

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences

Natela Donadze

**“Women’s types of social character in a transitional society (on the example
of Georgia)”**

A Thesis for PhD status defending

Supervisors of Studies: Iago Kachkachishvili, Full Professor, TSU,
Amiran Berdzenishvili, Associate Professor, TSU



2010

Structure of the work:

Introduction

I Chapter – Social character as a component of personality

§1. Personality and process of its formation

§2. Society, social character and personality

II Chapter – Typology of social character

§1. Erich Fromm's typology of social character

§2. David Riesman and his "The Lonely Crowd"

§3. Interdependence of social character and society (D. Riesman)

§4. David Riesman's typology of social character

1) tradition-directed social character and society

2) inner-directed social character and society

3) other-directed social character and society

§5. Factors of social character's formation

§6. David Riesman's typology of political styles

§7. David Riesman's typology of universal types

§8. Conclusion

III Chapter – Social character and women's social types

§1. Gender and its essence

§2. Study of students' attitudes towards modern Georgian society (Modern Georgian society in students' focus)

§3. Women's types of social character of modern Georgia in students' focus

§4. Women's types of social character of modern Georgia in experts' focus

§5. Study of women's stories

Conclusion

* * *

Scientific novelty of the thesis – In Georgia David Riesman's, the outstanding American sociologist's, typology of social character is analysed for the first time. The scientific work is an attempt to determine women's types of social character in modern, transitional Georgia.

Scientific importance of the work – Its significance is determined by exploration of women's types of social character in modern Georgian society.

Practical importance of the work – Data and conclusions got by sociological research concerning women's types of social character in modern Georgian society will ensure governmental and non-governmental organizations to draw up some program in order to improve Georgian women's social-economic, political, cultural, etc. conditions.

The objective of the research – To study women's social character in modern transitional Georgia, to delineate women's social types according to David Riesman's typology.

Tasks put to reach the aim - To analyse "Social character" as object of complex research, to review D. Riesman's typology of social character, sociological research of students' and experts' attitudes and estimations by means of in-depth interview and focus-group methods, analysis of women's histories in order to determine women's types of social character in modern Georgia.

* * *

The scientific work "Types of women's social character in transitional society (on example of modern Georgia)" consists of introduction, three chapters and conclusion.

In the introduction the author briefly reviews some processes characteristic of modern XXI century and indicates the aim of the work – to determine types of women's social character in modern transitional Georgian society.

In I chapter N. Donadze considers social character, as personality's component, as link between society and personality,

In II chapter she focuses her attention on famous scholars' typologies of social character, particularly, on David Riesman's typology – which is a theoretical basis of the work and sociological research. In this chapter she minutely describes D. Riesman's typology of social characters: tradition-directed character, inner-directed character and other-directed character,

factors of social character's formation. She also considers his types of political style and universal types.

In III chapter the author presents the data and results of sociological research, conducted by her.

In the conclusion N. Donadze analyses the information got by means of the research.

Introduction. Today, at the end of the first decade of XXI century, Georgia is in a transitional period. Transformational processes are taking place in every sphere of the Georgian social system and include all its elements. The transitional period is a very complex, difficult and painful, at the same time, it is a long-term social phenomenon. In the same historical period, in the same geographic space it is taking place opposition, coexistence and, sometimes, junction of two different social-economic systems, political and cultural values. Transition has concerned a society both on the macro level – social institutions and organizations, and on the micro level – social groups and individuals. People’s consciousness and thier life style, attitudes towards the essence of life, purpose of a human being in the world, in society are being changed. Transformation processes are occuring with different form and content, speed and intensity in different elements, components of a social structure. The social structure of a society, division of the socium into different strata is being shifted gradually. The economic, political, cultural, social, legal, educational institutions and their functions are being changed, the new reality is being constructed.

“The transitional paradigm has been somewhat useful during a time of momentous and often surprising political upheaval in the world. But it is increasingly clear that reality is no longer conforming to the model. Many countries that policy makers and aid practitioners persist in calling “transitional” are not in transition to democracy, and of the democratic transitions that are under way, more than a few are not following the model.”¹

The scientist is quite right when he declares that the transition paradigm has outlined its usefulness and it is time to look for better lenses.

The American scientist Christopher Haerpher suggested a new paradigm – “transformation” – to the scientific society. He supposes that in XXI century in some countries both political and economic transformations are occuring. From the political standpoint, it is a transformation from the totalitarian regime to the pluralistic democracy, from the economic standpoint – from the planned economy to the free market economy. According to Ch.

¹ Carothers, Th. (2002). The End of The Transition Paradigm. // Journal of Democracy. Vol. 13. No. 1. P. 6.

Haerpher, the term “transformation” is more appropriate than the concept “transition” to the interpretation of the specific character of the post-communist changes.¹

Transformation does not exist without transition. Transformation is the cause of transition and a transition is implemented on the basis of transformation.

The concepts “transition”, “modernization”, “democratization”, “transformation” show the processes of different political, economic and cultural reality. But it should be noticed that transition, democratization and transformation do not exist independently. Transition and democratization are the trends of transformation. At the same time, transition and democratisation are exercised on the basis of transformation.²

Globalization causes the main characteristic feature of our era, the rise and strengthening of the shifts. Globalization is a growing interdependence between different peoples, regions and countries in the world.³ It is the process by which the world is becoming a single entity, to be considered in its own right.⁴

The outstanding English sociologist Anthony Giddens supposes that no society on earth any longer lives in complete separation from others. Sociological analysis that confines itself to the study of single societies is becoming archaic. As human beings, we more and more share a common fate.⁵

As a consequence of globalization, human being perceives himself not only as a member of his social environment, social groups, social community, and society, but also as a part of the whole world.

Globalization is changing both the being and consciousness of people, especially woman. For them there are vast possibilities of self-realization and self-assertion, of developing a new personality, appropriate to a new, information society. These processes gradually and successively take place in modern Georgia as well.

¹ Haerpher, C. W. (2002). *Democracy and Enlargement in Postcommunist Europe*. New York. p. 3.

² Dolidze, B. (2011). *Transition, Democratization, Transformation. Why has transitionology “died”?* Tbilisi, p.p. 8-11

³ Giddens, A. (1997). *Sociology*. Cambridge. Polity Press. (Original work published 1989). p. 582.

⁴ Smelzer, N.J. (1995). *Sociology*. New Jersey. Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1985). p. 56.

⁵ Giddens, A. (1997). *Sociology*. Cambridge. Polity Press. (Original work published 1989). p. 64.

As I have mentioned, globalization and transformation are accompanied by changes of society and personality types. These shifts concern social character as a link between society and personality.

Whence the major theme of my scientific work is types of women's social character in modern Georgia, under transition, in the first chapter I focus my attention on consideration of social character, its essence and specificity.

One of the most essential problems of the modernity is human being – the most complicated phenomenon in the world. The theoretical approach to this subject is complex. It has been studied by different scholars – philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, etc. consider a human being's problem in different aspects.

Human being is a subject of social-historical activities and culture. It is a living system, the unity of physical and spiritual, natural and social, inherited and acquired characteristics. Human being is a natural creature, but the unity of different social relations makes its essence.

