

Velkova K.¹ Multiple identities of Russians and Bulgarians: Intercultural comparison

Велкова К. Множественные идентичности русских и болгар: кросс-культурный анализ

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

It has been revealed that people belonging to various groups ascribe different value and emotional importance to those groups as well as they form many group identities. However, the importance of group identity may also vary on a cultural level. This study aimed to compare group identification of Bulgarians and Russians – two culturally similar groups that chose different developmental paths in the last 30 years. In particular, we examined the relations between five group identities: national, religious, regional, Soviet/Communist, and European. A sample of 233 Russians and 279 Bulgarians underwent an online survey. Scales from the Mutual Intercultural Relations In Plural Societies (MIRIPS) questionnaire and Verkuyten's religious identity scale were used. The collected data was analyzed using multiple regression and correlation analysis separately for each subsample. Results showed significant differences in the identification of Russians and Bulgarians on five investigated categories. Moreover, the pattern of correlations between the group identities suggested variance in the group identity structure of the two subsamples. Among the Russians national, regional, religious, and Soviet identities were positively interrelated. Among the Bulgarian subsample two core identities were observed: religious and regional. These two identities served as a “bridge” between European and national identification. Finally, the socio-cultural changes were suggested to influence the identity structure in both countries. The striving of Bulgarians to distance from the country's Communist past might account for the disconnection of Communist identity from the other identity types. In turn, the political disagreements between Europe and Russia might be preventing Russians from cultivating an integral sense of belonging to Europe.

Keywords: group identity, intercultural differences, multiple identities, culture, identity correlation

Importance of group identities and culture

Individuals belong to different social groups in relation to self-categorization with variety of characteristics such as gender, occupation, national, ethnic, and political groups. Multiple categories might become salient simultaneously and create a more complex sense of identity triggering several group memberships at the same time. Multiple social identities vary in their stability and strength and might be activated in particular contexts. Moreover, belonging to multiple groups might produce positive outcomes depending on specific conditions. For example, identification with multiple groups positively influence health and well-being due to increased opportunities for social support [Steffens et al., 2016]. However, such effect is evident in the European context and lacks in the case of Asian societies where social support is perceived negatively [Chang et al., 2018]. Consequently, cultural background might also play an important role in defining important multiple group identities.

Huge amount of the existing research has been devoted to the comparison of identity types among host and migrant populations and ethnic majority and minority groups [Dimitrova et al., 2012; Maliepaard et al., 2010; Verkuyten, et al., 2012]. However, very little attention has been paid on multiple identities among different cultural groups. Accordingly, the current research strived to fill this gap in the literature by exploring the differences in identification between culturally similar groups and shed light on identification with culture-related categories among culturally similar societies.

The current research aimed to compare group identification of two culturally similar groups, i.e. Russia and Bulgaria, that differ in their paths of development during the last 30 years. Further, the relations between five group identities that refer to cultural context (national, religious, regional, Soviet/Communist, and European) were examined across both cultural groups.

Factors affecting group identification

Social identity plays a crucial role in the formation and development of human self-concept and has been defined as the awareness of individuals about their group belongingness as well as the emotional and value importance which group membership holds [Tajfel, 1972]. Social identity theory and Self-categorization theory suggest that a shift from the unique personality to the salient group membership occurs in the development of the sense of group belonging.

Nevertheless, identification process depends on a variety of other factors, including motivation [Capozza et al., 2006; Easterbrook, Vignoles, 2012], strength of identification [Jetten et al., 2004], and context [Chao, Moon, 2005]. It has been argued that culture plays an important role in defining contextual influences as well. According to Hofstede and colleagues, cultural differences occurred as orientations toward power and group membership varied across cultures [Hofstede et al., 2010]. As a result of this variation identity appeared differently in different cultures [Feitosa et al., 2012]. For instance, racial identities might be easily shaped by the social context [Sanchez et al., 2009] and related differently to other constructs across cultures [Johnson et al., 2012].

Social psychological research has proposed that human responses about social identity differ because of societal values that are promoted by social context [Smith 2007]. Moreover, importance of social values correlated with traditional ingroup and geospatial identities among Brazilians and Spanish and values accounting for geospatial identification varied across cultures: Social identities were mainly explained by normative values (i.e., belonging and tradition), whereas geospatial identification was explained by religiosity, and belonging in Brazil and tradition, social order, honesty, and power in Spain [Gouveia et al., 2002]. Furthermore, it has been suggested that conceptualization of constructs vary across cultures due to variances in the cognitive frameworks [Gibson, Zellmer-Bruhn, 2001]. Consequently, such construct disagreement might also occur in defining social identity. Therefore, in order to avoid major misconceptions of the examined cultural identity two close cultural groups were chosen (i.e. Russia and Bulgaria).

Multiple identities as a function of culture

Individuals might identify with a number of groups simultaneously [Brewer, 2001] and identification with a certain category does not provide sufficient information about one's social identity [Ashforth, Mael, 1989]. The considerations of multiple group belonging suggest that some groups are perceived as more central and significant compared to others [Tajfel, Turner, 1986]. Therefore, the more important a group is to the self, the higher self-identification with it might be observed. Moreover, multiple identification is a dynamic and complex phenomenon [Feitosa et al., 2012]. Social identity represents a complex construct and accounting for its complexity, it has been conceptualized as a compound of multiple overlapping identities [Miller et al., 2009; Roccas, Brewer, 2002].

