

FINAL REPORT

MINORITY'S INFLUENCE AND THE ROLE OF MENTALITY
IN SOCIAL CONFLICT IN
ESTABLISHING THE INSTITUTIONS
OF DEMOCRACY

1. INTRODUCTION

The area of our research is the phenomenon of social influence process and the role of person's and group's mentality in the conflict. Conflict implies the existence of at least two sides or parties, majority and minority (by its number, territory, resources and etc.). Until now the role of majority in social influence process was mainly studied - considering the existing numerous psychological researches on the phenomenon of conformity. There are not a lot of studies on the role and meaning of minority in social influence process. Studying the problem of minority and majority in the social influence process, we came to a conclusion, that interrelation of minority and majority is determined by the characteristics of attitude, which exists between majority and minority. Our researches identified that for the positive attitude is greatly determined by the common backgrounds /similarity/ among the mentality of minority and majority. While working on this problem we discovered the necessity of the mentality investigation.

2. THE CONCEPT OF MENTALITY

Mentality is the unity of group's or individual's behavior, thinking, feelings, attitudes, trends, it is formed with the influence of traditions, culture, social structures and the whole environment of human being and at the same time it influences the process of their formation. National and cultural, rational and emotional, conscious and unconscious, individual and social - all the contradictions are crossed on the mentality level and are mixed in its structure. In mentality high-organized forms of conscious (as philosophy, religion, science) and unconscious codes of culture are connected defining person's or group's whole life.

There is a very poor literature on mentality. It is worth admitting that the research work of the Russian scientist Gurevich - "Categories of the medieval culture". By Gurevich the main universal categories of culture, penetrating through all areas of this culture, at the same time are the categories, which define human conscious and are given as a conceptions and form of perception of the reality. These universal categories interrelate and create a model of the universe - the net of those

coordinates being as main semantic means of culture, by which people perceive the universe. Society proposes these categories by the direct teaching as well as unconscious influence through the cultural norms, traditions, habits, languages structure, folklore and etc.

This way mentality is formed. Gurevich noticed, that without the knowledge of these fundamental categories it is impossible to understand culture itself. In this research work attention is drawn to none obviously formulated and explicitly expressed components of culture, which are reflected in mentality, mediating person's or group's perception and behavior.

3. THE ROLE OF MENTALITY IN CONFLICT

Understanding the factors, which give rise to cooperation or competitive social process, as well as their characteristics requires deeper knowledge of mentality. Revealing conscious as well as unconscious content of mentality can help us to propose whether a conflict will take a constructive or destructive course.

Individuals, groups and nations with different cultural backgrounds must often negotiate about their conflicting interests, beliefs or values. Their cultural differences may give rise to barriers to interaction, misunderstandings, prejudices and behavior, which is unwittingly offensive, and these may reduce the chances, that negotiations will be constructive. Similarly, organizational effectiveness will be much impaired if people from different cultural backgrounds cannot work together successfully.

Differences in mentality are the most significant factors, involved in mis-perception and misjudgment. The perception of any act is determined by both the perception of the act itself and the context within which it occurs - the context of a social act often is not obvious, whereupon we tend to assume a familiar context - one that seems likely in terms of our own past experience. Since both, the present situation and the past experience of action and perception may be rather different, it is not surprising that the two will interpret the same act differently. Misunderstanding of this sort are very likely when an actor and perceiver come from different cultural backgrounds and are not fully informed about these differences. A period of rapid social changes also make misunderstandings widespread as the gap between past and present widens.

As researches have pointed out, the self-identity of individuals is very much linked to the characteristics of the groups which they identify. These characteristics then help to define their social identity. The expectations, beliefs, language, practices, rituals, norms and values which members of an inter-group have in common, define their shared culture. The culture, in turn, establishes the symbolic meaning of actions,

defining a type of action as appropriate or inappropriate, respectful or disrespectful, friendly or hostile- praiseworthy or blameworthy, and etc. Cultural differences are established early and the cultural assumption acquired in childhood often have heavily laden emotional connotation to cultural differences, which play significant role in ethnic conflicts, is apt to result in strong emotional reactions. Although the term ethnocentrism is usually employed in reaction to ethnic and national groups, it is well to recognize that an analogous process can occur in the relations between various social categories. Each social category has its own subculture and the differences between the subcultures (in expectations, practices, languages, norms, values and so on) may lead to misunderstandings, stereotypes and prejudices which affect the ability of people in different categories to manage the conflicts between them successfully. There have been few studies, which focus on how cultural factors effect the national negotiating styles. (Weiss and Stripp, 1985). Such researches show, that it is necessary to provide negotiations with an understanding of the implicit cultural assumption which are likely to determine how negotiators from different nations perceive the world, including the way in which they see and evaluate the mechanisms for processing disputes and decide on their course of action. Lacking such knowledge, negotiators from different cultural background are likely to be misunderstood one another and apt to engage in behavior that is unwittingly offensive to the other circumstances not conducive to constructive conflict resolution. These investigations would suggest that major misunderstandings and difficulties might occur between negotiators from different nations if they were not trained to be sensitive to their cultural differences in negotiation's styles.

The perception of differences between individual and other, between group and out-group is a necessary condition for conflict, but sometimes differences and dissimilarities can be complementary and lead to a banding. This are incompatible differences which give rise to conflict.

The incompatible action may arise because one or both parties (sides of conflict) perceive that the existence of the other's attributes threatens or weakens the support for his own valued attributes. It is not the objective incompatibility that is crucial but rather the perceived incompatibility. The objective incompatibility may not be recognized because there is a false consciousness with regard to the incompatible interest, and hence, conflict would be latent rather than actual. Mis-perception may lead to the perception of an incompatibility where not true incompatibility exists and leads to a false conflict.

There is not yet really satisfactory definition and classification of ethnic conflicts. There are many different theoretical approaches to understand the conflict. Psychologists consider conflict as an interpersonal phenomenon, social psychologists

are concentrated on interpersonal and inter-group conflict, sociologists have stressed out social role, status and class conflict, economists have focused on economic competition, about negotiations, politics on international conflicts and so on.

When investigating the conflicts in Georgia as in many post-totalitarian countries we need to consider almost all kinds of approaches, because these conflicts have political, economical, as well as ethno-psychological features. Any comprehensive approaches to understand conflict will necessarily include consideration of both objective and subjective factors, whether the conflict participants is a person, group or nation. Subjective factors are: values, goals, cognition, expectations, and etc. Objective factors: participant's resources, power, skills, allies and enemies as well as characteristics of the social-cultural - institutional context within which their relationship is embodied. Deutsch considers several key nations in the social-psychological approach to conflict. The most interesting issues to us are the following:

1. Each participant in a social interaction responds to the other in term of his perception and cognition of the other; these may or may not correspond to the other's actualities.

2. Each participant in a social interaction, being cognizant of the other's capacity for awareness, is influenced by his own expectations concerning the other's actions as well as by his perceptions of the other's conduct. Their expectations may or may not be accurate.

3. Social interaction takes place in a social environment - in a family, a group, a community, a nation, a civilization - that has developed technique, symbols, categories, rules and values, that are relevant to human interactions. Hence, to understand the events that occur in social interactions one must comprehend the interplay of these events with the broader social-cultural context in which they occur.

Deutsch (1973, 1985) considers the determinants of whether a conflict takes a constructive or destructive course. The hypothesis, which he has termed "Deutsch's crude law of social relations", is that the characteristic process and effects elicited by a given type of social relationship (for example, cooperative or competitive) also tend to elicit that type of social relationships. Thus, cooperation between persons or groups is induced by a perceived similarity in beliefs and attitudes, or readiness to be helpful, openness in communication, trusting and friendly attitudes, sensitivity to common interests and de-emphasis of opposed interests; and etc. Similarly, competition is induced by the use of tactics of coercion, threat or deception, attempts to enhance the power differences between oneself and other; minimalisation of the awareness of similarities in values and increased sensitivity to opposed interests; suspicious and hostile attitudes and etc.