According to the outstanding German scientist Erich Fromm, a representative of each culture is always the manifestation of human being's nature, but determined by the social conditions in which he lives.

By the complexity of human being's mental organization to the social environmental relations a human being can be characterized as: a) individual, b) subject and c) personality.¹ From this point of view, the process of human being's development is a process of socialization.

The process of social being's transition into personality is very complex. At different stages of development different social mechanisms have crucial meaning. Through these mechanisms a human being acquires social roles and adopts a concrete cultural system. The importance of different elements of the social environment (social-economic conditions, cultural environment, family, school, peer-groups, mass media, etc.) varies at different phases of the socialization process, also in various societies and at the different stages of the development of society.

Socialization is an adoption of the social experience by an individual. During this process a concrete personality is created. Erich Fromm states that the process of socialization begins from

¹ Nadirashvili. J. (1975). Social psychology of a person. Tbilisi. The University Publishing House. p.p. 62-106. (In Georgian).

the moment, when a social being manifests himself and shows his own attitudes towards others by rules and forms of human relations.

In this chapter, I focus on various sociological and psychological approaches to the personality, which explain human actions by the impact of social factors.

The structure of personality defines its ideas, feelings and actions. According to the sociological paradigm, personality is a product of social relation. He is also an active, creative subject.

In the second paragraph of the same chapter I show the connection of society and personality. In order to understand a concrete personality it is not enough to describe his relations with people. We should begin with society as a whole. Personality as a constituent part of society is determined by the regularities of the whole. The relationship between society and personality is the most interesting problem of the sociological theory.

In the process of the historical development not only the widespread and dominant social types and their value orientations are changing, but the interdependence between personality and society too.

Erich Fromm considers social character as an intermediate link between the social-economic structure and the ideas and ideals dominant in a society. At the same time, social character is a mediator in both directions: from the economic basis to the ideas and from the ideas to the economic basis, that is, not only the economic basis creates a certain social character; social character, on its part, creates some ideas. The ideas, just once formed, influence the social character too and indirectly impact the social-economic structure of a society.

In the second chapter I consider famous scientists' typologies of social characters, as the aim of our scientific work is to study types of women's social character in modern transitional Georgia. Some of these typologies are very interesting from the scientific standpoint.

In the first paragraph of the second chapter I analyse Erich Fromm's typology.

According to Erich Fromm, the social-economic structure of a society (economic factor, as the firmest factor, is of paramount importance in the genesis of a social character) creates a social being's character. On the other hand, a human being's nature influences those social conditions, in which he lives.

E. Fromm thinks that “social character is a main element of the functioning of a society.”¹ He signifies a kernel of the character structure, which is typical for the majority of representatives of the given society, with the concept of “social character”. He proposes the typology of social characters consisting of the following five elements: receptive, exploiter, accumulative, marketing, and productive.

In the work I discuss each type and its characteristic features.

A person with a receptive character thinks that “a source of everything good” exists outside a human being and the only way to gain some desirable thing (it may be material or spiritual, love, knowledge or pleasure) is to get it from the outside. A receptive social character is sentimental, dependent and passive. **A person with an exploiter character**, as a receptive character, considers the outside to be a source of the things – of everything – he/she can gain. But unlike a receptive type, a person with an exploiter character takes everything with force and craft. Such a person exploits everyone and everything, what he/she can “squeeze out”. **An accumulative social character’s** one of highest value is thrift, economy. It is his ideal. His life style is savings, economy and not expenditure and wasteful generosity. Equality is very important for him. He wants everyone to have the same prosperity. An accumulative social character is oriented to the past. **A person with a marketing social character is** estranged from other people. He considers himself as a thing, goods, which can be bought or sold. He aspires to sell himself well at the market. All these 4 types are unproductive. As to the fifth type - **a person with a productive social character** - according to E. Fromm, is an objective of the mankind’s development. He is a honest, quiet, affectionate, creative personality.

E. Fromm notices that for the social character of XIX century a principle trend was characteristic – “To have”, but the objective of XX century’s social character is “To use”.

Erich Fromm considers that a social character is of great importance to understand social processes. The individuals’ social character is formed according to the life style of the given society, and the main features and traits of this character, on the other hand, become creative forces, forming a social style. Social character is a structure, by means of which human being’s energy is specifically formed. Society uses it for its own purposes.

¹ Fromm, E. (1992). Beyond the Chains of Illusion. Moscow. Publishing House “Republic”. p. 335. (In Russian translation).

In short, the unity of a personality's specific value orientations in a given society, the unity of some main features and traits, characteristic of a certain social group, is called a social character.

In his scientific works E. Fromm analyses not only social character but also society, mainly, capitalist society. He truly denotes that there does not exist a society on the whole, there are only specific social structures which function according to certain rules. These social structures change in the course of the historical development.

Many sociologists and psychologists (especially a famous American sociologist David Riesman) truly note that their scientific conceptions have been greatly influenced by Erich Fromm's doctrine of social character and modern capitalist society.

The II and III paragraphs of II chapter are dedicated to the analysis of David Riesman's typology of social character and society. In my work I also focus on his typology of political styles and a typology of the Universal types.

First of all I want to notice that David Riesman's typology of social character, given in his book "The Lonely Crowd", is a theoretical basis of my scientific work.

The wide popularity of "The Lonely Crowd" is caused by the typology of social character given in this book. The basis of this typology was to study the changing American character.

As David Riesman underlines, "this book is about social character and about the differences in social character between men of different regions, eras, and groups. It considers the ways in which different social character types, once they are formed at the knee of society, are then deployed in the work, play, politics, and child-rearing activities of society."¹

The scientist analyses the concept of "social character" and notes that it is neither "personality" nor a "character". "Personality" denotes the total self, with its inherited temperaments and talents, its biological as well as psychological components, its evanescent as well as more or less permanent attributes. As to "character", it refers only to a part of personality – that part which is formed not by heredity but by experience. According to D. Riesman, "social character" is that part of "character" which is shared among significant social groups and which is the product of the experience of these groups.

¹ Riesman, D. (1953). *The Lonely Crowd*. New York. Yale University Press. (Original work published 1950). p. 18.

In the third paragraph of the second chapter I show David Riesman's analysis of the relation between social character and society. The scientist acknowledges Erich Fromm's theoretical proposition about the connection between society and social character. According to E. Fromm, "In order that any society may function well, its members must acquire the kind of character which makes them want to act in the way they have to act as members of the society or of a special clans within it. They have to desire what objectively is necessary for them to do. Outer force is replaced by inner compulsion, and by the particular kind of human energy which is channeled into character traits."¹

D. Riesman sounds quite persuasive asserting that the link between social character and society is very significant. A society ensures some degree of conformity from the individuals who make it up. He uses the term "mode of conformity" interchangeably with the term "social character". Though he himself acknowledges that conformity is not all of social character. Social character includes not only "mode of conformity", but also "mode of creativity".

In order to show the connection between a society and a social character and to characterize socialized types of human beings, D. Riesman uses some demographical categories, especially the population growth. He tries to link certain social and characterological changes, as a cause and effect to some population shifts.

According to the population growth and some characteristic social traits, D. Riesman distinguishes three types of societies and respective social characters.