It is important to point out that groups of belonging might differ according to the process of socialization they represent [Rouchy, 2002]. Hence, primary or natural and secondary or instituted group belonging could be distinguished [Rouchy, 2002]. Primary groups are described by personal, intimate, long-term relationships, affect self- and identity construction, and influence the development

of values, beliefs, norms, and worldviews. Those groups typically include family members, close friends, and romantic partners. Contrariwise, secondary groups represent relatively impersonal and temporary relationships and occur as goal- or task-oriented functional groups. Furthermore, natural groups have been linked to culture, as cultural characteristics such as religious affiliation, ethnicity, class, and nationality are transmitted through natural groups [Rouchy, 2002]. Individuals adopt culture in their families from early childhood and the inherited cultural norms remain invariable even in situations of change in social context and worldviews [Martsinkovskaya, Solodnikova, 2018]. Thus, a conclusion has been made that primary groups create environment for the development of cultural identity. In accordance with those provisions, a number of culture-defined natural identities were included in the current research in order to assure cultural distinction: national, Soviet/Communist, religious, regional, and European. It should be noted that Soviet identity in Russia represents identification with the values and ideals of the former Soviet Union and has been referred to as a supranational identity that reflects the merge and the convergence of ethnic groups included in the former USSR [Wojnowski, 2015]. The corresponding Communist identity in Bulgaria was built on the basis of Soviet identity, as Communism in Bulgaria was adopted from the USSR and used the Soviet-like model of operation and development.

Cultural contexts of the current research

The present research was conducted in the Russian and Bulgarian contexts. Russia and Bulgaria have a long history of partnership and political cooperation along with Slavic and Orthodox backgrounds. Moreover, those countries could be viewed as alike, considering cultural identifiers such as values. Schwartz cross-cultural analysis indicated similar levels of all cultural value orientations (i.e., harmony, embeddedness, hierarchy, mastery, autonomy, and egalitarianism) were observed among both Russian and Bulgarian cultures [Schwartz, 2008]. Further, among Russian population leading values include Security, Tradition, Power, and Achievement [Lebedeva, Tatarko, 2018]. Magun and Rudnev found that similar levels of commitment to those values were observed among post-Communist countries, including Bulgaria [Magun, Rudnev, 2013]. Finally, Russian and Bulgarian cultures share similar dimensions according to Hofstede's cultural dimensions: Both cultures are collectivist, feminine, restrained, and characterized by high power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation [Hofstede et al., 2010].

However, along with intercultural similarities the two contexts have their peculiarities. Russia is an example of multicultural society that combines more than 190 different ethnic groups speaking more than 160 different languages [Russian census, 2010]. Furthermore, after the collapse of the

USSR Russian society underwent some crucial changes. It has been proposed that post-Soviet Russian citizens experienced social identity alternation: highly inclusive Soviet identity consolidating all national groups of the former USSR has been replaced by other more confined identities, including national, religious, and regional identities [Galyapina et al., 2018]. However, Soviet identity was proposed to be still relevant for the post-Soviet societies [Wojnowski, 2015], to reflect the merge and the convergence of ethnic groups included in the former USSR and to oppose former Soviet space to Western world [Wojnowski, 2015]. Further, taking into account the territorial location of Russia, identification with Europe was also investigated.

The ethnic structure of Bulgaria is more homogeneous and is represented mainly by Bulgarian majority (84.79%) and Turkish (8,81%) and Roma (4,87%) minorities [Bulgarian National Statistical Institute, 2011]. Although Orthodox Christianity is the country traditional religion (according to the last census in 2011 59,4% of the population profess this religious affiliation), different religious groups friendly coexist. Further, Bulgaria represents an Eastern European post-Communist society that underwent deep political, economic, and cultural turmoil after the collapse of the Soviet Union and during its transition from communism to capitalism [Dimitrova et al., 2018]. Though Bulgarian Communist identity reflected socialist values and unity and was interconnected with national and ethnic identities, the Communist regime itself has been described as vastly oppressive [see Dimitrova et al., 2018]. Therefore, post-Communist development of Bulgarian cultural identity included a reconstruction of national identity within an ahistorical and depoliticized frame [Kaneva, Popescu, 2011]. Finally, by becoming a member of the European Union in 2007 Bulgaria encountered new social and economic perspectives in terms of expansion and modification of existing multiple social identities.

According to recent research results on social identification, Russians identified as citizens of the Russian Federation in the first place; secondly, they identified themselves as residents of a particular city/town, whereas religious identification was relatively weak [Valdai discussion club report, 2014]. Similarly, Bulgarian mainstream population had a generally low religious [Dimitrova et al., 2012] and high national identification [Dimitrova et al., 2014]. In addition, Bulgarians were highly attached to their home city/town and country, whereas their attachment to Europe was lower [Standard Eurobarometer, 2018]. Poll data revealed that 46% of the surveyed Bulgarians perceived themselves in terms of their nationality only, 41% in terms of national and European identities, 6% in terms of European and national identities, and 1% perceived themselves as Europeans only [Eurobarometer, 2018]. In relation to political views, Russians considered the Soviet Union as a stable State and felt nostalgic about Soviet times [Golovashina, 2013]. On the contrary, in 2018 almost a half of Bulgarians viewed communist ideology as generally unacceptable, while a third of the sur-

veyed respondents considered some acceptable aspects and only a few indicated it was generally acceptable [Gallup International, 2018].

Nevertheless, comprehensive research information about a more complex multiple identity among those cultural groups lacks. Consequently, the current study on group identities across cultures was expected to provide important insights into cultural identity in the chosen contexts. The main research questions that were expected to be answered were the following:

- RQ 1: Do different types of group identity correlate among Russian and Bulgarian subsamples?
- RQ2: Are there any differences in the group identification between Russians and Bulgarians?