Thus, all such researches emphasize the necessity of knowledge of different nations mentality for building correct interrelations and avoid the conflict.

4. CONFLICT AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE PROCESSES

Although the conflict has been a fascinating topic for scientists, as well for governmental leaders throughout recorded history, the systematic study of conflict and conflict processes is of recent vintage. This area was not identified as a field of scholarship, as such until after the World War II, even though scholarly work on conflict in many disciplines occurred earlier. There are conflict processes and variables that affect the courses and outcomes of conflict which cut across the various behavioral and social sciences. There are investigations, which try to characterize the nature of conflict (Deutsch) and have tried to identify some of the processes involved in conflicts. Other scholars (Brocker and Rubin, 1986; Smoke, 1977) have discussed insightfully the processes involved in the escalation of conflict. It is evident, that there is a long way from having the comprehensive suggestions about how to prevent, abort or de-escalate such conflicts.

In recent years many workshops and programs for training people in the skills of constructive conflict resolutions have emerged. Training has taken place with negotiators, managers in industry and government many self-helped books have been published. Centers and institutes of training and research in conflict resolution have been established at a considerable number of universities. All of this is in response to a strong worldwide need for more knowledge about how to prevent destructive conflict and how to encourage constructive controversy. But as Deutsch (1985) notices "as a theoretician-researcher who has tried to develop some of this knowledge, as an educator who has tried to develop a framework for teaching conflict-resolution skills and as a teacher who has tried to teach such skills, I am concerned that there is relatively little research being done on the effectiveness of what we are teaching.

Conflict is one of the forms of relations, which included phenomenon, as is social influence. So the results of studies on social influence phenomenon may be useful in understanding and managing the different conflicts. Studying the psychological mechanism of social influence process we discovered the importance of attitude between the conflicted parties. At the beginning of researches on social influence phenomenon, social influence was understood only as a conformity.

The psychology of social influence has, until now, been based on a psychology of conformity, of submission to the group and its norms. It has been fashioned and

considered from the point of view of the majority, authority and social control. Till 70ies in psychological literature only the possibility of majority producing conformity influence was in the center of attention. After these years the time was ripe for a new orientation: an orientation towards a psychology of social influence which will be a psychology of innovation, of the possibilities of acting on and in relation to the group; a psychology, which will be thought out and fashioned from the points of view of the minority, the deviant, and of social change. A full understanding of influence phenomena requires that we view the minority, individual or subgroup in terms of the impact they may have on the group opinion. They have been viewed only as influence receivers or deviants. They must now be also seen as potential influence emitters and norm originators. Influence is exerted in two directions: from the majority toward the minority and from the minority toward the majority. In other world, influence is a reciprocal process, involving action and reactions of both - source and target. By thinking of each group member, irrespective of whether he is in a position of authority, whether he is a deviate, whether he belongs to the majority or to the minority, as both an emitter and a receiver of influence, we are better able to group what happens to him in a real social interaction. This means searching in all cases for symmetrical relationships. Each part of a group must be considered as emitting and receiving influence simultaneously. Every individual and subgroup regardless of status, is both being acted upon others at the same moment, whenever influence occurs. Thus a majority which is attempting to impose its norms and point of view on minority is at the same time under pressure from this minority to make itself understood and to make its norms and point of view acceptable. Conversely, when a minority accedes to a majority positions, it must be able to understand the motivations and opinions, which it is assuming, and this will involve a process of adjustment and modification of these motivations and ideas, so that they will fit as far as possible the existing minority frame of influence.

All societies are heterogeneous by definition, and people do not all share the same world within a society. Individuals, classes, and professional interests are in conflict, and their objectives and modes of action are incompatible. Laws, conventions, administrative regulations attempt to transform these centrifugal forces into centripetal ones. Order crystallizes out of the shifting mass of virtual disorder. And what applies to society as a whole applies also within each group. Social control and social change, sometimes complement each other and sometimes oppose each other. But these two forces are not equally strong in all sectors of social life, or in all parts of society or groups. Not do they have equal impact on all developmental phases of a collective system. These are commonplace observations, but they do call attention to some neglected implications.

Off-hand, one might assume that groups such as the family, the church, school, industry, the army, certain political movements, would act to maintain social control as the dominant force. In these groups, the requirement of continuity, the need to transmit practices and values, the need to maintain hierarchic relationships, entail a constant supervision of individual behavior and a no less constant vigilance to prevent or eliminate deviance whenever it occurs. Consensus, submission to norms, the suppression of strong personal preferences, and the need for guidance and approbation seem to be necessary preconditions for any coordinated and conflict-free interaction.

Social influence is not necessarily associated with either uncertainty or disagreement. Everything around us is arranged in such a way as to confirm us in our attitudes, strengthen our agreement with each other, and forestall anything that might unsettle this state of affairs. All means conversations about the weather to political speeches, are used in such a way as to avoid the slightest awakening of curiosity. But when influence is exerted in the direction of change, disagreement is inevitable. Conflict is a necessary condition of influence. It is the starting-point and the means of changing other, of establishing new relations or consolidating old ones. Uncertainty and ambiguity are concepts and states derived from conflict. Everything must therefore be seen in the context of interaction. This is a consequence of the emphasis placed on conflict. As soon as influence was held to be a matter of reducing uncertainty or ambiguity, the other person, the source of influence, had the role mediator of facts with regard to the environment. In the words, using persons or relying on them amounted to an alternative way of using or relying on physical objects; other persons served as a sort of remote sensor or grappler, permitting the subject to extend his resources for dealing with the material world. But it must be recognized that the other person, the source of influence, will obviously tend to encourage a need of this kind, in order to serve his own interests. He will tend to provoke the state that forces the subject to rely on him, since he is the antagonist with whom the subject must come to terms. If this is the case, we certainly cannot continue to conceive of him merely as a "mediator of facts". Relative strengths, feelings, intentions, sincerity, courage, and so on, all must be taken into account, and they are very easily overlooked when we are dealing with non-personal, non-social entities.

With these factors acknowledged, the divergence between alternative solutions represents a sort of conflict with respect to consensus. Such conflict is inevitable in consensus matters to us, especially if we have nowhere else to go in order to find it. In short, in social influence, relations with others take precedence over relations with objects, and inter-individual dynamics take precedence over intra-individual dynamics. This constitutes exactly the reverse of what has been accepted up to now.

At this level, interaction is characterized by divergence and antagonism. In dealings with other persons or subgroups, each person or subgroup brings to bear a value system and characteristic reactions which are unique. It has a certain margin for accepting or rejecting the value system and reactions of its antagonists. Confrontations of frequently incompatible systems entail the risk of rapid termination of exchanges, in so far as the parties give preference to their own mode of thinking and seek to affirm their own point of view as against that of the antagonists. The tensions resulting from such confrontations may quickly lead to breakdown of communication, the isolation of the participants, and inability to achieve the purpose of the social exchange in which they were taking part. Furthermore, self-confidence has been shaken and anxiety has been produced.

In order to avoid this kind of situation, the parties are compelled to attempt a readjustment of the system which will lead to a reduction or resolution of opposition, and this is done at the cost of a few concessions. To the extent that the influence process takes place in such a context of conflict, and tends to lead to readjustment procedures, it would seem to be closely related to the process of negotiation. The connection between influence and negotiation has not been recognized until now.

5. INNOVATION AND MINORITY'S ROLE IN THE CHANGE OF MAJORITY'S MENTALITY

The literature on innovation does not acknowledge the influence the minority groups can exercise on the majority group's perception. It is contended that people who belong to the majority group are more likely to innovate. However, without the presence of minority groups, the majority is not confronted with dissonant opinions, and consequently cannot put its own assumptions in question. We consider that minority groups have a significant role in the innovation process which is the important and necessary component of the process of democratisation.

The participants that share the dominant group norms, and consequently adopt the consensual cognitive schemes of the majority cannot exercise a significant influence on the innovation process. The reason for this is that it is necessary to disrupt the automatic processing by breaking the consensual schemes in order to bring about important changes.