The scientist calls the society with the potential of population's high growth the tradition-directed one, the society of transitional population grown – the inner-directed one, and the society of incipient population decline – the other-directed one.²

As each society creates such a character, which favours the functioning and developing of the given society, D. Riesman's types of societies form the social characters appropriate to them.

A tradition-directed society develops in its typical members a social character, whose conformity is encouraged by their tendency to follow tradition. D. Riesman calls such people the tradition-directed ones.

¹ Riesman, D. (1953). *The Lonely Crowd*. New York. Yale University Press. (Original work published 1950). p. 19.

² Riesman, D. (1953). *The Lonely Crowd*. New York. Yale University Press. (Original work published 1950). p. 23.

An inner-directed society forms in its typical members a social character, whose conformity is defined by their tendency to follow an internalized set of purposes and goals acquired in childhood. Such people are termed as inner-directed.

An other-directed society creates in its typical members a social character, whose conformity is determined by their tendency to be sensitive to other people's expectations and preferences. Such people are termed as other-directed.

I think D. Riesman is quite right when he points out that his social types of social character and society are "ideal types".

In the following three paragraphs I consider D. Riesman's types of society and social character, their specific traits and features more minutely.

Tradition-directed types. Tradition-directed people's behaviour is regulated from the outside by traditional cultural models, kinship relations, religion, mores etc. Their characteristic feature is the conformity to external norms of behaviour, to their social group's ethics.

In this society obedience to the traditions is dominant. The culture (with its values, norms and views of reality) controls everybody and everything. In spite of this, individuals, especially adults, are respected very much. In such a society social mobility is very rare and the range of choice is minimal. Most of the people are adjusted, they are tuned with social institutions.

Inner-directed types. In an inner-directed society most of people have social character whose conformity is determined by inner principles, internalized purposes and goals. In such a society personal mobility and opportunity of choice for the individuals are increasing. It is the result of its main traits and features, accumulation of capital and a constant expansion almost in every sphere of social life. Inner-directed people are sensitive not to the rigid traditions but to the norms and goals inculcated in them by the adults. Their social character is formed not only in a family but during the work and for the work. They have highly individualized character. The people of inner-directed social character possess a somewhat greater degree of flexibility in adapting themselves to ever changing requirements and in return require more from their environment (p. 31). They control their own lives.

Other-directed types. The main characteristics of an other-directed society are capitalism, industrialism, urbanization, centralization, and bureaucratism.

This society develops in its members a social character whose conformity is determined by a tendency to be sensitive not to the traditions and internalised goals and purposes but to other people's expectations. In making decisions and during acting they pay great attention to other people's opinions and not to the traditional values and their inner principles.

The other-directed people follow the crowd, share its values and behavioural norms.

The comparison of social characters. D. Riesman compares these three types of social characters and shows structural differences between them. He thinks that to explain these differences it is necessary to see the differences in the emotional sanction or control in each type. Of course, all these three social types are impacted by culture but each of them is influenced in a different way. The tradition-directed person feels the impact of his culture, but it is mediated through the specific, small number of individuals with whom he is in daily contact. These people expect of him that he behave in the approved way. The sanction for behaviour is the fear to be shamed. Although the inner-directed person is comparatively independent, he goes through life less independent than he seems, obeying this internal piloting. Getting off the course may cause the feeling of guilt. At home the inner-directed person is thought to choose the direction in his life. He can receive signals from other authorities who are like his parents. The other-directed person he learns to respond to signals from a far wider circle than is constituted by his parents. The family is no longer a closely knit unit to which he belongs but merely part of a wider social environment to which he early becomes attentive (p. 41).

D. Riesman shows some resemblance between the social types. According to him, the other-directed person is like the tradition-directed one: both live in a group milieu and lack the inner-directed person's capacity to go it alone. The inner-directed person is insensitive to others. The other-directed person is at home everywhere and nowhere. He must be able to receive signals from far and near. The sources are many, the changes rapid. The tradition-directed person takes his signals from others, but they come in a cultural monotone (p.p. 43-44).

The scientist points out that the types of social character are abstractions. "It is necessary first to abstract from the real individual his "personality", then to abstract from that his "character", finally to abstract from that the common element that forms "social character".

All persons have the capacity for each of these modes of conformity. In some cases it is possible that in the course of their life their social character may be changed.

In the next paragraph I focus on D. Riesman's description of the factors of formation and changes in the agents of socialization. He considers in details the process of social character formation and shows the role of socialization agents in different types of society.

According to the author, the human agents (parents, teachers, members of peer-groups and story-tellers/mass media) stand between social structures and already formed social character. They transmit social inheritance and have a great impact on children, on their lives and hence, on the whole society.

Culture plays the greatest role in the process of a human being's formation as a personality. Cultures differ by different means, stages, and agents who are most important on each stage of the formation of social character,

Parents have a great responsibility in the formation of their child's/childrens' social character. But their role is not of the same significance in different types of society.

In a tradition-directed society family is the major factor of social character formation. At a very early period of their lives children learn to imitate a small number of adult standards. As a rule, social maturity waits on biological maturity. But in a tradition-directed society social maturity sometimes passes ahead of biological maturity.

A child has to imitate such specific features as bravery and cunning. The parents train their children to succeed. "The growing child do not confront problems of choice very different from those he watched his elders face, and his growth is conceived as a process of becoming an older, and therefore wiser, interpreter of tradition." (p. 57)

In an inner-directed society there is a great opportunity of social and geographic mobility. Because of these processes during the socialization children should learn not their parents' roles but the roles that are very complex and unexpected. The children should be prepared for the unknown future. In such a situation the parents' roles become less important. But they ask more of their children, just as they ask more of themselves. The children are early taught to make a choice, to gain the means necessary for the realization of their goals. The choice is not made

automatically. The process of socialization is long and complex. Young generation becomes prepared to face and meet new situations.

In an other-directed society dependent on the parents' duty is to prepare their children for a severe competition in every sphere of social life, to teach them values and behavioural norms necessary to achieve their goals. Their aim is to help their children adapt to new conditions. But they are not sure how to bring up their children. For the advice they address to their contemporaries and mass media, the parental role becomes less important in the other-directed society. In an other-directed society a child is controlled by school and his peer-group.

The scientist delineates changes in the role of the teacher, in the configuration of adult authorities. He calls schoolteacher a proxy parent whose power has increased.

In an inner-directed society the school is concerned mainly with impersonal matters. The teacher's aim is to train the children in decorum and in intellectual matters. Number of schools becomes more. Schools are accessible and "democratic".

But teachers do not pay attention to the emotional problems of the child. Formal schooling increases to train people for the new, more specialised tasks.

According to D. Riesman, a proxy parent's – the schoolteacher's – authority and power increase as a consequence of the shift to other direction. In an other-directed society the teacher's role is changed. The new teachers are more specialized. They often are opinion leaders. "The teacher continues to hold the reins of authority in her hands, hiding her authority, like her compeer, the other-directed parent, under the cloak of "reasoning" and manipulation." (p. 83)

D. Riesman thinks that the other-directed child is taught at school to take his place in a society where the concern of the group is less with what it produces than with its internal group relations, its morale.

One of the agents of socialization is a peer-group. The peers' impact on a person is especially very strong in the period of adolescence.