Methodology

A total sample of 512 respondents took part in an online survey including a subsample of 233 Russians (33,9% males, 66,1% females, 60,1% aged between 30 and 49 y.o.) and a subsample of 279 Bulgarians (24,4% males, 75,6% females, 44,8% aged between 18 and 29 y.o.). Basic characteristics of both subsamples are provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Basic sample characteristics

		Russia		Bulgaria	
		number	percent	number	percent
Gender	Male	79	33,9	68	24,4
	Female	154	66,1	211	75,6
Age group	18-29	65	27,9	125	44,8
	30-49	140	60,1	112	40,1
	50 +	28	12	42	15,1
Religion	Orthodox	133	57,1	202	72,4
	Non-believers	80	34,3	57	20,4
	Others	20	8,6	20	7,2
Education	Primary	2	0,9	0	0
	High School	21	9	47	16,8
	College	32	13,7	28	10
	University	156	67	190	68,1
	Higher	22	9,4	14	5

All participants filled in a questionnaire comprising demographic measures (i.e. gender, age, education level, and religion) and measures of national, Soviet/Communist, regional, religious, and European identification. The questionnaire used scales from the Mutual Intercultural Relations In Plural Societies (MIRIPS) questionnaire (<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/mirips>) translated into Russian and adapted for use in Russia [Lebedeva, Tatarko, 2009] and modifications of Verkuyten's religious identity scale [Verkuyten, 2007]. Both Russian and Bulgarian versions of the instrument were validated prior to administering the survey and the scales used were translated and back-translated into Bulgarian by two independent bilingual translators.

The instruments applied in the study included the scales listed below. All scales showed high reliability across both subsamples that is indeed presented in Table 2.

- national identity scale consisted of eight items (e.g., 'Being part of Russian culture makes me feel happy').
- Soviet/Communist identity consisted of eight items, (e.g., 'I am proud of being a Soviet person').
- religious identity consisted of six items, (e.g., 'I identify strongly with Christians').
- regional identity consisted of six items, (e.g., 'I feel a strong sense of belonging to my place of birth').
- European identity consisted of six items, (e.g., 'I feel a strong attachment to Europe').

Results

The obtained data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, Cronbach's α , Multi-group confirmatory factor analysis, analysis of variance, and correlation analysis in SPSS 23 and Amos 23.

Firstly, descriptive statistics and reliability of identity scales were computed (Table 2). All scales had a high level of internal consistency, as determined by Cronbach's alpha of over 0,87 for each scale. Also, both subsamples displayed strong identification with their nations, respectively $M = 3,64$ ($SD = 0,89$) for Russians and $M = 4,23$ ($SD = 0,71$) for Bulgarians. Russians felt the weakest identification with Europe ($M = 2,70$, $SD = 1,06$), while Bulgarians showed lowest strength of identification with Communism ($M = 2,03$, $SD = 0,80$).

Table 2

Descriptive statistics of identity scales

	Russia			Bulgaria		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's α	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's α
National identity	3,64	0,89	0,909	4,23	0,71	0,875
Soviet/Communist identity	3,17	0,93	0,917	2,03	0,80	0,895
European identity	2,70	1,06	0,942	3,39	1,12	0,944
Regional identity	3,36	1,04	0,936	3,79	1,19	0,959
Religious identity	2,77	1,30	0,975	3,32	1,31	0,974

Secondly, the invariance of the scales representing the aforementioned five identity types was tested by applying multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (MGCFA). Inclusion of measurement equivalence test was of high importance because any cultural differences in the meaning of social identities might undermine the conclusions driven. As methodological issues in intercultural research (e.g. equivalence and bias) should be considered with caution [Van de Vijver, Leung, 2000], in order to avoid misinterpretations of the empirical data configural, metric and scalar invariance were examined. The model showed a good fit and all factor loadings were significant ($p < 0,05$). Results indicated that the model had configural, metric ($\Delta CFI < 0,01$, $\Delta RMSEA < 0,015$) and scalar ($\Delta CFI < 0,01$, $\Delta RMSEA < 0,015$) invariance [Chen, 2007]. Consequently, comparison of mean scores of national, Soviet/Communist, religious, European and regional identities among Russians and Bulgarians was reasonable and appropriate. Model fit indices are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Results of scale invariance test

	Chi-square (degrees of freedom)	Chi-square difference (degrees of freedom difference)	Comparative Fit Index	Comparative Fit Index difference	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation difference
Configural invariance	1,590 (962)	-	0,966	-	0,034	-
Metric invariance	1,617 (991)	72,954 (29)	0,964	0,002	0,035	0,001
Scalar invariance	1,671 (1006)	78,626 (15)	0,960	0,004	0,036	0,001

Thirdly, identification differences between Russians and Bulgarians were investigated (Table 4). Due to age inequality across the subsamples, multiple hierarchical regression analysis was performed controlling for the effect of participants' age group. For the purposes of the analysis age group was dummy coded and the last age group was used as a reference group. The obtained results revealed the presence of statistically significant difference between cultural groups in terms of identification with all suggested groups. Bulgarians showed higher scores on national, European, regional, and religious identification, while Russians had higher identification with the socio-political past, i.e. Soviet vs Communist political systems. However, some age group effects were also revealed in terms of Soviet/ Communist and religious identification as by including age group in the model the proportion of the variance explained rose significantly from 30,6% and 4,1% to respectively 32,5% and 10%. Results suggested that younger participants had significantly weaker identification with the Soviet/ Communist past, whereas participants aged between 30 and 49 had significantly weaker European identity compared to participants who were aged 50 and above. Furthermore, participants included in the oldest generation group had a significantly stronger religious identity than the other two generation groups.

Table 4

Results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis controlling for age group

	National identity		Soviet / Communist identity		European identity		Regional identity		Religious identity	
	Coeff.	t	Coeff.	t	Coeff.	t	Coeff.	t	Coeff.	t
Country	0,35	8,37***	-0,55	-14,98***	0,30	7,08***	0,19	4,34***	0,20	4,68***
R ²	0,121		0,306		0,090		0,036		0,041	
F(1, 510)	70,11***		224,41***		50,17***		19,87***		21,92***	
Country	0,34	8,05***	-0,53	-14,23***	0,29	6,77***	0,21	4,66***	0,23	5,44***
Younger generation	-0,01	-0,14	-0,15	-2,74**	-0,12	-1,89	-0,11	-1,64	-0,33	-5,17***
Middle generation	-0,04	-0,58	-0,02	-0,31	-0,15	-2,29*	-0,01	-0,12	-0,14	-2,13*
R ² change	0,001		0,019**		0,009		0,010		0,059***	
F(3, 508)	23,48***		81,40***		18,61***		8,16***		18,93***	

Notes. Significance level: ***p < 0,001, **p < 0,01, *p < 0,05.