Culture implies stability and emphasizes conceptual sharing. Thus, it implies similarities among members of a given collectivity in the way they behave, perceive their environment, and process the information. On the other hand, innovation

involves a deviation from the normal course of actions (Moscovici, 1976). Therefore, we are arguing that minority groups can influence the innovation process by provoking changes in the majority group's consensual cognitive schemes. That is, they create a conflict with the majority group's point of view, and bring the attention on certain elements that were not previously considered.

It is important to note here that we do not refer to minorities in terms of a small percentage of the persons in an organization, but rather to groups of individuals that do not share the dominant culture. Thus, we take a political perspective of the organization. Minority group's members by definition do not have control over the organization's resources although they can exercise influence over certain contingencies and acquire some of the necessary resources; whereas the dominant group's members do have control over the organization's resources, share the dominant culture, and have a higher status.

Although minority groups' members self-categorize themselves, the dominant group's members can assign them labels in order to consistently interpret and organize the information coming from the dissident members.

Strong cultures are characterized by the regular use of certain categories in routine or scripted ways. Thus, the stronger the dominant culture is, the more developed are the paradigms for processing information, and the beliefs about the nature of targets. Thus, a dominant group's members who share a strong culture are more likely to use labels to communicate about dissident members. This phenomenon will be more frequently observed when the dominant culture is highly institutionalized. This is often determined by the content of mentality of those people, who are the members of majority and minority not only in the concrete situation. They have some internal disposition and prefer to be members of majority or minority. When they are in the group which is more fit for their mentality they feel comfortable, work better, and there is a low possibility for conflict.

Therefore, minority groups can disagree with dominant group norms and still progressively gain credibility through their action. Despite their lower-level positions in organizations, minority groups can acquire the necessary resources they will rely on to exercise an upward influence on the dominant group. concrete examples of this process can be found in the wider society.

When minority groups resist rather than conform, and also propose new opinions, it creates conflict. Such conflict has the effect of rupturing consensus, and introduces an alternative view to the dominant one. "In this view, we can say that individuals or groups that innovate exercise influence by creating or increasing conflict" (Moscovici,

1976). We can explain this by the introduction of a sudden cognitive process. We can define the dissident cognitive process as an extensive cognitive process of the dissonant stimuli that progressively affects the consensual cognitive schemes. That is, the consensual cognitive schemes are changed by a revised detailed information process in which the dissident cognitive process contradicts the agreed-on meaning of the dominant group members' conception of the reality. Thus, the conflict is internalized before it gets resolved.

Cultures are systems of enduring, socially agreed-on meanings that guide behavior. Since cognitive processes determine meaning it follows that organizations will exhibit behavior that is guided by socially agreed-on meanings, which are in turn sanctioned as legitimate by the social cognitive processes of those individual and groups working in the organization. The legitimacy of the dominant group's culture determines the extent to which organizational culture can control the organizations members behavior.

There are ambiguities in culture that should be acknowledged. Martin and Meyerson suggest new metaphors of culture such as a web. "This image depicts culture as a web of diversity, loosely coupled, and volatile networks of symbols and relationships" . When the importance of various issues, relationships, or voices shift, so too would the specific image of culture. This view, which sees culture as dynamic and multivocal, represents a radical departure from those views that depict "culture as a hierarchical system of stable relationships and universal symbols" (Meyerson, 1991). This view of culture recognizes and legitimates a diverse chorus of voices, interests and perspectives that exist in society. Thus, it undermines the claims that there is a single dominant voice. As Clifford mentions: "A culture is, concretely, an open-ended, creative dialogue of subcultures, of insiders and outsiders, of diverse factions...". Therefore, we should acknowledge the existence of subcultures, and reorganize that counterculture is a normal process that can bring about changes to the course of actions in society.

According to Smircich and Finney (1983) and Mitroff (1986), culture may be viewed as a phenomenon emerging from networks of related and integrated consensual cognitive schemes and scripts.

Cognitive processes guide the group's culture and behavior. They lie embedded within the thoughts and actions of groups' members. Cognitive schemes are built from experience with relevant instances, and they become more abstract, more complex, and more organized with experience (Fiske and Taylor, 1984).

In society groups do not share the same relevant instances. The purpose for which a group of individuals plans to use the information gathered has been shown to affect the processing of that information.

Minority group's and the dominant group do not have the same observational goals. Members of a minority group develop their own subculture and consensual cognitive schemes. Thus, they will be attentively to stimuli that majority group members may overlook. They can also process the information in a different way. Their perception of the organization's environment will differ from the dominant groups members' perception. Thus, organizations are constituted of different groups who differ in their "enactment" process, and consequently have different views of the environment. These different views may overlap to some extent, but they cannot be very similar since they were developed by individuals who have different backgrounds, abilities, and interests, i.s. different mentality.

The dominant group cognitive consensuality can retard society and is perhaps the most reasonable explanation why society can be slow to change. Because innovation implies new ways of thinking and doing, new patterns of cognitive processing are necessary. Since the dominant group can exercise more control than other groups over the innovation process, their cognitive consensuality must be destroyed and rebuilt in order to bring about significant innovations. Nemeth and Straw (1989) noted the importance of majority group members exposure to dissident members in overcoming the deleterious consequences of the conformity to erroneous views. They also found that even when dissident members were erroneous they still contributed to the detection of truth and to the movement of both performance and decision making. Minority views, even when they are wrong, foster the kinds of attention and thoughts processes that lead to the detection of new truths and raise the quality of decision making. One element of this is that minorities, if they persist over time, stimulate the majority to extent more cognitive effort and to think in more divergent ways about an issue. Thus, members of the dominant group who get in contact with minority group's perception. That is, they cannot continue to process the information automatically, but must rather process it extensively.

To understand the importance that minority groups influence can have over the development and adoption of innovative practices, it is essential to know how the consensual cognitive schemes can hinder the innovation process.

Finney and Mitroff (1986) note that once schemes become embedded in a culture, they can take on an unconscious nature. It is the unconscious nature of some schemes that makes it difficult for "organizational decision makers to perceive the inconsistencies

between their espoused and enacted strategies". Thus, it can explain why it is so hard to understand the failures of a given course of action.

Cognitive structuring is costly because it ignores discrepant information or biases the information processing toward existing schemes, which are the components of mentality. It discourages disconfirmation of present schemes. Thus, it resists revision of current cognitive structures, and inhibits creative problem solving.

We have to recall that innovation is a process. In a sense, cognitive structuring is one step behind the current environmental conditions. Because such structures are resistant to alteration or change, they can preclude the innovation process. Therefore, there has to be a disruption in the automatic processing in order to modify the schemes. This disruption is achieved either by a change in formal power or by the manifestations of the minority groups. The later influence is latent, whereas the former is manifest.

The minority group's influence requires temporal spacing to provide the opportunity for dissociation between the source and the content of the message. Thus, once the content has been dissociated from the source (here - minority), it has an impact on the cognitive processes. This means that minority groups that gain credibility will get the attention of the dominant group's member who will become more attentive to the stimuli, but it is only after the occurrence of the dissociation that the stimuli will be processed. Therefore, as we mentioned previously, the conflict is internalized, and the process is latent. We must recall that labels provide a psychological distance between the dominant group and the minority groups. Therefore, dominant group's members do not want to identify with the minority groups' members. That is why the dissociation must precede the dissident cognitive process.

As K. Weick (1979) says: "..... it is easy to argue that the images and thoughts of powerful people are crucial but that images, thoughts, expectations, and sense-makings of less powerful people are not. This position neglects the latent influence that minorities can have on the dominant group. The case of minority group's influence on innovation clearly illustrates this process.

We sustain that minority groups can initiate innovation through the influence they can exercise on the consensual cognitive schemes of the dominant group. Thus, their impact of the process would not be directed but rather indirect.

We should remember that minority groups try to gain concessions from the dominant group. Innovation may be a way to make concessions to minority groups. As will be explained, intimates of crises, these concessions are more likely to occur. That is, the

dominant group seeks new solutions, and may allow minority groups to participate in the decision process. Thus, they formally recognize the minority influence.