In an inner-directed society the adults – the parents and teachers – bring up the children with high demands of rationalism and self-discipline. Their destiny, as D. Riesman notices, is

always loneliness. Their friends' circle is very limited by social bounds. At school they have formal relations with other children. No one pays great attention to their play and leisure.

So, the peer-group's influence on the inner-directed child is very minimal.

As to the other-directed child he is greatly impacted by the members of his peer-group. In an other-directed society the parents gradually lose their role and influence. The child is surrounded by his sociometric peers. The Peer-group is formed on the basis of age and social status, and less on the basis of temperament and taste. The children's values are measured by the peer-group's approval. The age peer-group creates standards of behaviour, tastes and opinions and its members obey to them. For the children there exists only one moral – the group's moral.

When discussing the peer-group's influence, D. Riesman suggests an interesting comparison: "If the adults are the judge, these peers are the jury." It means that peer-group's power and influence are much stronger.

The scientist considers a peer-group to be between an individual and those informations, news, stories, which come from the mass media. Storytellers are very important agents of socialization. D. Riesman underlines that his focus is less on the media themselves and their patterns of operation and control than on the effects of imagery and storytelling on the child audience.

The author is quite right saying that "these effects cannot be considered in isolation from the constellation of parent, teachers and peer-groups who operate on the assembly line of character."* (p. 106)

In a tradition-directed society the major mechanisms of transmitting cultural values and behavioural norms are oral traditions, myths, legends and songs, which were predecessors of the modern means of communication.

In an inner-directed society there is a great craving for books and press. Press helps link the newly individuated person to the newly forming society. It also supports very specific "character-building" measures. Print served, along with other agencies of socialization, to destroy a traditional standard of living and working (p. 111). The inner-directed man is open to "reason" via print.

I should agree with D. Riesman's opinion that words not only affect us temporarily; they change us, they socialize or unsocialize us. The word-in-print may disorient as well as orient the audience.

In an other-directed society the socializing role of mass media is greatly expanded. In such a society children begin their training as consumers at an early age. The same occurs in the sphere of mass media. The mass media ask the child to see the world as "the" child (and not as the adult) – that is, the other child – sees it.

In an other-directed society the children are bombarded by different means of communication (in XX century by radio, comics, magazines, television, etc. Today, in XXI century – especially by television and internet. Very often they are addicted to them).

As D. Riesman indicates, different social character types, once they are created in a society, are then deployed in work, play, politics and child-rearing activities.

The scientist pays a great attention to work as one of the factors for the formation of a human being's social character. He compares the meaning of work in two different societies – the inner-directed and other-directed ones.

According to the author, an inner-directed man's tendency is to think of work in terms of nonhuman objects, including the objectified social organization. For him production means technological and intellectual processes. Here less attention is focused on human elements, human cooperation, more – on products. People can work together even when they do not like each other. The centre of an inner-directed man's life is a production sphere where work has a self-sufficient meaning. A human being is perceived as a unity of features and traits necessary in the given sphere. The economy is quite loose jointed and impersonal. An inner-directed man is work driven and work oriented.

D. Riesman underlines that for an other-directed man the work is more a process of human relations and human cooperation than the skillful activities and qualitative products. Deep changes are occurring in the economic sphere. In an other-directed society professional skills are less important than capacity of manipulating people. Here people become the main problem of the industry.

As to the spheres of leisure and consumption, D. Riesman notices that a tradition-directed man does not make a choice where to work or to play or whether to create a private blend of his own; matters are decided for him by tradition (p. 141).

The same spheres in an inner-directed society is a side show, the major show is work. In contrast to a traditional-directed man, an inner-directed one knows the difference between work and play. As work is very hard and working hours are very long he has little time for leisure. But he can afford a good deal of independence in his moments spared for consumption. As in an inner-directed man's life work has a dominant value, leisure and play have minor roles.

In an other-directed society work and leisure are interpreted as the sphere of relations. The domains of work and leisure partly cover each other. An other-directed man's character, on the whole, is created for the consumption and leisure. D. Riesman supposes that in an other-directed society there is not only a growth of leisure, but work itself becomes both less interesting and less demanding for many (p. 172).

As to the politics, in "The Lonely Crowd" D. Riesman considers politics and underlines that he does not investigate it as the activity exercised by the state or groups, parties and classes within a society. He analyses the politics as the process by which people become related to political emotions. The Scholar is sure that politics become one of agencies of social character formation. When speaking of the political consequences of social character the scientist uses the term "style". According to the political style, D. Riesman distinguishes the following types – the indifferents, the moralizers, and the inside-dopesters. There are two styles of the indifferents – the old and new ones. Some people are excluded from the political sphere because of the lack of the political education, political tools of literacy, and organizational experience (As it happened in the old times), because of low social status and poverty. "Characteristic of the tradition-directed indifferent is an attitude that politics is someone else's job". (p. 195) Unlike the tradition-directed indifferents, inner-directed and other-directed ones represent the new style of indifference to politics. Their indifference is not classic. They have the elementary political tools of literacy, some organizational competence and are aware of the political activity's benefits.

D. Riesman considers that the new style different may withdraw from politics in two cases:
1. When an individual thinks that the political scene is so hopeful that no action seems necessary, he can afford more political indifference. 2. When an individual thinks that the political scene looks so confused that no action seems adequate or so hopeless that no action looks promising.

An inner-directed man sees the politics as a field of work and judges it accordingly (p. 201).

With the help of politics, an inner-directed man wishes to improve all people and social institutions. He does not look to politics for the intellectual orientation. He turns to politics to defend his interests. He has responsibility to himself or others or both. D. Riesman distinguishes the moralizers' different styles: the style of the moralizer-in-power, the style of the moralizer-in retreat and enthusiasts.

D. Riesman thinks that the spread of other-direction has brought to the political scene the attitude of the inside-dopester, originating not in the sphere of work but of consumption (p. 210). The inside dopester may be a person who considers that since he can do nothing to change politics, he can only understand it. Or he may see all political issues in terms of being able to get some insider on the telephone. The author assumes that some inside-dopesters want to be on the inside, to join an inner circle. It is remarkable that if the inside-dopester can't change the others political opinions, he tries to change his own opinions and in such a way resemble these others. Generally, the inside-dopesters is very competent, the school system and the mass media have taught him to be competent in every sphere of life. As a rule, the majority of inside-dopesters take no active part in politics, some of them do. The inside-dopesters' goal is the following: never be taken in by any person, cause, or event. Politics for the inside-dopesters mainly is a means for group conformity. He must have acceptable opinions and when he engages in politics he must do so in acceptable ways. The inside-dopester is subordinate to a peer-group. The inside-dopester brings to politics a certain kind of realism that the moralizer often lacked.

Summarizing his arguments in the political sphere, D. Riesman concludes that an inner-directed person, if he is political at all, is related to the political scene either by his morality, his well-defined interests, or both. As against this, an other-directed person, if he is political, is

related to the political scene as a member of his veto group. He leaves it to the group to defend his interests.

In the VI paragraph I consider D. Riesman's three universal types – adjusted, autonomous and anomic. D. Riesman underlines that the other-directed person seeks adjustment. In the case when he can't achieve it he becomes anomic. At most he tries to be autonomous.