Finally, a correlation analysis (i.e. partial correlations) of the relationship between different identities of Russians and Bulgarians was conducted independently for each subsample (Table 5). In Rus-

sian subsample the results demonstrated strong positive correlations of national identity with Soviet ($r = 0,37, p < 0,001$), regional ($r = 0,41, p < 0,001$), and religious ($r = 0,50, p < 0,001$) identities. Soviet identity was significantly and positively correlated with regional ($r = 0,38, p < 0,001$) and religious ($r = 0,32, p < 0,001$) identities and significantly and negatively correlated with European identity ($r = -0,18, p < 0,01$). Regional and religious identities were also significantly positively correlated ($r = 0,47, p < 0,001$).

Across Bulgarian subsample national identity was significantly and positively correlated with regional ($r = 0,45, p < 0,001$) and religious ($r = 0,33, p < 0,001$) identities, European identity was significantly positively correlated with regional ($r = 0,16, p < 0,01$) and religious ($r = 0,15, p < 0,05$) identities and significantly negatively correlated with Communist identity ($r = -0,19, p < 0,01$). Similarly, to the Russian subsample, regional and religious identities were significantly positively correlated ($r = 0,33, p < 0,001$).

Comparison of the correlation patterns in the observed cultural groups reveals some similarities as well as some differences in the relationships between different identity types. Common correlational structure highlighted relationships between regional, religious, and national identities: In both cultural contexts those identity types were strongly positively correlated. Moreover, Soviet/Communist and European identity had a significant negative correlation.

Intercultural differences were found in the identification with broader types of identity. Thus, in Russia Soviet identity was positively correlated with national, regional, and religious identities, while European identity lacked any significant links with those identity types. Contrariwise, in Bulgaria European identity was significantly positively correlated with regional and religious identities, while Communist identity was insignificantly correlated with those identity types.

Table 5

Correlations between multiple identities across cultures

		1	2	3	4
Russia					
1	National identity	1			
2	Soviet identity	0,37***	1		
3	European identity	-0,04	-0,18**	1	
4	Regional identity	0,41***	0,38***	0,09	1
5	Religious identity	0,50***	0,32***	0,04	0,47***

Bulgaria					
1	National identity	1			
2	Communist identity	-0,03	1		
3	European identity	0,06	-0,19**	1	
4	Regional identity	0,45***	-0,02	0,16**	1
5	Religious identity	0,33***	0,03	0,15*	0,33***

Notes. Significance level: * $p < 0,05$, ** $p < 0,01$, *** $p < 0,001$.

Discussion

The current study on group identities revealed some resemblance, but also difference in the identification of Russians and Bulgarians. Despite of the cultural similarity of the two groups, including Slavic background, historical connectedness, and similar cultural dimensions and value profiles [Hofstede et al., 2010; Magun, Rudnev, 2013; Schwartz, 2008], there were significant differences in the identification with the examined culture-related categories. Bulgarians displayed higher identification strength with all examined categories except for socio-political Communist identity. Such results could be linked to the effect of multiculturalism: As in European societies compound identification labels are unpopular (e.g. African American, Chinese Canadian), ethnic and national identification are negatively correlated [Phinney et al., 2006]. Therefore, cultural diversity in Russia might affect the strength of identification with nation-related categories because of the interference of population's ethnicity.

Identification disparity remained even after controlling for participants' age. Nevertheless, generational differences accounted for a significant percent of the explained variance in Soviet/Communist and religious identification models. In this sense, the older generation was more religious than others. This finding corresponds to the overall effect of aging causing increase in religious beliefs [Bengtson et al., 2015]. Moreover, older generation identified more strongly with political past compared to the younger one, which might be caused by the specific socialization context and values transmitted during early life [Newman et. al., 2014] as well as the positive relationship between age and predispositions toward nostalgia [Kusumi et al., 2010].

The correlation patterns between groups identities of Russians and Bulgarians indicate strong effect of socio-cultural context on identification process. Among Russian subsample national, regional, religious, and Soviet group identities were positively mutually correlated. Among Bulgarians, religious and regional identities were both correlated with national and European identities, but the lat-

ter two did not significantly correlate. Therefore, religious and regional identities was suggested to play an important role in the construction of Bulgarian multiple identity as they “bridged” European and national identities.

It should be also noted that both cultural groups showed some alike identification trends. For example, identity groups rooted in the cultural and historical ancestry served as a core element of the individual’s self: the levels of national and regional identification were higher compared to other group identities. Such findings correspond to the previous findings on identification [see Standard Eurobarometer, 2018; Valdai discussion club report, 2014]. Nevertheless, a common identity frame was present among both cultural groups formed by the interrelations of national, religious, and regional identities. Consequently, it could be assumed that those identities primarily shaped the multiple identity among the two culturally close groups. Moreover, Soviet/Communist and European identification categories were negatively correlated among both subsamples. Such observation might be connected with ideological opposition between former Soviet space and Western world [Wojnowski, 2015]. However, further development of the relations between culture-related group identities depend on other context-dependent factors.

The inversed effect of Soviet/Communist and European identification might be attributed to socio-cultural development of Russian and Bulgarian societies. Both populations faced identification challenges during the post-Soviet period and coped with socio-cultural instability after the collapse of the Soviet Union differently. In Russia Soviet regime was typically associated with ethnic cohesion and peaceful coexistence of ethnic groups [Wojnowski, 2015]. Hence, nostalgic memories of Soviet times in Russia were rather positive. Further, Western world was perceived as an opposition of Soviet space. Political disagreements that have taken place for the past 30 years might have impeded the development of a positive image of Europe and favorable conditions for identification with Western values. As a result, European identity was not interrelated with other culture-defined group identities.