However, the latent process cannot be formalized or controlled by the dominant group since it escapes the consciousness of the mental process. Therefore, exposure to the minority group's opinion is enough to bring about changes in the cognitive processes.

We propose that minority groups will have an important role in periods of crises in which the dominant group's consensual cognitive schemes can no longer provide appropriate solutions. Indeed, it is well established that threat and crisis can damage information processing, and reduce the creativity of the organization (Dutton, Sandelands and Straw, 1993). Such a crisis is more likely to occur when the organization has to face a rapidly changing environment, and a highly competitive market.

When there is a low level of uncertainty in the organization's environment, dominant group members can use their consensual cognitive schemes to successfully cope with their environment. On the other hand, when they perceive a high level of uncertainty they may start to feel less confident about the accuracy of their potential responses and consequently become more motivated to search novel solutions. Thus, they may become more receptive to minority groups opinion.

Thus, as Nemeth and Straw state: "dominant parties exclude minority input until time of crisis develops - period in which it is apparent that the prevailing wisdom and assumptions are no longer accurate or have not kept pace with environmental changes".

In times of crisis, organizational culture heterogeneity helps organizations adapt to the changing environment. As we will explain, this can lead to a higher rate of adoption of innovations.

Conflict between minority and dominant groups is more easily resolved in times of crisis. Minority groups can obtain concessions from the dominant group since both sides will benefit from it. As Deutsch proposes: "Any attempt to introduce a change in the existing relationship between two parties is more likely to be accepted if each expects some net gain from the change than if either side expects that the other side will gain at its expense".

We studied the conditions under which minority groups are more likely to exercise influence on the dominant group, and explained how changes occur and how this can

have an impact on the crisis process. However, minority groups' influence is moderated by certain factors.

6. THE ROLE OF MINORITY IN THE PROCESS OF DEMOCRATIZATION

The development of the process of democratization will be possible when together with other problems the issue of considering the minority's ideas is solved.

In the totalitarian countries not only influence of the minority but its existence was not possible because a totalitarian country is strong with its monolithity, which was achieved during years by using force and appropriate ideological propaganda and the existence of any type of minority could destroy its monolithity. But existence of minority is one of the main important components for development of the society and with more or less frequency and intensity it exists in the totalitarian countries. It is natural that in a democratic country minority exists and it is considered to be a very important component for the normal and successful development of the society. The basis of a democratic state is individual freedom, private ownership, electiveness of the government and etc. which naturally means that the minority's influence exists and plays a significant role in social processes.

By our standpoint social influence process is a bi-directional process in which the minority is not only a passive target of influence but also can produce some influence upon the majority. In real social influence process both - the majority and the minority are active and the character of influence depends upon the attitudes between the source and target of influence.

Social influence processes, including conformity, anti-conformity, innovation, normalization are considered by us, as different forms of person's adaptive behavior which is performed on the level of social activity and we try to explain its psychological regularity on the basis of set theory, worked out by Georgian Psychologist D. Uznadze (1886-1950). Besides this, we base our work on such researches, as are French and Raven, Hollander, Willis, Kiesler, Asch, Deutsch, Cratchfield and others.

During last years our investigations are focused on the problem of minority's influence. In post-totalitarian countries among them in Georgia implementation of the process of democratization will be possible when together with other problems the issue of considering minority's ideas is solved. In a totalitarian state not only influence of minority but also its existence was not expectable. Today the democratic changes

requires knowledge of psychological mechanisms of minority influence. In this direction we have done a number of researches on the psychological nature of minority's influence among those it has to be underlined that our experimental data shows that considering the different ideas of minority provides better decisions.

We found out different factors which caused minority to be more influential. The valence of attitude which exists between source of influence and targets of influence was found to be the most significant factors for influence. Using some modification of Ash's experimental technique, sociometric method and original method of set worked out by D. Uzmadze, we study the role of attitude for majority's and minority's influence and found out that it is the most significant factor for influence, even the behavioral style of minority, which is the main factor for minority's influence by Moscovici, causes influence only when there is a positive attitude towards minority.

There are researches (among those ours) which confirm that the existence of different ideas in the process of decision making, considering the minority's views, provide better decision making. The results of the experiments show, that in the process of problem solving minority's influence forces people to pay attention to more aspects of the situation, than in the case of majority's influence. Thoughts are led divergently - better solutions are found. Minority's influence provokes creative activities even when minority is false. The minority's and majority's influences have different cognitive and motivational factors, which are researched in Western psychology more widely than in our countries.

In psychological literature till 70ies only the possibility of majority producing conformity influence was in the center of attention. From such researches appeared that the reason of conformity was dependence - minority is dependent upon majority for verification of information or for psychological support. Then on the basis of other researches was concluded that the reason of influence can not be dependence, because minority can also influence, but minority has no such features which are connected to conformity (for example status, force and etc.). The alternative of dependence as a factor of influence was considered the consistency of behavior style of minority. Recently the particular attention was paid to the effect of membership in minority's influence, in particular it was identified that in-group minority (or minority of the membership group) has influence but out-group minority has not.

The situation in Easter Europe, in NIS and in Georgia as well requires the participation of new people in decision making. When reality changes, it needs new ideas, new forms of action. Such changes does not happen in majority's mentality, new ideas appear in a single individuals' mentality - in minority. So minority usually is the source of finding the better forms for adaptation toward the new reality. Researches

showed that as individuals are motivated to achieve correct judgments of things, conformity of individuals to a group facilitates the attainment of its goals and thus leads to its adaptation to reality. Deviants (minority) are considered as a source of difficulties that can preclude its adaptation to the external environment (Festinger, 1950; Schechter 1951; Jones and Gerard, 1967). Deviance was regarded as a defect rather than an asset. Deviant members were hypothesized to transgress norms, but not to invent others. However, in the larger society minority's political activities do not seem to correspond to this narrow vision. Minorities defend their opinions and beliefs, and their rights to be different. They pursue a definite goal, and are committed to their system of beliefs. Thus, we have to acknowledge the presence of active minority groups in our society that are trying to gain concessions from the majority. These groups sometimes bring about changes in the whole society. Decedent movement in Georgia changed the perception of the majority about the anticommunism and the need of independence.

The literature on innovation does not acknowledge the influence that minority groups can exercise on the majority group's perception. It is contended that people who belong to the majority group are more likely to innovate. However without the presence of minority groups, the majority is not confronted with dissonant opinions and consequences put its own assumptions in question. Our experiments try to explain the role that minority groups have in the innovative process.

Hollander's opinion about the meaning of idiosyncratic credit for influence refuses the chance of minority to make influence, as dissenters who challenge the majority without first earning high status will be globally overruled by the majority, but we find out, that in some circumstances consistency and active minority lead to innovation and change. Therefore, minority groups can disagree with majority groups norms and still progressively gain credibility through their actions. Despite its low level position, minority group can acquire the necessary resources they will rely on to exercise on upward influence on the majority. When minority groups resist rather than confirm, it creates conflicts. If minority also proposed new opinions, such conflict has the effect of rupturing consensus and introduces an alternative view to the dominant one. The goal of the dominant (majority) group is to exercise social control by means of increasing conformity, whereas the goal of the minority group is to obtain concessions from the dominant group by means of accentuating differences. They are obliged to do this for attracting the attention of majority, in such a way they have a chance to show their knowledge, resources, possibility for better decision making in after crises.

The researchers present many factors, which cause influence (see French's and Raven's 5 basis of the social power, Festinger's attractiveness, Moscovici's theory of behavior

style and other), but it is difficult to find common psychological background in order to explain the nature of this phenomenon.

7. PSYCHOLOGY OF SET AND ITS MEANING FOR THE UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

To use the psychological theory of set worked out by Georgian psychologist Uznadze gives us the possibility to find out the common background for explaining almost all kinds of behavior which are considered under the concept of social influence.