According to the author, "The adjusted are the typical tradition-directed, inner-directed, or other-directed – those who respond in their character structure to the demands of their society or social class. Such people fit the culture as though there were made of for it; as in fact they are." (p. 278). The adjusted are those who reflect their society or their class within the society, with the least distortion. In each society, besides the adjusted people, there are men who do not reflect their society or class within the society. Some of such people are anomic, some - autonomous. Both types do not conform to the characterological pattern of adjusted. Anomic is synonymous with maladjusted. The autonomous are such people who can conform to the behavioural norms of society but are free to choose what to do – to conform or not. D. Riesman underlines that nonconformity in behaviour does not necessarily mean nonconformity in character structure.

The scholar emphasizes that these three universal types (the adjusted, the anomic, the autonomous) like his historical types (tradition-directed, inner-directed and other-directed) are "ideal types", that is, constructions necessary for analytical work.

Indeed, as D. Riesman says, every human being is one of these types to some degree, but no one could be completely characterized by any of these terms. Despite this, an individual can be characterized by one mode of adaptation, which is dominant in his life. The same is with a society. It also can be characterized according to the relative frequency and importance of one of these three modes of adoption in the social structure.

At the end of the second chapter I consider some scientists' opinions about D. Riesman's typology of social character. Many of them are of high opinion of D. Riesman's book "The Lonely Crowd" and the typology of the social character given in it. I'll mention some of them:

"David Riesman is one of the most stimulating and insightful writers in the field of social and psychological interpretation today. "The Lonely Crowd", though it has raised some

eyebrows in professional circles, will certainly rank as a daring and provocative interpretation of many of the trend of contemporary society” – Talcott Parsons.

“... “The Lonely Crowd” seems to me to be one of the most important books about America to have been published in recent times. And... one of the most interesting books I have ever read” – Lionel Trilling.

“The Lonely Crowd” has put forward for our understanding of modern man a large and stimulating idea that will, I think, reach far and last long” – Robert Redfield, professor of Anthropology.

Despite the popularity and recognition of this typology, there are some scholars who look sceptically at its universality and consider its accuracy an issue.

Though the famous American sociologist Alex Inkeles thinks that David Riesman’s set of social types has probably achieved wider currency than any sociological typology ever attained.¹, he is rather critical when he analyses typology of social character (also other scholar’s different typologies).

A. Inkeles states that on closer examination the types defined by different authors seem often to be the same old cast of characters decked out with new and catching titles, even though the historic plot is basically unchanged and even the parts sound fundamentally the same. The inventors of the social types might be asked to define more precisely what are the signs, the indicators, whereby I might know one type from another. Unfortunately, I often discover on closer examination that the distinguishing characteristics of the types cannot be precisely stated.

A. Inkeles, guided by his experience, concludes that social reality is more complex than the initial schemes suggest, and the key to social change more elusive than we imagined. The pure qualities of personality dealt with by theory are elusive, hard to measure, and difficult to isolate in real situations. Often the composite ideal types cannot be found.

It is difficult not to agree with A. Inkeles’s opinion. Indeed, in reality I cannot find such people who are on the whole tradition-directed, inner-directed, or other-directed.

¹ Inkeles, A. (1964). What is sociology? New Jersey. Prentice-Hall. p.p. 52-56.

The American sociologist Stephen Cole in his book “The Sociological Orientation” doubts to what extent Riesman’s concept of other-direction really characterises the way contemporary Americans behave? He argues that most people conform to some groups and not to others. The groups that we look up to and want to conform are called our reference groups; People seem to be other-directed when they are interacting in groups that they have chosen. The same individuals might seem to be inner directed if observed interacting in the groups that they have not chosen. The general point is that to some extent we are all inner-directed and I are all other-directed” (p.p. 96-97).

D. Riesman himself marks that sometimes it is not easy to define any type, its characteristic traits and features, to underline its indicators.

Despite this D. Riesman’s typology is very interesting, widespread and acknowledged.

In “The Lonely Crowd” D. Riesman describes the influence of culture on personality. The major point is that the culture one lives in determines who he is and how he behaves, including the patterns of personality and character.¹ But personality is not only the product of culture. Each individual possesses a peculiar unique nature that makes him different from others. The concept of “personality” is wider than the concept of “character”, which is wider than the concept of “social character”.

Social character is an unity of those components which are characteristic to the whole group. It is a character necessary for the society. Social character ensures the conformism. The structure of social character is firmer than the social structure. Despite the significance of social character, I should not overstate its role in the process of social development.

Such are general conclusions got as a result of the acquaintance with David Riesman’s social character typology.

My aim was to explore the types of women’s social character in modern Georgia being in a transitional period. The basis of our investigation is D. Riesman’s typology of social characters that’s why I have considered to review this typology in details.

¹ Landis, J. R. (1971). *Sociology: Concepts and Characteristics*. Belmont. California. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

As the major objective of my scientific work is to study types of Georgian women's social character, it is reasonable to review gender and its essence, on the whole, and women's issues, particularly.

Modern scholars use the term "gender", in contrast to the concept "sex" to denote social phenomenon and sociological discourse of sex. Gender is the culturally constructed aspects of maleness and femaleness.* Gender is social expectations about the attributes and behaviours of males and females. Sex is the biological fact of being male or female. Gender is a social-psychological fact – the awareness of being a member of one sex or the other. It is "a form of social differentiation. It refers to the sociocultural distinction between males and females. Which sex is given in nature, gender is a socially constructed framework that human beings have created to make sense of and deal with the sex difference." Gender is one of the key dimensions of social structure of society. It constitutes a social system with other cultural and social-demographic characteristics (race, age, ethnicity, stratum, etc.). It is a fundamental indicator of social relations between men and women constructed in major social institutions and based on a certain culture.

Determination of gender roles is subjective and has a concrete - historical character. In each society there are definite traditions, values, norms, customs, which define gender roles.'

Today gender relations are considered as one of the most significant aspects of relations between women and men in different spheres of social life (economic, social, political, cultural, etc.).

In Georgia this problem became an object of special attention and analysis in the nineties of the last century. This period is connected with important economic, social and political changes. On the basis of gender methodology exploring and generalizing these processes offer opportunity to form such technologies, which ensure women's resocialization, eminence of her role and status in society, and formation of important strategies.

* Stone, L., McKee N.P. (2002). *Gender and Culture in American*. New Jersey. Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1999). p. 227.

* Hughes, M., Kroehler, C. J., Vander Zanden J. W. (2002). *Sociology. The core*. New York. McGraw-Hill (Original work published 1986). p. 246.

One of the most important problems is to implement democratic and liberal ideas in regard to gender issues. However, sometimes it is rather difficult, because of certain culture-specific preconceptions and prejudices.

Modern Georgian Society in Students' Focus. Hence the major objective of our scientific work is to ascertain women's types of social character in modern Georgia, it is necessary to show and analyze the reality of Georgian society in transformational period, because, as D. Riesman truly considers, each society ensures to create such social character which secures its functioning and developing.

If we want to understand the essence of a component (that is – of personality, social character) we should focus our attention on the whole (that is – on society), as just this whole is a field of research.*

Following this conception in order to determine and analyze women's social characters in modern Georgian society I have considered expediently to show a social reality of Georgian society in transitional period.