In Bulgaria the Communist period was viewed negatively due to its repressive nature. Accordingly, Communist identity was replaced by the European identity: A socio-political inclusive category was replaced by another, similar one. Historically speaking, the Communist regime was legally labeled “criminal” and society’s actions against it were described as just and moral (i.e., the 38th National Assembly adopted the Law Declaring the Communist Regime in Bulgaria Criminal in 2000). Moreover, the majority of the sampled population were born and socialized in conditions of a social and economic crisis during the Communist regime designation and post-Communist period. Thus, it could be suggested that this particular environment cultivated a specific representation of the Communist past and facilitated the formation of unfavorable attitudes toward it; therefore, the identifica-

tion with Communist past became weak and provoked negativity. These happenings also led to the process of national identity reconstruction and full rejection of Communist identity as a part of multiple Bulgarian identity. Additionally, the membership of the country in the European Union emphasized the cultural and political overlap of European countries and created favorable conditions for identification with Europe and common European values. Consequently, two major events might be influential in the identification process: firstly, the rejection of the Communist past and secondly, country's membership in the European Union and the expectations of prospect positive socio-cultural outcomes.

Limitations and future research

The current research shed light on crucial aspects of multiple identity of Russians and Bulgarians. However, an important limitation should be also noted. Obtained results cannot be generalized to all post-Soviet vs European societies as each country has its own contextual peculiarities that might influence identification. Further investigation should be performed of the identification patterns in other European and post-Soviet countries in order to reveal the importance of Soviet identity among the population of the former USSR republics and validate the connection between national and European identities through religious and regional identities.

Conclusion

All in all, multiple identity of Russians and Bulgarians showed both similarity and disparity in terms of identity interrelations' structure. Among both cultural groups national, religious, and regional identities were significantly positively correlated, while Soviet/ Communist and European identities were significantly negatively correlated. However, multiple identification of Russians comprised significant positive associations between national, regional, religious, and Soviet categories, whereas in Bulgaria religious and regional identities had positive significant relations with national and European identities, but the latter two were not significantly correlated. Hence, it was concluded that social and cultural contexts of the two culturally similar countries played a crucial role in the development of a collective group identity.

Acknowledgements / Acknowledgement

Author would like to thank professor Nadezhda Lebedeva (National Research University Higher

School of Economics) for her kind assistance and guidance in article preparation.

Funding

The article was prepared within the framework of the HSE University Basic Research Program.

References

Ashforth B.E., Mael F. Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*. 1989, 14(1), 20-39. DOI: 10.2307/258189

Bengtson V.L., Silverstein M., Putney N.M., Harris S.C. Does Religiousness Increase with Age? Age Changes and Generational Differences Over 35 Years. *Journal for the scientific study of religion*. 2015, 54, 363-379. DOI: 10.1111/jssr.12183

Brewer M.B. Ingroup identification and intergroup conflict: When does ingroup love become outgroup hate? In: R.D. Ashmore, L. Jussim, D. Wilder (Eds.). *Rutgers series on self and social identity: Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction*. 2001. Vol. 3, 17-41. London: Oxford University Press.

Capozza D., Brown R., Aharpour S., Falvo R. A comparison of motivational theories of identification. In: R. Brown, D. Capozza (Eds.), *Social Identities: Motivational, Emotional and Cultural Influences*. 2006, 51-72. London: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

Chang C.W., Yuan R., Chen J.K. Social support and depression among Chinese adolescents: the mediating roles of self-esteem and self-efficacy. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2018, 88, 128-134. DOI: 10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.03.001

Chao G.T., Moon H. The Cultural Mosaic: A Metatheory for Understanding the Complexity of Culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2005, 90(6), 1128-1140. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1128

Chen F.F. Sensitivity of Goodness of Fit Indexes to Lack of Measurement Invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2007, (14)3, 464-504. DOI: 10.1080/10705510701301834

Dimitrova R., Chasiotis A., Bender M., van de Vijver F. Collective identity and wellbeing of Roma minority adolescents in Bulgaria. *International Journal of Psychology*. 2012, 48(4), 502-513. DOI: 10.1080/00207594.2012.682064

Dimitrova R., Chasiotis A., Bender M., van de Vijver F.J.R. From a collection of identities to collective identity: Evidence from mainstream and minority adolescents in Bulgaria. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science*. 2014, 48(4), 339-367. DOI: 10.1177/1069397114523922

Dimitrova R., Musso P., Solcova I.P., Stefenel D., Uka F., Zahaj S., Tavel P., Jordanov V., Jordanov E. Multiple Social Identities in Relation to Self-Esteem of Adolescents in Post-Communist Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Kosovo, and Romania. In: N. Lebedeva, R. Dimitrova, J. Berry (Eds), *Societies and Political Orders in Transition: Changing Values and Identities in the Post-Communist World*. 2018, 225-241. Basel: Springer International Publishing.

Easterbrook M., Vignoles V.L. Different groups, different motives: Identity motives underlying changes in identification with novel groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2012, 38(8), 1066-1080. DOI: 10.1177/0146167212444614

Feitosa J., Salas E., Salazar M.R. Social identity: Clarifying its dimensions across cultures // *Psihologijske Teme*. 2012, 21(3), 527-548.

Gallup International. Bulgarians are strong supporters of the EU. There are few supporters of repressive ideologies, 2018.