The psychological theory of set by Uznadze is a general psychological theory of human activity. Set is a state of readiness predisposition of the subject to the definite activity in definite situation.

Uznadze distinguished so called primary set and secondary fixed set. Experimental data indicate that the primary set arising on the basis of the joint influence of the outside and inside factors should be distinguished from the secondary fixed sets which are formed later on as a result of transparency and fixation of primary sets to the objects and phenomena included in the behavior. They assume the structural forms of the given objects and phenomena and are formed as dispositions. According to this we consider attitude as a secondary set fixed on the level of social activity.

In the psychic activity we have singled out individual, subject and personality levels, whose psychological content is largely determined by the content and the structure of the set forming on the basis of these levels. Correspondingly, the differentiated characteristics of the set forming the basis of the practical, theoretical and social behavior is performed through such constituent factors as need, situation, personal and social requirements.

Experimental investigation carried out in this respect demonstrates the regularities of accommodation which do not only characterize the formation and action of sets but also express the general psychological nature of human activity.

The theory of set has been employed by us to explain the psychological mechanisms of conformal and anti-conformal behavior proceeding from the social function of conformity, which is expressed in a certain form of man's adaptation to social environment and is thus purposeful behavior. Set has specific regularities at different levels of man's activity. Conformal behavior is a social behavior and its character can be explained by the regularities of person's social activity set. Conformal behavior of

a person is that which meets the requirements and expectations of a standard of social group, whereas when this person chooses to behave anti-conformally, he apparently deliberately violates these requirements and expectations. But infrequently anti-conformal patterns of behavior are paralleled to independent ones due to their visible similarity; however they have quite different psychological determinants. When a person rebuffs any requirement of a social group the hypothetical reason of such a behavior entirely differs from independent ones. The formal being wholly determined by the influence of the group: therefore the behavior of the person in question is conformal ad maximum because this behavior is conditioned not by true, actual independence but conversely by the joint pressure of the group. We regard conformal and anti-conformal behavior as a social activity of principally the same type, determined by a social group, but exercised in the opposed direction. The concepts of actual set and socially fixed set (attitude) make it possible to regard the conformal and anti-conformal behavior as those determined by the valence of a personality's socially fixed set (attitude) towards a group. At each given moment of social activity a person develops a definite momentary set stemming from the requirements of the person in question, his already fixed sets and the social situation existing at the moment. A fixed set as a programmed preparedness to display a definite pattern of the behavior is triggered into action by relevant circumstances and thus contributes to the formation of momentary sets. We believe that the factor of valence of a socially-fixed set to a given social group is decisive in determining conformal or anti-conformal behavior of a person. The role of attitude valence towards groups was studied for both conformal and anti-conformal behavior. Analyses of the experimental data has revealed that the influence of a social group on a person is determined by the attitude of the person towards the given group. The socially-fixed set (attitude) takes part in the formation of actual set of concrete behavior and determines the process of behavior in the corresponding direction. In the group towards which a person has a positive attitude conformal behavior is observed, while in case of a negative attitude, we see the opposite.

As we mentioned above attitude is a form of fixed set which is formed on the level of social activity, on the basis of social need and social environment. Before concrete social activity in the process of formation of concrete actual set of social behavior, attitude (fixed set) toward the source of influence takes part, and if this attitude is stronger, then other components of actual set, it gives the direction to concrete action.

It became traditional to begin the investigation of attitude phenomena from pointing out the excessive indeterminance of the concept of attitude (Allport, 1935; Gibson, 1941; Prangishvili, 1967; McGuire, 1974; Nadirashvili, 1974;). The reason of such state of attitude's problems lies in the fact, that the discussion of attitude's nature goes

without regard for the context of any general theory of behavior. It makes difficult the decision of the problem of attitudes formation and modification.

By our opinion, psychological theory of set, worked out by D. Uznadze, give the possibility to avoid this obstacle.

Social influence process can not readily be explained in the traditionally "conformity" perspective - according to this view only the majority has a possibility to make influence while the minority only has to change. By our standpoint social influence process is not one-way process- but it is a bilateral process in which the minority is not only a passive target of influence, but it also can produce some influence upon the majority. In social influence process both - the majority and the minority are active and the character of influence depends upon the attitudes between the source and target of influence.

Social influence processes, including conformity, anti-conformity, innovation, normalization and so on, are certain form of social activity and its characteristics can be explained by the regularities of set.

In our experiments on the process of influence, we have constructed experimental situations by using modifications of sociometric method and Asch's classic technique. In one of the series of experiments the source of influence was majority and conformity of anti-conformity of subjects was fully determined by the valence of attitude. The other experiment was done for the study minority's influence: minority was acting with consistency behavioral style, in one situation the others had positive attitude towards him, in another situation attitude towards minority was negative. The subjects were the students of Tbilisi State University. The results of both experiments confirmed, that influence happens only when the target of influence has a positive attitude toward the source of influence. From this experiments particularly interesting is that consistency of behavioral style, which is considered by the researches as a main factor of minority's influence, plays its role only in the case of positive attitude toward the minority.

On the basis of psychological and social researches is established that the minority can change the majority's attitudes and beliefs, when minority is behaving according the alternative ideas. But it is less clear how does the majority's influence affects, when the effort of influence is directed from the out-group minority, which represents different social category (f. ex. dissidents of the totalitarian regime, national minority, blacks in the racist society and etc.) and the theoretical and empirical interests are high for finding out how important is the membership category for influence and how much can the out-group minority strengthen the minority's assuring power.

According to Taifel's theory of social identity perception of belonging to different social categories create in-group favoritism and out-group discrimination. These facts are also explainable from the our point of view - the main factor is that person has positive attitude toward the in-group as toward the part of his membership group and negative attitude toward the out-group.

Psychologists have been active in this field, investigating mainly the attitude of one ethnic group towards the other or the attitudes towards the various minority groups.

8. LANGUAGE AND MENTALITY

Formation of a human being and human consciousness is connected to the development of language. As Marx stated, language is as old, as consciousness, language is a practical thing existing for other people as well as for us in the form of consciousness (or as a form of consciousness). The possibility of linguistic communication leads to formation of auto-communication, internal dialogue, which is the essential mechanism for building the consciousness. The link between the structure of language and the consciousness is widely researched by Hegel. He considers, that for consciousness is the form of abstraction from the natural surroundings and formation of attitude towards it, made by subject through the language. Using the language subject receives the knowledge from other people, experience fro the prior generations. By the grammar structure of language the subject undertakes some mental experiment, and thus receives the new knowledge.

Language in itself carries ideal standards, expressed in the form of semantic components, which abstract different aspects from reflected reality. Through this subject in its consciousness undertakes both functions - analysis and syntheses. Such actions enable the subject to build new mental structures. Some ideal forms of reality are generally expressed in the meaning of word.

In modern linguistics the object of analysis is not the single word, but the phrases or whole text. Many scientists notice that under the concept of "sign" shall be considered not a single word but the product of the finished semiotic act. To change the "atomic" paradigm of semantic analyses by the analyze of the whole phrase is the principle achievement of genetic semantic.

Every mental sphere has its own contest with its emotional color, which dictates rules of action. Every mental sphere describes reality in different ideas, opinions,

conceptions, and etc. Some of them are constructed on the basis of subject life experience, other on the basis of scientific researches, mythology, art, some on the basis of common sense and so on. The principle meaning for us has the fact, that all this mental systems are constructed by person or group of people. The picture of reality is not impersonal, the meaning of any linguistic (verbal) text can not be understood without the context of mental sphere, limited to categorization, characterizing the given person or group or whole humanity. A person's position, his attitude toward the reality, his knowledge about the reality is implicitly gives in the linguistic symbols. So to interpret a linguistic symbol without considering the subject-interpreter, as it is done by the authors of the so called semiotic triangle (Ogden-Richards theory) is not correct.