For this purpose in autumn of 2010 I conducted a sociological research. My target group was the students of Tbilisi State University. I have considered essential to show students – social agents' - attitudes towards Georgian society and their estimation of its reality. Why have I chosen students? In XXI century - the information era, students are one of the largest and significant social groups. In the first decade of this century the number of students has increased. Students have become a mass social professional and age group. As a result of reforms carried out in Georgian educational system, during last some years students' social-economic, stratum and regional, geographic structure has changed. Students are no longer a privileged group. Young people from employees', workmen's, farmers', ect. families of different regions of Georgia have great possibilities to join students' community. It is remarkable that among students there are a lot of girls. The change of students' social structure has caused their democratization, which, on its part, becomes a basis of liberalization of their values, interests

* Тойнби, А. (1995) Цивилизация перед судом Истории. Москва. Издательство «Прогресс, Культура». стр. 134.

and opinions. Higher education has become an important part of socialization. Local and global changes have impacted students. Students, on their part, have become a factor of changes.

Because of the abovementioned, I have chosen students as objects of our research hence they are able to provide us with information necessary for the investigation. The subject of the research is students' estimations and opinions of modern Georgian reality and their attitudes towards it. I have interviewed 61 students of different faculties who have learned "Introductory course of sociology" and have certain knowledge of some sociological categories, concepts and issues. My aim was to show modern Georgian society of transitional period in students' focus.

According to Peirre Bourdieu, one of the outstanding representatives of modern social sciences, peculiarity of society is that it has two beings: on the one hand, it is given in objective social structures and on the other hand, it exists in social agents' consciousness. That's why sociology as a science should study not only objective structure but also its descriptions by agents, their approaches, attitudes to established structures.*

I have considered qualitative methods to be relevant to this objective, specifically a semi-structured interview. In the process of interviewing I operated with an interview guide.

As I have mentioned I have interviewed 61 students (41 – girls and 20 – boys). In order to keep gender balance I've chosen only 40 interviews (20 – girls and 20 – boys). Girls' interviews were sampled by a method of lottery – probability sample. During the interviews the students were answering very frankly and competently. They spoke not only about the abovementioned questions but also about different local, Georgian intrasocial problems and global ones. Students have diverse life experiences, interests, tastes, attitudes, information, identities, values, etc. therefore they show different understandings and meanings.

On the first question of our interview-guide: "What specific features are characteristic to Georgian society in transitional period?", the students show awareness of local and global processes and changes. It is notable that almost all students consider that all social processes and changes occurring in Georgia are connected with globalization. They underline that the Georgian society of XXI century is considerably different from that one of XX century. Some students think that this difference is caused, mainly, by globalization and new technologies.

* Современная Социальная Теория: Бурдьё, Гидднес. Хаберманс. (1995). Новосибирск. Социализм Пьера Бурдьё. (2001). Москва.

All-embracing information has become accessible to definite number of population. This process, on its part, has made accessible education for young generation, representatives of different social-economic and geographic-regional groups. Together with possibilities, people's demands are being expanded. Individuals have both freedom and opportunity of choice and satisfaction of their requirements. That's one point of view which shows some students' positive attitudes towards the social reality of modern Georgian society. Positive but different ideas are given in some students' interviews (Their number is very few). According to them, progressive changes are being occurred in modern Georgian society. There are some abstracts from their interviews: №2' (G. L. – a fellow) - "Changes began with so called "Rose Revolution". Democratic reforms required changing of the society. In previous society communist values, norms and ideas were dominant. Now progress is evident. Today our society is more tolerant, liberal and united than it was seven years ago." №3 (G. Z. – a fellow) thinks that "after so called "Rose Revolution" the society has become more active, tolerant and liberal, but the society is not wholly free of soviet remains".

When speaking about positive tendencies in modern Georgian society (question №2) some students emphasize the processes of democratization and globalization, progressive changes, introduction and implementation of new technologies, reforms of some social institutions. G. G. (№24 – a fellow) - "Today a lot of good things are occurring in our society. I think a human being's opportunities increase, education is more respected (valued)."¹

Answering the third question of the interview-guide a considerable number of students demonstrate their critical attitudes towards the social-economic and political conditions of the modern Georgian society.

№21 (M. Ch.) – "I have never thought that I would live in a country, where there is no just, objective, impartial and free thinking. Now we live in the capitalist world where everyone is competitor to everyone". №8 (M. G.) – "To my mind, affairs are not so well, but for some reason, Georgia is considered to be a country of welfare, peace and development, revival. This is a false opinion about our reality." №23 (L. S.) – "There are a lot of obstacles and changes in

* I've numbered interviews. These numbers show students' interviews.

¹ Style of students' speech is everywhere preserved (maintained).

Georgian society. Economic problems are very keen. Our main problem is that we don't know what we want. Radicalism and aspiration for changes will lead us to fatal results."

A. M. (№38 - a girl) - " From the economic standpoint there is inequality in our society. Level of unemployment is high. The society is separated only into two strata – high and low. Practically there is no middle class. Only some few percentage of population has access to economic and social welfare." N. B. (№16 – a girl) – “during last 20 years there is a hard economic background, that makes people embittered (resentful) and deviant.” №34 (B. O. -) “If we examine our society in economic context,we shall see that a lot of families are on the very brink of poverty.” №14 (K. G. – a girl) – “In society the distinction between social strata gradually becomes obvious. At the same time alienation takes place.”

IV question concerns social relations in modern Georgian society. “Society is the totality of people and social relations in a given geographic space.” No society exists without relations. That's why the form and content of the relations characteristic to a society are very important.

When estimating the social relations in modern Georgian society the majority of students express their anxiety about altered relations. K. G. (№14 -) remarks that “the modern society is quite different from that one, which existed tens of years ago, when relations between people were close, friendly and ingenuous. Today such traits and relations are very rare in our society. People are becoming alienated.” T. G. (№40) considers that “Georgians have always been distinguished by attention, warmth and respect to each other, by close kinship relations. Now attitudes towards people have changed, relations have become cool. Respect has been changed by aggressiveness and roughness.”

Culture is one of the issues the students are interested in most of all (V question).

Society is a unity of people who interact on a certain territory and have common culture. Culture is an essential element of society. Society does not exist without culture and culture – without society, “Each society is a concrete cultural phenomenon” (Kodua, E.).

Values are significant components of culture. As some scholars consider, to characterize a society is possible by studying its values system.

* McIntyre, L. F. (2002). *The Practical Skeptic*. New York. McCray-Hill. (Original work published 1999). p. 129.

Objectivity-subjectivity of value is a complex and disputable issue. Objective consideration of value concept means, that the object of estimation exists irrespectively of evaluator, and subjective one – when value is perceived as entirely dependent on subject’s feelings and estimation (Bechvaia, D.).*

People have both cognitive and estimation attitudes towards objective reality.

In our research the students show both cognitive and estimation attitudes towards modern Georgian society. As a rule, estimation attitudes are accompanied by certain subjectivism. It’s natural that students, as independent individuals and personalities with diverse values, value hierarchy and value system, differently interpret one and the same social fact, phenomenon or process.