<https://www.gallup-international.bg/en/43933/bulgarians-are-strong-supporters-of-the-eu-few-but-not-quite-supporters-of-repressive-ideologies/>

Galyapina V., Lebedeva N., van de Vijver F. A three-generation study of acculturation and identity of the Russian minority in the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2018, 49, 976-992. DOI: 10.1177/0022022118767578

Gibson C., Zellmer-Bruhn M. Metaphors and meaning: An intercultural analysis of the concept of teamwork. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2001, 46(2), 274-303. DOI: 10.2307/2667088

Golovashina O.V. Obraz Sovetskogo Soyuz a v social'noy pamyati sovremennyh rossiyan (na materialah empiricheskogo issledovaniya) [Image of the Soviet Union in social memory of Russians (on materials of empirical research)]. Social'no-ekonomicheskiye yavleniya i process [Socioeconomic phenomena and processes]. 2013, 11(057).

<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/obraz-sovetskogo-soyuza-v-sotsialnoy-pamyati>

Gouveia V.V., de Albuquerque F.J.B., Clemente M., Espinosa P. Human values and social identities: A study in two collectivist cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*. 2002, 37(6), 333-342. DOI: 10.1080/00207590244000179

Hofstede G., Hofstede G. J., Minkov M. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*. USA: McGraw-Hill, 2010.

Jetten J., Spears R., Postmes T. Intergroup Distinctiveness and Differentiation: A Meta-Analytic Integration. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2004, 86, 862-79. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.6.862

Johnson L.R., Kim E.H., Johnson-Pynn J.S., Schulenberg S.E., Balagaye H., Lugumya D. Ethnic identity, self-efficacy, and intercultural attitudes in East African and U.S. youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 2012, 27(2), 256-289. DOI: 10.1177/0743558411412955

Kaneva N., Popescu D. National Identity Lite: Nation Branding in Post-Communist Romania and Bulgaria. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*. 2011, 14, 191-207. DOI: 10.1177/1367877910382181

Kusumi T., Matsuda K., Sugimori E. The effects of aging on nostalgia in consumers' advertisement processing. *Japanese Psychological Research*. 2010, 52, 150-162. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5884.2010.00431.x

Lebedeva N.M., Tatarko A.N. Strategii mezhkul'turnogo vzaimodeistviya migrantov i prinimaushchego naseleniya Rossii [Strategies of intercultural interaction of migrants and host society in Russia]. Moscow: RUDN, 2009.

Lebedeva N.M., Tatarko A.N. Basic Values in Russia: Their Dynamics, Ethnocultural Differences, and Relation to Economic Attitudes. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*. 2018, 11(3), 36-52.

Magun V., Rudnev M. Basic human values of Russians: both different from and similar to other Europeans. *Sociology. SOC. Высшая школа экономики*. 2013. No. WP BRP 23SOC2013.

Maliepaard M., Lubbers M., Gijsberts M. Generational differences in ethnic and religious attachment and their interrelation: a study among Muslim minorities in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 2010, 33(3), 451-472. DOI: 10.1080/01419870903318169

Martsinkovskaya T.D., Solodnikova I.V. Transformation of sociocultural and linguistic identity in the process of socialization in a multicultural environment // *Psikhologicheskie Issledovaniya*. 2018, Vol. 11, No. 58, 4. <http://psystudy.ru> (in Russian, abstr. in English).

Miller K.P., Brewer M.B., Ar buckle N.L. Social identity complexity: Its correlates and antecedents. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. 2009, 12(1), 79-94. DOI: 10.1177/1368430208098778

Newman D., O'Brien J., Robertson M. *Sociology: Explaining the Architecture in everyday Life: Readings*. 10 ed. Sage Publication, 2014.

Roccas S., Brewer M. Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2002, 6(2), 88-106. DOI: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0602_01

Rouchy J.C. Cultural Identity and Groups of Belonging // *Group*. 2002, 26(3), 205-217.

Sanchez D.T., Shih M., Garcia J.A. Juggling multiple racial identities: Malleable racial identification and psychological well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2009, 15(3), 243-254. DOI: 10.1037/a0014373

Schwartz S.H. The 7 Schwartz cultural value orientation scores for 80 countries.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304715744_The_7_Schwartz_cultural_value_orientation_scores_for_80_countries, 2008.

Smith T.W. Social identity and socio-demographic structure. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 2007, 19(3), 380-390. DOI: 10.1093/ijpor/edm015

Standard Eurobarometer. Spring report, 2018.

https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_18_4148

Steffens N. K., Jetten J., Haslam C., Cruwys T., Haslam S.A. Multiple Social Identities Enhance Health Post-Retirement Because They Are a Basis for Giving Social Support. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2016, 7, 1519. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01519

Tajfel H. Social categorization. English manuscript of “La categorization sociale”. In: S. Moscovici (Ed.). *Introduction a la psychologie sociale*. Paris: Larousse, 1972, Vol. 1, 272-302.

Tajfel H., Turner J.C. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In: S. Worchel, W. G. Austin (Eds.). *Psychology of Intergroup Relation*. Chicago: Hall Publishers, 1986. 7-24.

Valdai discussion club report. National identity and the future of Russia. 2014. http://vid-1.rian.ru/ig/valdai/Identity_eng.pdf.

Van de Vijver F., Leung K. Methodological issues in psychological research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2000, 31(1), 33-51. DOI: 10.1177/0022022100031001004

Verkuyten M. Religious group identification and inter-religious relations: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. 2007, 10(3), 341-357. DOI: 10.1177/1368430207078695

Verkuyten M., Thijs J., Stevens G. Multiple identities and religious transmission: A study among Moroccan-Dutch Muslim adolescents and their parents. *Child Development*. 2012, 83, 1471-1476. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01794.x

Wojnowski Z. The Soviet people: national and supranational identities in the USSR after 1945. *Nationalities Papers*. 2015, 43(1), 1-7. DOI: 10.1080/00905992.2014.953467

Поступила в редакцию: 16 апреля 2020 г. Дата публикации: 4 ноября 2020 г.

Information about author

Velkova Kristina. PhD Student, Research intern, PhD school of psychology, Centre for sociocultural research, Faculty of social science, Department of psychology, National Research University Higher School of Economics, ul. Myasnitskaya, 20, 101000 Moscow, Russia.

