultural and historical factors.

According to N. Khudolei "the national code of culture can be characterized as a complex of stereotypes formed under the influence of national culture in the consciousness of a certain nation" [8, 644].

According to Ye. Babosov, the national code of culture is "a system of unique archetypes, images and values, polished by centuries of the historical development of the people characterizing their identity, mentality and spiritual and moral attitudes" [1, 48].

The national code of culture functions both at the level of public consciousness and at the level of individual consciousness. In this regard it is possible to speak about the concept of the cultural code of a personality. As it was emphasized by Ye. Diener and N. Lopatina the cultural code of personality still does not have an unambiguous interpretation in the scientific literature but at the same time it is considered as a kind of ideal construct associated with the unconscious sphere hidden from direct understanding but determining human behavior [4, 132].

So, the difficulties of defining the concept of national code of culture appeared due to the variety of approaches to the interpretation of culture as well as the changeable nature and the possibility of situational reading of the phenomenon of national consciousness itself. In order to highlight the essence of a particular national code, it is necessary to highlight a certain ideological invariant, which is very difficult, since consciousness, both individual and collective, is a process of changing states due to a huge variety of factors, from natural-geographical to economic and informational. At the same time, it is a mistake to believe that the cultural code of a nation

is something like an ever-elusive illusion, since its functioning and influence on society and culture is quite real and measurable (which manifests itself in national identification, differentiation of "one's own" and "others'", motivation of behavioral strategies, etc.). Generally the following definition of the national cultural code can be given: it is a system of mental representations, images and stereotypes of consciousness and behavior which has a non-hierarchical historical character, reflects national values, and also serves as the basis of the national mentality.

The national code of culture is the basis of the national mentality which can be present as a set of psychological and ideological ideas, guidelines and attitudes. It is by reading the national code that people identify each other as "compatriots" or "foreigners". National codes form systems of values and anti-values for each separate culture, integrating its empirical diversity into a single semantic space.

Most countries of the world are multiethnic, so the national code is a meta–ethnic level of interpretation of culture. As Ye. Babosov rightly notes the national cultural code manifests itself "as a historically established and developing system of socio-cultural communications, integrating into the dynamically evolving integrity of spiritual, moral, family, natural, geographical, economic, and geopolitical features that are considered generally accepted norms of self-identification of people, regardless of their ethnicity, and transmitted from generation to generation through teaching and upbringing, preservation and reproduction of the historical memory of the people" [1, 48].

The mechanisms of transmitting of mentality and also cultural codes are language, art, social and cultural practices including rituals (religious and non-religious, social ones). If earlier the borders of national culture were relatively clearly delineated and were connected with the territorial borders of states and regions today in the era of globalization and

digitalization these borders were transferred to the virtual space, where they underwent a significant transformation and were largely erased. In the information space of modernity, there are cultural texts that contain the meanings of various national cultures, often united in an eclectic unity. Such a situation in itself is a challenge to national identity and mentality, since it raises the question of the impossibility of preserving national cultural codes in the same form.

Under the influence of the factor of universal digitalization the following trends in the transformation of national cultural codes as the basis of national mentality have now been formed:

1. Universalization trend. Generalization of cultural meanings, their transition to the global level which is accompanied by the blurring of former cultural boundaries and differences.

2. Localization trend. Aggravation of national issues in the context of global information challenges. The need to update and analyze the unique and distinctive features of national cultures. This trend is related to the functional role of the national cultural code. Each national cultural code is characterized by a set of qualitative universal characteristics that perform a human-forming and human-elevating role in the formation of behavioral stereotypes, life positions, social expectations, ideological and life-meaning preferences and expectations of individuals, their social groups within the cultural and civilizational boundaries peculiar to a particular people [1, 48].

3. The trend of marginalization and individualization of cultures, the emergence of a new ones on the borders of the traditional cultural space, the strengthening of the personal principle in culture. This trend is most clearly manifested in two aspects. The first aspect is overcoming the old social and natural laws through digital

technologies. The second aspect is the transition from the general to the particular, from intersubjective universal values, ideals and guidelines to private human ideals and values (as well as private human anti-ideals and anti-values) [12, 129].