To analyze great empirical materials, Sepir and Warf concluded, that "we analyze the reality in the direction, which is given in our language. We single out some categories of reality not because they are given clearly in reality. On the contrary, reality in front of us with its multiformity which has to be organized in our mentality and this way of organization depends on our language. Georgian psychologist D. Ramishvili made different experiments to clarify the idea of the great linguist Wilhelm Humboldt, who considered that differences in language are not the differences of sign but the different perception of this object. The picture of world is different for the people speaking different languages, because of different sign and grammar systems, which determine the different picture of the world. Many scientists agree with this idea (Ramishvili, W. Humboldt).

9. PSYCHO-SEMANTIC METHOD AND ITS USAGE FOR THE STUDY OF MENTALITY

The term of psychosomatic denotes the researches, which are made on the boundary of psycho-linguistics and psychology of perception and personality. Individual consciousness is considered as a system of meanings, which is given as a part of system of perception and personal values. Psychological structure of meaning is a system of connection and opposition of words in the process of verbal act or act of consciousness. The meaning has double nature - it is the unit of social consciousness and at the same time it is the unit of individual consciousness. Meaning is a unit of social consciousness and refines all social experience in its forms according to the strict logistic laws. But the social consciousness as well as individual is not heterogeneous as it includes not only scientific knowledge, but social stereotypes and prejudices, based on common sense and nation's life experience. These stereotypes and prejudices also are transited from one generation to another, reflecting definite

historic, national, cultural forms of social consciousness. Definite forms of activities of people and social groups also generate its specific profiles of consciousness. All these makes semantic components of language and psychosemantic direction to consider semantic component as functional and not as morphological units. Semantic component may be chosen according to the experimental purposes and may accentuate different motivations, relations and etc.

The researches on mentality enable to reveal the conscious and unconscious dispositions and through this a concrete individual or nation can realize the formerly unconscious aspects of mentality and that helps to increase the level of self-consciousness. The principal difficulty is to find out the adequate method for studying mentality. We consider, that for the days the best method for studying mentality is the psychosemantic method. On the bases of linguistic analyses this method enables to construct personal semantic areas and to reveal general categories, characterizing this concrete person or nation. Psychosemantic method is based on the principle to study the nature of person or nation through the preferences characterizing mentality and expressing in the language by the forms of evaluation. Such methods generally use adjectives for expressing preferences but to evaluate person's or people's characteristics through the adjectives, which have already expressing emotional labor, often provokes falsification the results consciously or unconsciously.

Such difficulty can be avoid by using phraseology, as a linguistic unit, by which the subject evaluates different aspects of reality.

Every phraseology as a rule expresses subject's attitude, but in the veil form. Phraseology, together with the words and aphorisms is the component of language and not only the speech as they can be renewed by the mass and are known to almost all people speaking the language.

One peculiarity of phraseology is the unity, non-additive form of its components, which in whole gives a full meaning. The second peculiarity of the phraseology is the metaphorical, picturesque character: as it expresses abstract units through concrete ones the phraseology represents a definite form of reflection. They emerge in the process of communication on the basis of expressing emotional evaluation, relation, attitudes for the precise and verbal expression of the human characteristics.

It can be said that phraseologies, similar to linguistic aphorisms, provide information about the meaning which reality has but more the information on the attitude towards this meaning i.e., at the same time they provide the evaluation of reality, without which the process of consciousness can not exist. The evaluation can be done in two ways: 1. In the content of aphorism, in this case phraseology, expressed the subject's

relation toward the reflected object and is this relation is veiled by a metaphor; 2. The usage of phraseology connected to the place is not the expression of object as much as the situation in which the subject is.

Thus, the evaluations are based not only on the features of events but on the subject's ideas on the reasons of this event. Exactly because of this subjective direction of phraseology, it can be said that phraseology is considered as a definite form of reflection, relation between people and other person's conception.

Phraseology if it is expressed by the grammar form of verb and thus expresses definite action, can be considered as a set of this action or state, which can accommodate the concrete situation with the value system, on the basis of which a person directs its life. A person evaluates the possible actions not only on the basis of the appropriation but with the importance to the person. A person tries to identify how much the future action matches its values, ideals, level of pretense. The unity of expressions through phraseology can appear as a strategy which expresses the system of values of an individual or group, establishes the values and social orientation of a person, the life experience of individuals is limited, thus they carry different orientation. Thus, it can be said that they appear as different sets in different situations. Georgian psychologist D. Uznadze provides a possibility to explain the peculiarities of the various levels of mental activity on the basis of the theory of set. The problem of relation between conscious and unconscious is one of the principle parts of Uznadze's set theory and provides an original solution of this problem.

In set conscious and unconscious elements of mental activity are reflected. The theory of set gives a possibility to reject the idea that the unconscious forms function as an activity only of a neuro-physiological order in the brain. According to Uznadze's theory, the constructiveness of the evaluation of the concept of unconsciousness, lay in the substitution of the opposing points of view. According to this certain forms of unconsciousness, brain activity are linked in their dynamics with the semantic categories of meaning, purpose, and significance. Uznadze's theory of set made clear: a) that the unconscious is psychologically oriented; b) that it (i.e., the unconscious) can in essence be treated only as a structurally and functionally unique and very important form of the mental activity proper.

By Uznadze, on the level of social activity before the concrete action, a specific state of readiness towards the future action is formed, in which a person accommodates his value system to the concrete situation. This process usually is undertaken unconsciously if the action does not face any obstacles. After performing this activity the set lives it track on the person (fixed set by Uznadze). Many researches on the theory of set confirm that the set has the functions of organization and direction of the

behavior. The established set frees a person during the performance from the necessity of analytical and mental action. The phraseologies are similar to the fixed set and are ready for realization in the appropriate situations. The phraseologies are stored in the mentality of the people who speak the given language and as they express the set and represent the dispositions of certain behavior, thus, the direction of the future behavior can be predicted.

Between the sign system of culture, in which its universal categories are fixed, the most significant is language. Language is the soul of national culture, "its internal form". Person's perception and cognition of the universe is mediated by language systems. Language habits and norms unconsciously define the picture of the universe ("icons") of the people, speaking the given language. The more the languages are far from each other, the more differences are between the icons. Structure of language imposes the people, speaking this language, the way of description and perception of the environmental reality. The icons of the universe of any ethnical groups, the variety of the forms of categorization is greatly due to those sign system, which act in the term of social and national communities.

The principle of language's and culture's unity is reflected in one of the modern directions of sociology - ethno-methodology, which pays significant attention to the aspects, which are interesting to us - particularly to the unexpressed moments of mentality existing in the linguistic acts.

In order to use folk-lore, particularly phraseology, for studying mentality, enables us to reveal such content, which is unconscious even for the person and this revealing happens indirectly, through the metaphors of phraseology, which eliminate social undesirables of responses.

As we have mentioned above, mentality reflects social reality and the changes in social environment will induce changes in it, but these changes are not simultaneous, the political and economical factors make changes in mentality step by step, through some time.

10. EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH OF GERMAN PEOPLE'S MENTALITY

The situation in the West and East Germany presents the unique material for studying the influence of different social-economical and political-ideological factors on mentality. German nations is a well-formed nation, having long history and high level of culture. The state of Germany was separated by political wills of other states.

During 50 years this two part of one nation were in strong isolation from each other, under difficult economical and political systems, having different ideological pressure. This situation provides social sciences with rich material for studying the specific of mentality.

Our objective is to investigate what is the most significant for the character of mentality such determinants as language, culture, traditions and etc. or economical and political factors and are 50 years enough for making any changes in action's mentality? If yes, what kind of changes are they.

In our experimental research on the first stage of experiments we pick up from German folklore material the popular phraseology, expressing values, attitudes, thoughts, habits, modes of behaviors, personal trends and etc.

Afterwards from this list of phraseology the list was reduced to the most popular phraseological units, expressing better the personal or behavioral trends, characterizing German style of life will be chosen up by the experts, whose native language is German. These phraseology would serve as a scale-descriptions in the next stage of experiments for evaluation of the most significant for the German culture existential and ethical stereotypes. Then the experimental subject should describe these stereotypes with the help of the above-mentioned phraseology. Experimental subjects were divided into two groups. One group's subjects are Germans, living in GDR, the second group - Germans, living in FRG. Using modern statistic methods it is possible to establish the characteristics components of the mentality, their common and specific content, and the influence of different factors on mentality.