It is very interesting to show students’ attempt to analyze the culture of modern Georgian society. In the process of interviewing the students have focused their attention on Georgian culture, on the whole, and its components: values, norms of behaviour, traditions, customs, opinions, language, etc. They acknowledge that culture is cause of integrity of society. There are some examples of their opinions (some are very similar, some – contradictory): Some students mark that “Georgian society is striving for (aspiring to) the West and Western values which are being instilled (inculcated): human rights, freedom of speech, tolerance, rights to express ideas, civil rights, etc. At the same time we don’t forget our traditions and values.” (G. Z. - №3). “Today Western values are very popular in our society: human rights, liberal attitudes towards each opinion and idea, tolerance to each race, religion and nation, etc.” (G. L. - №2, 20 y. a fellow). “Today we can notice striving for European values. Together with receiving new values we must keep our values, traditions, customs which are of vital importance for such not numerous (small) nations as we are.” (G. K. №35).

Above cited passages from the students’ interviews show their respect and love of Georgian values, traditions, customs, etc. and their readiness to receive new Western values respective to our society. In spite of their positive attitudes towards new values and norms of behaviour some students consider that alteration will take a lot of time, changing of generations. Some students express their resistance to cultural changes. They have constant fear and anxiety, that Georgian

* ბეჭვაია, დ. (2007). აქსეოლოგია. თბილისი, გამომცემლობა “ნეკერი”, გვ. 85. /Bechvaia, D. (2007). Acceology. Tbilisi. p. 85/.

culture will be undermined. It will lose its originality and unique characteristics. K. G. (№14 – 18 y. a girl) – “Georgians’ majority don’t realize the danger accompanying the process of cultural value change. It is loss of our national identity. It is a real menace for Georgia.”

As we have seen a lot of interviewed students stress that in modern Georgian society traditions, customs, values are very significant and they don’t contradict liberal democratic principles and values which are widespread all over the world.

According to famous American sociologist Neil Smelzer, we live in a highly institutionalized society. Even the simplest kinds of interaction are the building blocks of complex institutions.’

One of the questions (question №7) concerns **social institutions** of modern Georgian society and their functioning. In their interviews the students delineate, mainly, major social institutions: family, religion, education, politics, mass media, etc.

As to family – an agent of socialization and social institution – students express diverse opinions and ideas. According to the majority, family is a main agent of socialization in modern Georgia. They consider that, basically, family forms a child’s thinking, determines personality’s values, behaviours, opinions and principles. Its major function is to bring up children. It defines the creation of an intellectual, thinking, educated, progress-oriented person. They think that “family is just that which is more valuable and important for a human being. Family’s care, love and warmth can not be changed by anything” (S. G. – a girl). “In the process of socialization family and parents have the most important influence, because here main values are created. Family has taught me all values, norms of behaviour and traditions which are very significant for me” (T. G. - a girl). “Family is just the first agent of socialization. It ensures transmission of cultural values, great importance of customs to young generation. It creates faith. It is a foundation for personality’s formation, a member of society” (T. K. - №17).

Some students (very few) acknowledge family’s importance in the process of socialization, but think that in modern Georgia peer group has become a very significant agent of socialization. “Together with family an individual is influenced by friends’ group, that people with whom an individual has close and frequent relations” (R. A.). “Family is a main agent of socialization, but lately peer group’s impact has become stronger. Family’s values are being

* Smelzer, N. J. (1995). *Sociology*. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall, Inc. (Original work published 1981), p. 47.

replaced by peer-group's ones." Students consider that peer-group is very important for them, especially when they begin to live independently. Friends determine their beliefs, values and behaviour (T. K. - №17). It is remarkable that students from different regions of Georgia are more influenced by their peer groups as they live separately from their families. "In XXI century socialization agents' hierachy is the following: peer group, mass media, family and school." (M. G. - №9).

A very small number of the interviewed students consider that family is losing its role in socialization. They think it is caused by increasing role of information technology, internet and mass media in the process of socialization. This, together with positive influence, has negative effect on people, especially children and teenagers. Different kinds of electronic mass media have "shaded" other agents of socialization: school, peer group and family. Teenagers have become addicted to informational technology" (N. I.).

The students discuss modern Georgian family according to its structure. They state that, as a rule, families are extended (family form), monogamic (marriage form), patrilocal (residence pattern) and patriarchal (pattern of authority). "In modern Georgia extended families predominate over nuclear ones (which is caused by economic factors). Mainly, Georgians families are patriarchal. Economically strong families are egalitarian and neolocal (residence pattern also is caused by economic factors)" - (S. G. – a girl from a region). Unlike this opinion (as distinct from) some students think that extended and patriarchal families are vanishing, and nuclear and egalitarian ones take their place.

Almost all students state that "**religion** is one of the significant factors of personality formation because a human being's faith, ideology and principles are based on religion" (T. K.); "Religion determines main facets of Georgian people's culture. It has the most important meaning" (S. G.); "Religion is a powerful means – ecclesiastic (spiritual) salvation and acquisition of our place. More and more people go to church and try to live piously" (M. G.); "Modern Georgian society has turned to religion that was forbidden by Soviet Regime. In my opinion religion is the only consolidation power" (G. K. – a fellow). In contrast to such ideas some students consider that for some people going to church is like fashion. It is a kind of conformism to gain (get) others' approval. They simply immitate, follow believers values and

norms of behaviour” (T. G. – a girl, L. D. – a fellow, R. A. – a girl, S. G. – a girl, L. S. – a fellow, etc.). Only about three students think that some young people are not religious, they show preference to atheism. Some respondents consider that Christianity, especially orthodoxy, is endangered by global tendencies (T. K. – a girl).

In spite of these diverse opinions about religion, many students think that religion is one of the main agents of socialization (even the most important one for some interviewees).

When delineating social life of modern transitional Georgia most of students have focused their attention on **education** as a social institution.

Students are aware of the role of education in developing of modern Georgia, in the process of their professional mastership and formation of personality. They remark that the accessibility to education ensures scientific and cultural progress of Georgian society. N. D. (№39 – a girl) – “Reforms are occurring in all spheres of social life of our country, among them in educational system, which implies introduction of new technologies, modern programs, teaching methods, computer systems”. “Education has a great role in personality formation. It becomes obligatory in Georgian society. It assures intellectual and emotional training” (S. G. – a girl). “School (education) has helped me to integrate with other members of society” (T. G. №10 – a girl).

Some respondents express their dissatisfaction – “For many young people it is impossible to get education in prestigious universities where only representatives of rich families study” (S. G. – a girl).

Some students show very interesting ideas about the aim of getting education. M. Ch. (a girl) considers “that education is very important. People differ according the objective of being educated – some want to get knowledge and desirable profession, but the aim of majority is to gain power and wealth by education. They are striving for high social status, which they can achieve by means of education, as they consider”. Here is nearly the same reasoning (discourse) – “People of low stratum try to gain levels of economic and political power and to raise social status. That’s why today education has become of massive character. In fact, only some young people enter universities to get knowledge and become educated” (A. M. – a girl).

According to some students, together with positive changes there are some negative phenomena in educational system. Currently the relations between students, their solidarity have become weaker. Majority of students do not take an active part in social life of the country. And what is more, a lot of them are indifferent both to political activities and intrauniversity problems.