The third trend deserves special attention. Overcoming the laws of society and nature in the era of digitalization is expressed in the virtualization of such basic aspects of anthropological existence as time, physicality and communication. Digital technologies make it possible to establish contacts regardless of distances and physical boundaries. At the same time, a person's perception of itself, its physicality, its consciousness and its Self changes [7, 204]. Digitalization makes it possible to try on various virtual images replacing physical physicality in the personal consciousness. The material environment is largely replaced by its digital simulation [2, 16] an example of which is the use of human hologram technology. This technology is one of the most relevant areas of development of IT technologies and is widely used in the fields of distance education, corporate events and exhibitions, and in the field of cultural leisure. Communication between the presenter (lecturer, guide) and the audience in this case takes place in off-line mode, since a hologram is a pre-recorded high-resolution information that is broadcast on a display or on a holographic film (for example, MUSION technology). Thanks to the use of hologram technology the same event can be held simultaneously in several places with a pronounced effect of the speaker's presence at this event.

Communication in the digital age is increasingly becoming asynchronous (via e-mail boxes, answering machines, etc.). Moreover digitalization itself is becoming a cultural value since it allows you to overcome not only cultural space but also cultural time as time boundaries between epochs and civilizations. As T. Kuznetsova rightly points out, "a detailed analysis of the architectural originality of the Egyptian pyramids,

deciphering ancient manuscripts, reproducing the voices of priests who lived thousands of years ago according to the structures of the remains of their larynx, and so on would have been impossible without the use of digital technologies" [9, 5].

In fact, a modern person is born in the real physical world but lives in two worlds – physical and virtual. The digital cultural space is centered on the subject of cognition. Local cultures act in this context no more than individual derivatives of interpretation and synthesis of cognizing subjects [12, 122].

Additionally digitalization creating ample opportunities for individual choice of cultural information [11, 61] strengthens the trend of transition from the general to the private. In the cultural context it means, first of all, that culture is becoming more and more personality-centered and less and less general. Personality in the context of modern digital culture is forced to creativity as a necessary way of adaptation in the information environment, since the economy is reorienting from material production, the production of goods to the production of services and information. If in the pre-industrial and pre-digital eras the cultural tradition built on the basis of the national cultural code determined the whole life of a person. Today it acts only as a starting point for personal and social development. Based on the assimilation of national culture, innovation is being formed today which presupposes individual creativity that goes far beyond the national cultural codes. This in turn is possible due to the development of the global digital economy. Information products produced in the modern world thanks to digitalization are distributed outside national cultural borders and are oriented towards a cross-border cultural format.

So, as almost any phenomenon digitalization has both positive and negative aspects of influencing on culture. The positive aspects are the expansion of the spatial and temporal boundaries of culture which leads to

its enrichment, simplifies intercultural interaction, and therefore removes many intercultural contradictions and forms a tolerant dialogue of cultures. At the personal level digitalization contributes to the individualization of culture (which now depends on the ways of interpreting the entire diversity of cultural codes by the cognizing subject) as well as creativity and innovation as necessary conditions for adaptation in the digital economy. Negative, "dark" aspects of digitalization are the blurring of national cultural boundaries, the leveling of national identity or the aggravation of nationalist tendencies and chauvinism as an attempt to keep the boundaries of national culture inviolable, as well as a number of problems related to ethics (computers are not moral subjects) and security (vulnerability of personal data, digital vandalism, manipulation and information piracy [13, 133]). Cultural and social reality in the era of digitalization, in general, becomes less stable and more unstable which, according to P. Feyerabend's apt expression occurs according to the principle "all means are good" [5, 23].

Under the influence of digitalization social and cultural space of national states is gradually moving from a geographical and physical dimension to a virtual digital dimension. It is important to remember that the basic features of the national cultural code and national mentality have traditionally been formed under the influence of the natural geographical factor. In the new realities of the digital society this factor ceases to be the leading one which automatically entails the processes of transformation of the national cultural archetype.

The actors of the digital economy and at the same time the agents of the field of culture are the Ministries of Culture, state and non-state cultural institutions, opinion leaders, etc. [16, 127]. Under the influence of these factors, the economic processes of digitalization are being introduced into the cultural code of the people.

The fundamental functional roles of the cultural field in the context of digitalization are ideological, adaptive and integrative. It is expressed in the fact that the field of culture contributes to the understanding of digitalization in general and, in particular, the digital economy, helping society to adapt to new conditions of existence and preserving the integrative integrity of the social system in conditions of constant transformations.

During the thematic interviewing of representatives of the field of culture in 2020–2021 dedicated to their attitude to the digitalization of culture both positive and negative assessments of this process were obtained, which were divided approximately equally in percentage ratio [16, 127–128]. Positive assessments include an increase in the accessibility of cultural achievements to a mass audience due to digitalization while negative assessments were mainly related to issues of digital security, vulnerability of personal data and the threat of destruction of traditional values.

It is obvious that digitalization as an objective and versatile process cannot develop without taking into account mentality and the cultural code of the countries involved in it. In this regard questions about how to strengthen the positive aspects of the impact of digitalization on the national culture of a country and minimize the negative impact come to the fore.