E-mail: kvelkova@hse.ru

For citation: Velkova K. Multiple identities of Russians and Bulgarians: Intercultural comparison. *Psikhologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 2020, Vol. 13, No. 73, p. 6. <https://psystudy.ru>

To cite this article: <https://doi.org/10.54359/ps.v13i73.174>

Велкова К.¹ Множественные идентичности русских и болгар: кросс-культурный анализ

Velkova K. Multiple identities of Russians and Bulgarians: Intercultural comparison

¹ Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Москва, Россия

Люди принадлежат к разным группам, приписывают этим группам разную ценность и эмоциональную значимость и формируют множество групповых идентичностей [Brewer, 2001; Tajfel, 1972]. Однако важность групповой идентичности может варьироваться на культурном уровне. Данное исследование сравнивает групповую идентификацию двух схожих в культурном отношении групп, которые выбрали разные пути развития в течение последних 30 лет (болгары и русские). Были проанализированы отношения между пятью групповыми идентичностями: национальной, религиозной, региональной, советской / коммунистической и европейской. При проведении онлайн-опроса была собрана выборка из 233 россиян и 279 болгар, были использованы модификации шкал из опросника MIRIPS и шкалы религиозной идентичности Веркайтена [Verkuuyten, 2007]. Собранные данные были проанализированы с использованием множественной регрессии и корреляционного анализа отдельно для каждой подвыборки. Результаты показали существенные различия в идентификации русских и болгар со всеми исследуемыми категориями. Более того, паттерн корреляции между групповыми идентичностями предполагал некоторые различия в структуре групповой идентичности двух подвыборок. Среди русских национальная, региональная, религиозная и советская идентичности были значимо положительно взаимосвязаны. Среди болгар наблюдались две основные идентичности: религиозная и региональная. Кроме того, они служили «мостом» между европейской и национальной идентификацией. Наконец, было предложено, что изменения в социокультурном контексте сыграли свою роль в структуре идентичности в обеих странах. Стремление болгар дистанцироваться от коммунистического прошлого страны может объяснять отделение коммунистической идентичности от других типов идентичности, в то время как политические разногласия между Европой и Россией могут препятствовать развитию чувства принадлежности к Европе у россиян.

Ключевые слова: групповая идентичность, межкультурные различия, множественные идентичности, культура, корреляция идентичности

Благодарности

Автор выражает благодарность профессору Национального исследовательского университета «Высшая школа экономики» Лебедевой Надежде Михайловне за помощь и рекомендации в процессе подготовки статьи.

Финансирование

Статья подготовлена в рамках Программы фундаментальных исследований Университета НИУ ВШЭ.

Литература

Головашина О.В. Образ Советского Союза в социальной памяти современных россиян (на материалах эмпирического исследования) // Социально-экономические явления и процессы. 2013. №11 (057). <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/obraz-sovetskogo-soyuza-v-sotsialnoy-pamyati>

Лебедева Н.М., Татарко А.Н. Стратегии межкультурного взаимодействия мигрантов и принимающего населения России. М.: РУДН, 2009.

Марцинковская Т.Д., Солodникова И.В. Трансформации социокультурной и лингвистической идентичности в процессе социализации в мультикультурной среде // Психологические исследования. 2018, 11(58), 4. <http://psystudy.ru>

Ashforth B.E., Mael F. Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*. 1989, 14(1), 20-39. DOI: 10.2307/258189

Bengtson V.L., Silverstein M., Putney N.M., Harris S.C. Does Religiousness Increase with Age? Age Changes and Generational Differences Over 35 Years. *Journal for the scientific study of religion*. 2015, 54, 363-379. DOI: 10.1111/jssr.12183

Brewer M.B. Ingroup identification and intergroup conflict: When does ingroup love become outgroup hate? In: R.D. Ashmore, L. Jussim, D. Wilder (Eds.). *Rutgers series on self and social identi-*

ty: Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction. 2001. Vol. 3, 17-41. London: Oxford University Press.

Capozza D., Brown R., Aharpour S., Falvo R. A comparison of motivational theories of identification. In: R. Brown, D. Capozza (Eds.), *Social Identities: Motivational, Emotional and Cultural Influences*. 2006, 51-72. London: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

Chang C.W., Yuan R., Chen J.K. Social support and depression among Chinese adolescents: the mediating roles of self-esteem and self-efficacy. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2018, 88, 128-134. DOI: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.03.001

Chao G.T., Moon H. The Cultural Mosaic: A Metatheory for Understanding the Complexity of Culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2005, 90(6), 1128-1140. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1128

Chen F.F. Sensitivity of Goodness of Fit Indexes to Lack of Measurement Invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2007, (14)3, 464-504. DOI: 10.1080/10705510701301834

Dimitrova R., Chasiotis A., Bender M., van de Vijver F. Collective identity and wellbeing of Roma minority adolescents in Bulgaria. *International Journal of Psychology*. 2012, 48(4), 502-513. DOI: 10.1080/00207594.2012.682064

Dimitrova R., Chasiotis A., Bender M., van de Vijver F.J.R. From a collection of identities to collective identity: Evidence from mainstream and minority adolescents in Bulgaria. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science*. 2014, 48(4), 339-367. DOI: 10.1177/1069397114523922

Dimitrova R., Musso P., Solcova I.P., Stefenel D., Uka F., Zahaj S., Tavel P., Jordanov V., Jordanov E. Multiple Social Identities in Relation to Self-Esteem of Adolescents in Post-Communist Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Kosovo, and Romania. In: N. Lebedeva, R. Dimitrova, J. Berry (Eds). *Societies and Political Orders in Transition: Changing Values and Identities in the Post-Communist World*. 2018, 225-241. Basel: Springer International Publishing.