Two groups of subjects have participated in the research. The first group consisted of the Germans living in the former GFR (26 people) and another group consisted of Germans living in former GDR (24 people). The scale descriptors are 40 popular German phraseologies which were selected by the German experts (philologists, psychologists, see annex I). Using this scale describes the experiment's subjects were to evaluate ten stereotypes by 0-5 scores. For example if the content of the No.1 phraseology perfectly matches the stereotype A), then the subject of the experiment was to write number 5 in the appropriate cell, if less the number 4 and etc. From these stereotypes five were so called existential stereotypes (I, typical man, ideal man, man 30 years ago, men in the future) and five were ethical stereotypes, which were chosen from the ethical groups having more importance and real contact with Germans (German, Polish, Russian, Jewish, Turkish).

The participation in the experiment depended only of the wish of the experiment's subject. It was not easy to complete this experiment as a lot of people were refusing to

participate. We had no aim to research why it happened. The reasons could be laziness, lack of time or other more important reasons. It was more difficult to undertake the experiment in former GDR as a lot of the people were refusing to participate. Each subject was spending approx. 30-40 minutes on the questionnaire.

The procedures of the experimental result's treatment

On the basis of the data from the subjects matrix were created: means for each stereotype and phraseology were established separately for each group. The level of confidence of these means were calculated. Correlation matrix according to each group were calculated. The data were treated by factor's analyses, by the method of main component, by the program of VARIMAX.

The results of the experiment and its analyses

At the beginning we have identified the weight of each phraseology, means for each group and among those the level of confidence (see annex 1 on the diskette). According to each stereotypes the following results were received:

For characterization of

- stereotype "I" differences between these two experimental groups were significant for the phraseologies No. 4,5, 6, 8, 19, 20, 25.
- stereotype "typical man" phraseology No. 9, 18, 19, 21, 25, 29, 31, 38, 39.
- stereotype "ideal man" phraseology No. 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30, 35.
- stereotype "man 30 years ago" phraseology No. 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 22, 30, 34, 39.
- stereotype "man in the future" phraseology No.1, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 19, 24, 26, 29, 34, 37, 40.

For ethical stereotypes:

- German: 12, 15, 19, 22, 24, 25, 27.
- Polish: 1, 10, 12, 13, 16, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36.
- Russian: 1, 6, 10, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36.
- Jewish: 4, 10, 11, 12, 15, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 32, 34, 37, 40.
- Turkish: 7, 23, 25, 27, 33, 36.

There data state that the phraseologies are successfully selected and are useful for the characterization of the selected stereotypes. It would be furtherly interesting to analyze contents of each phraseology in connection to each stereotype and research. But at the given moment the main objective of our research is to identify the

differences and similarities of the mentality of the experimented two groups on the basis of the evaluation of these stereotypes. Comparing the correlation among the stereotypes in this two groups provides the further picture (annexes II, III).

For the subject of the former GDR group:

No. 1 stereotype (A1) "I" is in statistically significant positive correlation with "typical man" (B1), "ideal man" (C1), "man 30 years ago" (D1), "man in the future" (E1) and ethnical stereotype German (F1), negative correlation is between "I" and ethnical stereotype Polish and Russian, correlation between Jewish and Turkish is not statistically significant.

Stereotype No. 2 (B1) "typical man" is in positive correlation with "I", "ideal man", "man 30 years ago", "man in the future", German. Negative correlation with Polish and Russian. No correlation with Turkish and Jewish.

Stereotype "ideal man" - is in positive correlation with "I", "typical man", "man 30 years ago", "man in the future", German and Jewish.

Stereotype "man 30 years ago" is in positive correlation with "typical man", "ideal man", "man in the future", ethnical stereotype German, negative correlation with Russian and Polish, no correlation with Jewish and Turkish.

Stereotype "man in the future" (E1) is in positive correlation with "I", "typical man", "ideal man", German, Jewish, no correlation with Russian, Polish, Turkish.

Ethnical stereotype German (F1) is in positive correlation with "I", "typical man", "ideal man", "man 30 years ago", "man in the future" and Jewish, negative correlation with Russian no correlation with Polish, Turkish.

Ethnical stereotype Polish (G1) is in positive correlation with and Russian, Jewish, Turkish, negative correlation with "I", "typical man", "ideal man", "man 30 years ago", no correlation with "man in the future" and German.

Ethnical stereotype Russian (H1) is in positive correlation with Polish and Turkish, negative correlation with "I", "typical man", "ideal man", "man 30 years ago", German no correlation with "man in the future" and Jewish.

Ethnical stereotype Jewish (I1) is in positive correlation with "ideal man", "man in the future", German, Polish, Turkish, no correlation with "I", "typical man", "man 30 years ago" and Russian. Is not in typical correlation with any stereotypes.

Ethnical stereotype Turkish (J1) is in positive correlation with Russian, Polish and Jewish, negative correlation with “ideal man”. No correlation with other stereotypes.

For the subject of the former GFR group:

No. 1 stereotype (A) “I” is in statistically significant positive correlation with all existential stereotypes and with ethnical stereotype Russian, Jewish. No correlation with Polish, Turkish and what is especially interesting no correlation with German.

Stereotype No. 2 (B) “typical man” is in positive correlation with all stereotypes, no correlation with “ideal man”.

Stereotype “ideal man” (C) - is in positive correlation with “I”, “man 30 years ago”, “man in the future”, Jewish. No correlation with “typical man”, German, Polish, Turkish.

Stereotype “man 30 years ago” (D) is in positive correlation with all stereotypes except “I” and “ideal man”.

Stereotype “man in the future” (E) is in positive correlation with all stereotypes.

Ethnical stereotype German (F) is in positive correlation with all stereotypes, no correlation with “I” and “ideal man”.

Ethnical stereotype Polish (G) is in positive correlation with “typical man”, “man 30 years ago”, “man in the future and with all ethnical stereotypes. No correlation with “I” and “ideal man”.

Ethnical stereotype Russian (H) is in positive correlation with all stereotypes except “ideal man”.

Ethnical stereotype Jewish (I) is in positive correlation with almost all stereotypes.

Ethnical stereotype Turkish (J) is in positive correlation with “typical man” and with all ethnical stereotypes. No statistically significant correlation with “I” (+ 54) and ideal man (- 212).

It is worth mentioning that in the GFR group there are no negative correlation which states on more tolerance and harmony of this group’s mentality.

We will not stop on every detail of the resemblances and differences between the data on these two groups, we only emphasize our attention on the differences, which express more precisely the influence of different social and political factors on the content and structure of mentality.

First of all we were interested to reveal such unconscious strata of mentality, which can not be expressed directly by the different social and psychological reasons (socially unacceptability of answers, psychological mechanism of ego-defense and etc.)

Concerning resemblance between these two groups it is remarkable that in both groups the correlation between the stereotypes, which we call existential ones (I, typical man, ideal man, man 30 years ago and man in the future) are positive and high. But diametrically differ the relations towards the ethnical stereotypes. In FRG group there is a positive correlation towards the stereotypes as are Russian, Polish, Turkish. In the GDR group there is a negative correlation towards these stereotypes and no significant correlation towards the ethnical stereotype Turkish. No correlation towards the Turkish may be explained by the rare contact between GDR Germans and Turkish. Germans living in former GDR are less informed on the Turkish characteristic and this is accordingly reflected in mentality.

The most significant to us is the different kind of correlation with the ethnical stereotype Russian in groups FRG and GDR. In FRG group all stereotypes are in positive correlation with stereotype Russian. In GDR group all existential stereotypes are in negative correlation with stereotype Russian. We think that this is determined by the official pressure from Russia during the last 50 years. This negative attitude towards Russia was not revealed openly but it seems that it was deeply inculcated in mentality and now it was revealed indirectly with help of different phraseology, which directly do not touch any ethnical relations. There is a negative correlation with stereotype Polish. Which is the indication of the approach of a GDR group for which Russian and Polish are not very different from each other and thus their evaluation is very similar. In the mentality of GDR group there is a limited differentiation between the characteristics of a Russian and a Polish.