Therefore, national mentality is a historically formed type of thinking and feeling that determines an individual's or a community's understanding of social and cultural reality. National mentality reflects a cultural code unique to each culture – a system of representations, images and stereotypes of consciousness and behavior, which has a non-hierarchical historical character, reflects national values, and also serves as the basis of national identity. The cultural code operates through the cultural field which along with the fields of power, science, education, economics, information technology and finance, forms the social field of the digital economy.

Digitalization as a large-scale socio-cultural process has both positive and negative aspects which are read differently by the public consciousness, depending on the specifics of the national mentality and the content of the national cultural code. The main trends in the transformation of cultural codes under the influence of digitalization are their universalization, localization and individualization.

Many representatives of the cultural sphere of the countries involved in the process of digitalization are able to adequately assess the advantages of digitalization in the field of cultural democratization. At the same time, it is the critical attitude to the negative factors of digitalization, such as the vulnerability of personal data, digital vandalism, leveling of the national identity of culture, and so on that can become a motivating factor for finding ways to minimize the impact on the national cultural space. Consequently, the national mentality creates a kind of "ideological immunity" against the "dark side" of digitalization, without hindering the use of its positive opportunities, first of all, democratization and increasing accessibility to leading cultural achievements for the general population.

References:

1. Babosov, Ye. (2016). Cultural Code of the Nation: Essence and Features // *Nauka i Innovatsii*. No. 157, 48–50 [in Russian].

2. Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacres et Simulation* / Paris: Galilée, 240.

3. Davliyerova, S.T. (2006). National Self-Consciousness: Facts and Problems // *Izvestiya AN Respubliki Tadzhikistan. Seriya: Filosofiya i Pravo*. No.1, 41–53. [in Russian].

4. Diner, Ye.V., Lopatina, N.V. (2020). United Digital Knowledge Space in the Formation of a National Cultural Code of Personality: Design Methodology // *Vestnik MGUKI*. No. 6 (98), 130–138. [in Russian].

5. Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. New York: Verso Books, 399.

6. Gordiyenko, O.V., Sokolova, A.A., Simonova, A.A. (2019). Axiological Characteristics of Digital Transformation of Education // *Pedagogika i Psikhologiya Obrazovaniya*. No. 3, 9–21. [in Russian].

7. Jacobi, B.G. (2013). The Human Dilemma. Life Between Illusion and Reality // *Journal of Philosophy of Life*. Vol.3, No.3. 202–211.

8. Khudoley, N.V. (2017). National Code of Culture and its Actualization in Proverbs, Sayings and Classical Literary Texts // *Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Voprosy Obrazovaniya: Yazyki i Spetsial'nost'*. Vol. 14. No. 4, 643–653. [in Russian].

9. Kuznetsova, T.F. (2019). Digitalization as a Cultural Value and Digital Technologies // *Gorizonty Gumanitarnogo Znaniya: Tsennosti Proshlogo – Tsennosti Budushchego*. No. 5, 3–13. [in Russian].

10. Mamedova, N.M. (2021) A Man in the Era of Digitalization: on the Verge of the Real and the Virtual // *Vek Globalizatsii*. No. 3, 74–85. [in Russian].

11. Medak, T. (2008). Transformations of Cultural Products, Free Culture and the Future of Internet // *Digital Culture: The Changing Dynamics.* Zagreb: Institute of International Relations, 59–70.

12. Mikailova, I.G. (2021). Global Digitalization of Sociocultural Reproduction: "Deus ex Machina" or the End of the Human Era? // *Sotsial'nyye Novatsii i Sotsial'nyye Nauki*, No. 1, 121–132. [in Russian].

13. Sanders, C.S., Scanlon, E. (2021). The Digital Divide Is a Human Rights Issue: Advancing Social Inclusion Through Social Work Advocacy // *Human Rights and Social Work*. Vol. 6 (2). 130–143.

14. Styopin, V.S. (2011). *Civilization and Culture*. Saint-Petersburg: SPbGUP, 408. [in Russian].

15. Volkova, Ye.A. (2015). National Mentality as a Factor of International Communication // *Vestnik MGIMO-Universiteta*. No. 1 (40), 232–236 [in Russian].

16. Volokhova, A.Yu., Ogurtsova, N.V. (2021). The Place and Role of the Field of Culture in the Formation and Development of the Russian Digital Economy // *Mezhdunarodniy Nauchno-Issledovatel'skiy Zhurnal*. No. 11 (113). Part 4. 125–129. [in Russian].

_____