Easterbrook M., Vignoles V.L. Different groups, different motives: Identity motives underlying changes in identification with novel groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2012, 38(8), 1066-1080. DOI: 10.1177/0146167212444614

Feitosa J., Salas E., Salazar M.R. Social identity: Clarifying its dimensions across cultures // Psihologijske Teme. 2012, 21(3), 527-548.

Gallup International. Bulgarians are strong supporters of the EU. There are few supporters of repressive ideologies, 2018.

<https://www.gallup-international.bg/en/43933/bulgarians-are-strong-supporters-of-the-eu-few-but-not-quite-supporters-of-repressive-ideologies/>

Galyapina V., Lebedeva N., van de Vijver F. A three-generation study of acculturation and identity of the Russian minority in the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2018, 49, 976-992. DOI: 10.1177/0022022118767578

Gibson C., Zellmer-Bruhn M. Metaphors and meaning: An intercultural analysis of the concept of teamwork. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2001, 46(2), 274-303. DOI: 10.2307/2667088

Gouveia V.V., de Albuquerque F.J.B., Clemente M., Espinosa P. Human values and social identities: A study in two collectivist cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*. 2002, 37(6), 333-342. DOI: 10.1080/00207590244000179

Hofstede G., Hofstede G.J., Minkov M. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival*. USA: McGraw-Hill, 2010.

Jetten J., Spears R., Postmes T. Intergroup Distinctiveness and Differentiation: A Meta-Analytic Integration. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2004, 86, 862-79. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.6.862.

Johnson L.R., Kim E.H., Johnson-Pynn J.S., Schulenberg S.E., Balagaye H., Lugumya D. Ethnic identity, self-efficacy, and intercultural attitudes in East African and U.S. youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 2012, 27(2), 256-289. DOI: 10.1177/0743558411412955

Kaneva N., Popescu D. National Identity Lite: Nation Branding in Post-Communist Romania and Bulgaria. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*. 2011, 14, 191-207. DOI: 10.1177/1367877910382181

Kusumi T., Matsuda K., Sugimori E. The effects of aging on nostalgia in consumers' advertisement processing. *Japanese Psychological Research*. 2010, 52, 150-162. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5884.2010.00431.x

Lebedeva N.M., Tatarko A.N. Basic Values in Russia: Their Dynamics, Ethnocultural Differences, and Relation to Economic Attitudes. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*. 2018, 11(3), 36-52.

Magun V., Rudnev M. Basic human values of Russians: both different from and similar to other Europeans. *Sociology. SOC. Высшая школа экономики*. 2013. No. WP BRP 23SOC2013.

Maliepaard M., Lubbers M., Gijssberts M. Generational differences in ethnic and religious attachment and their interrelation: a study among Muslim minorities in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 2010, 33(3), 451-472. DOI: 10.1080/01419870903318169

Miller K.P., Brewer M.B., Arbuckle N.L. Social identity complexity: Its correlates and antecedents. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. 2009, 12(1), 79-94. DOI: 10.1177/1368430208098778

Newman D., O'Brien J., Robertson M. *Sociology: Explaining the Architecture in everyday Life: Readings*. 10th ed. Sage Publication, 2014.

Roccas S., Brewer M. Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2002, 6(2), 88-106. DOI: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0602_01

Rouchy J.C. Cultural Identity and Groups of Belonging // *Group*. 2002, 26(3), 205-217.

Sanchez D.T., Shih M., Garcia J.A. Juggling multiple racial identities: Malleable racial identification and psychological well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2009, 15(3), 243-254. DOI: 10.1037/a0014373

Schwartz S.H. The 7 Schwartz cultural value orientation scores for 80 countries.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304715744_The_7_Schwartz_cultural_value_orientation_scores_for_80_countries, 2008.

Smith T.W. Social identity and socio-demographic structure. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 2007, 19(3), 380-390. DOI: 10.1093/ijpor/edm015

Standard Eurobarometer. Spring report, 2018.

https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_18_4148

Steffens N. K., Jetten J., Haslam C., Cruwys T., Haslam S.A. Multiple Social Identities Enhance Health Post-Retirement Because They Are a Basis for Giving Social Support. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2016, 7, 1519. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01519.

Tajfel H. Social categorization. English manuscript of “La categorization sociale”. In: S. Moscovici (Ed.). *Introduction a la psychologie sociale*. Paris: Larousse, 1972. Vol. 1, 272-302.

Tajfel H., Turner J.C. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In: S. Worchel, W.G. Austin (Eds.). *Psychology of Intergroup Relation*. Chicago: Hall Publishers, 1986. 7-24.

Valdai discussion club report. National identity and the future of Russia. 2014. http://vid-1.rian.ru/ig/valdai/Identity_eng.pdf.

Van de Vijver F., Leung K. Methodological issues in psychological research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2000, 31(1), 33-51. DOI: 10.1177/0022022100031001004

Verkuyten M. Religious group identification and inter-religious relations: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. 2007, 10(3), 341-357. DOI: 10.1177/1368430207078695

Verkuyten M., Thijs J., Stevens G. Multiple identities and religious transmission: A study among Moroccan-Dutch Muslim adolescents and their parents. *Child Development*. 2012, 83, 1471–1476. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01794.x

Wojnowski Z. The Soviet people: national and supranational identities in the USSR after 1945. *Nationalities Papers*. 2015, 43(1), 1-7. DOI: 10.1080/00905992.2014.953467

Сведения об авторе

Велкова Кристина. Аспирант, стажер-исследователь Центра социокультурных исследований, Аспирантская школа по психологии, факультет социальных наук, департамент психологии, Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», ул. Мясницкая, д. 20, 101000 Москва, Россия.

E-mail: kvelkova@hse.ru

Ссылка для цитирования

Велкова К. Множественные идентичности русских и болгар: кросс-культурный анализ. психологические исследования. 2020. Т. 13, № 73. С. 6. URL: <https://psystudy.ru>