In the GDR group there was an interesting correlation between the group of existential and ethnical stereotypes. There is a negative correlation between these two groups of stereotypes, exception is the ethnical stereotype Jewish, which has positive correlation with existential stereotype "ideal man" and "man in the future" (the ethnical stereotype German is in a particular situation because it is a national auto-stereotype and there are specific approach towards it in both German groups).

The ethnical stereotype Jewish has an interesting peculiarity. In the GDR group “Jewish” is the only ethnical stereotype which has positive correlation with existential stereotype, namely with “ideal man” and “man in the future”. Jewish nationality has such characteristics which are connected to the best qualities which are necessary for a man to accommodate the reality. Jewish has high scores according to the phraseologies which are, phraseology No. 4, 7, 8, 13, and others which are necessary for the accommodation to reality. These features are necessary for an ideal as well as future man and this explains a high level of correlation between “ideal man”, “man in the future” and Jewish. What about the existential stereotype “I”, it is not in correlation with Jewish in GDR group, but in FRG group it is.

If we consider the difficult historical past and the relations which existed during the World War II (genocide of Jewish nation), it is strange to find a correlation between the stereotype “I” and Jewish. We explain this by the fact that the natives of former FRG still have a feeling of blame towards the Jews and through the reduction of the distance between the stereotype “I” and Jewish, they try to free themselves from this blame and it is unconsciously reflected in their mentality. Concerning the GDR group there is no correlation between “I” and Jewish. After the World War II the GDR was included among the countries which were fighting against the Fascist Germany, thus psychologically it was separated from the German Reich and the feeling of blame towards the Jewish people is absent.

It is interesting to monitor the position of ethnical stereotype - German in the two groups. In GDR stereotypes “I”, “ideal man” and German is in high correlation with each other. In the FRG group there is no correlation between “I”, “ideal man” and German. We propose that in the part of Germany which was called GDR the ideological relativity to the socialistic system was more emphasized than the ethnical belongings. Unconsciously the above-mentioned caused a protest in the Germans living in GDR although this protest was never openly revealed. But this protest was unconsciously stored in their mentality. The expression of this is the negative correlation with Russian and Polish and high correlation with “I”, “ideal man” and German. The fact that in the FRG group “ideal man” and “I” are not in correlation with German can be explained in such a way: there was not ideological pressure on the Germans living in the FRG and there was no need to defend own nationality. Germans living in the FRG are more oriented to the values of humanity in general. They support the idea of EU, are active members of European Union and consider themselves more widely as an active part of the whole European Community.

The results obtained by us were also treated by the factor analyses (see Annexes IV and V).

All stereotypes are grouped into two factors:

For the FRG group:

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Polish,	.95353	.17131
Russian	.94033	.14994
Turkish	.92214	-.09973
typical man	.87653	.28727
German	.77750	.35269
ideal man	-.16717	.95073
I	.12412	.83337
Jewish	.61525	.71086
man 30 years ago	.47567	.60567
man in the future.	.49563	.59857

For the GDR group:

	Factor 1	Factor 2
German	.88749	-.04828
ideal man	.88624	-.34126
I	.87094	-.32028
men 30 years ago	.84505	-.19699
typical man	.83807	-.19055
man in the future	.82888	.19502
Turkish	-.06289	.88043
Polish	-.25601	.86931
Russian	-.29792	.84592
Jewish	.54859	.62667

According to the factor analyses have constructed a factor plot in rotated factor space (see annexes 4-5, pp. 2)

11. CONCLUSION

Our research was undertaken on the limited group of people cause by the objective reasons, but the statistical methods have shown that the data are confident and thus certain conclusions can be made. The first and the principle was that the value of psychosomatic method is argued and its priority for the research of a person and group

mentality, and significantly for the reveal of the unconscious components of mentality. Thus, this method can be widely used for the research of mentality of the different social groups. Concerning the characteristics of the German people, it was established that there is a difference between the mentality of Germans living in the former FRG and GDR. These differences are caused by the differences of the social and political factors in the two parts of Germany and still exist in their mentality. It requires time for the Germans living in former GDR to free of the legacy which was mainly expressed by the fact that ethnical prejudices are still strong in their mentality. The personal values, goals have more importance in the mentality of the Germans living in the FRG. Thus, we can conclude that they are more adjusted to fulfill the behavior oriented towards the high personal and public goals. The fact that there is no negative approach to any nationality in their mentality, frees their living energy for realization of this goal. In the mentality of Germans living in the former GDR there still is a strong ethnical prejudice, thus it can be proposed that they need more time for regulation of these relations. By this reasons we consider, that the effectiveness of their activity to other direction(i.e. to achieve different personal goals) is not yet so high as in FRG.

We want to emphasize a very interesting difference between the GDR and FRG groups. In the GDR group there is a high correlation between the stereotypes "typical man" and "ideal man". In the FRG group there is no correlation between these stereotypes. It can be caused by the fact that the FRG group has a critical approach towards the "typical man", which at the same time is in correlation with the stereotype "I". That is why there is no correlation between the stereotypes "typical man" and "ideal man". As for Germans from GDR the stereotypes "typical man" and "ideal man" are close to each other and are in high correlation, which means that the personal evaluation is higher then by the Germans of the FRG. This situation is sometimes useful but in this concrete case considering the existing circumstances, this is not as favorable and a more critical approach is required for the development of the achievement motivation which will make the activity of the GDR Germans more effective.

Considering the fact that the GDR Germans have negative correlation to the ethnical stereotype Russian, it can be changed in the future with the help of NATO extension. As the GDR neighboring former socialist countries are becoming the members of NATO, this will be of a support and will assist to free from ethnical prejudices, which makes more productive bases on the former GDR for the development of the process of democratization.

And at the end we must emphasize: the most significant result of this research is the fact that we have made approbation of our psycho-semantic method and it appeared to be good for the study of mentality especially for unconscious component of mentality. In the future, by using this method it will be possible to made a more wide investigation of different people, nations or the whole population of any country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gurevich, "Categories of Medieval Culture", 1974, (in Russian).
2. Weiss S. and Strpp N. (1985), "Negotiating with Foreign Business - Persons: An Introduction for Americans with Propositions on Six Cultures", N. J.
3. Deutsch N. (1983), "Conflict resolution: theory and practice". Political Psychology, No. 4.
4. Broken J. and Rubin J. F. (1985), "The social psychology of conflict escalation and entrapment". No. 1.
5. Smoke R. (1977), "War: Controlling Escalation". Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
8. Moscovici S. (1976) "Social influence and social change". Academic Press. London, N. J., San Francisco.
9. Uznadze D. (1966), The psychology of set. Tbilisi.
10. Nadirashvili Sh. (1981) Psychology of Attitude. Tbilisi.
11. Vittenstein A.(1958) "Logical-philosophical tractat".(in Russian)
12. Gac, V. (1972) "For a problem of semantic syntagmatic". in "Problems of structural linguistic".M.
13. Humboldt (1984) "Selected work in linguistic".M.
14. Jorf (1960)"The science and linguistic".M.
15. Ramishvili G.(1984) "Humboldt - the founder of linguistic." Introduction.
16. Nemeth G. (1986) "Differential contribution of minority and majority influence". Psychological Review Volume 93.
17. Allport, G.W. (1954) "The Nature of Prejudice". Reading , MA: Addison-Wesley.
18. Deutsch, M. (1985). "Distributive Justice". New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
19. Fisher, R. (ed.) (1964) "International Conflict and Behavioral Science". The Craigvile paper. N.Y.
20. Taifel, H. (ed.) (1982) "Social identity and intergroup relations". Cambridge University Press.
21. Magradze G.(1996) "The role of attitude in social influence process". Materials of XXVI international congress of psychology, Canada.