Generally, politics is one of the important social institutions, which considerably determines social life of any society. However, it is remarkable that politics is found to be the issue our interviewed students focus the least attention on. Even those students who speak about it have quite different ideas. G. M. (№24) - "Today Georgia has the Western political course. We have just now begun to build up democracy. This is not so easy. During 70 years we were victims of unwarranted experiment. Now liberal democracy has defeated socialism once and for all." In contrast to this opinion, some students consider that "There is no democracy in our country. Today I see more totalitarianism than democracy or authoritarianism." (M. G. №8 – a girl), "A form of false illusory democracy is dominant in our country." (T. K. – a girl), "In our country there is a personal, authoritarian power." Many students think that Georgian society is more or less indifferent to politics. "From the political standpoint, our society is indifferent. There are a lot of moralizers, but very few inside-dopesters. It causes playing in politics."- (M. G. – a fellow).

Means of mass communication are very important agent of socialization, especially in XXI century – in information era. Cultures differ by many facets, including content and form of mass media. They teach people to differentiate and perceive other people, phenomena, processes, attitudes, estimations, etc. in different ways. In modern epoch role, functions and impact of mass media (particularly internet, social webs, etc.) have increased immensely in the process of teenagers' and young people's interactions. It is the result of globalization and introduction of modern communication technologies. Some scholars call this increasing influence of mass media, especially television, "Telecracy".

It is very interesting to get acquainted with students' ideas and estimations, concerning mass media, on the whole, and modern Georgian means of communication concretely. T. G. (№

* Students' speech style is preserved.

- a girl) – “In our epoch the impact of mass information means is gradually increasing in the process of children’s socialization. They are much addicted to computer and internet, which have a great influence on their worldview, formation of their ideas, values, norms of behaviour, and change of traditional customs.” N. I. – “The increase of role of information technologies, internet and mass media have decreased the role of other agents’ of socialization.” G. Z. (№3 - a fellow) – “Free media endures our indirect participation in development of the country.” №17 (T.K.) – “Mass media have the major responsibility for formation of public opinion. That’s why they are called “The Fourth Power”. Just media is a leading power, which is able to determine sympathy-antipathy of our society, distortion of political attitudes. Unfortunately, unobjective, partial media often affect our consciousness powerfully and form false ideas about some issues.”

M. K (20 y. a girl) – “It is a regrettable reality that modern media have more negative than positive influence on children. The problem of media is very acute in modern Georgia. I think it needs profound and significant analysis. Modern society, so much addicted to computers, television sets, cannot give real evaluation of on-going processes.” K. G. (№14 – 18 y. a girl) – “One of the factors, causing society’s dehumanization, is internet. Most of Georgians, particularly young people, prefer to spend their free time more with internet than people.”

Some students are very critical to modern Georgian mass media, especially televisions.

N. M. (№20 – a girl). “Mass media damage (prejudice) the interests of our country. We cannot understand where is truth, because there are so many “truths” that it is difficult to distinguish. It’s very difficult to find a real, qualitative information. We may say that we are deprived of the truth.” S. G. (a girl) – “Modern Georgian mass media is less competent. They should elucidate the social phenomena a process so that people may have opportunity to discuss them reasonably.” A. M. - “It seems to me that the main purpose of our mass media is to make people “block-headed”, as well as the propaganda of “western” life style and destruction of Georgian culture.”

Besides the above-mentioned questions, the students were discussing some issues having interest for them. Such issues are: globalization, new technologies, ageism, gender problems, etc.

As the research has shown, different factors affect the interviewed students' – social agents' – understanding and awareness of modern Georgian society.

As I have mentioned above, the major issue of discussion in focus-groups was to determine women's types of social character in modern, transitional Georgia. The students - participants of the focus-groups - have demonstrated deep knowledge of David Riesman's typology of social character and the ability of *independent* or critical? analysis. They delineate the traits and features characteristic to each type – tradition-directed, inner-directed and other-directed. On the basis of this typology the students have tried to show women's social characters in modern Georgian society. Almost all of them state that now in Georgian society, in most cases, three social characters coexist. L. L. (Tbilisi, a fellow) – “As David Riesman notes himself, his types of social characters are ideal. That's why it is erroneous and difficult to regard Georgian women as representatives of this or that type. At the same time, we should take into consideration diversity and differentiation of our society according to many facets (for example, age, economic condition, geographic residence, level of education, etc.). A. I. (Tbilisi, a fellow) – “Modern Georgian women's social characters are different. To characterise them we should use all three types.”

The students are right when they declare that women's social characters are determined by many factors, among them types of society, their social environment and social groups are of paramount importance. Other aspects of women's social life – their life experience, age, economic condition, background, social status, education, social stratum, marital state, activity, etc. – have not less significance.

According to the students, most of the women are tradition-directed, especially in regions (concretely, in villages) and representatives of elder generation. As to inner-directed women their number is not great. As a rule, such women live in cities, are career-oriented. Most of them are young, open to changes and new values and norms of behaviour. Some students have quite opposite opinions. They think that women's majority are inner-directed and, mainly, they are middle aged. The participants of focus-groups consider that the other-directed social character is typical for young women, especially from prosperous families. The students underline that it is obvious no social character is dominant in modern Georgia. When speaking

about themselves the students underline that they belong to all three social characters. In some spheres of social life (e.g. life, family, religion, etc.), they are tradition-directed, in other ones – inner directed (career, education, etc.) or other directed (peer groups, religion, etc.).

As the research has shown, no social character is dominant in modern Georgia and very often women are representatives of all three types. It is no wonder because now the country is in transitional period.

Besides the typology of social character, D. Riesman suggests three types of political styles: indifferents, moralizers and inside-dopesters.

During the session the students have expressed their opinions about this typology. They consider that modern women's vast majority, mainly, are indifferent, only some of them, educated ones, are inside-dopesters. From 40 participants of the focus-groups 23 students consider themselves indifferent, 4 – inside-dopesters. Others have not mentioned their political style. The students try to explain their indifference. All of them stress that they are indifferent of new style - they have political knowledge and organizational abilities, but their attitudes towards political affairs are not active. Some students think that the political situation is so vague that they are very disappointed and sure that their participation in politics will not change anything,

Types of women's social character in modern, transitional Georgia in students' focus.

In IV paragraph of III chapter I delineate types of women's social character in modern, transitional Georgia in students' focus.

In order to explore and determine women's social characters in modern Georgian society I have conducted sociological research using focus-group method.

Focus groups were formed according to the premise that participants of target groups – students – have knowledge of sociology, on the whole, and David Riesman's typology of social character, particularly, as it is the theoretical basis of my work. I have constituted 4 focus-groups. Each of them consisted of 10 members and was homogeneous according to the following parameters: age, social status, level of education. 2 groups were homogeneous according to sex and residence, other 2 ones – heterogeneous according to the same criteria. In the first group there were students born in Tbilisi (5 girls and 5 fellows), the second group

consisted of 10 girls, the participants of the third and fourth groups were students from different regions of Georgia (III group – 10 girls, IV group – 5 girls and 5 fellows, born in regions). The students were representatives of different faculties and specialities of Tbilisi State University.

During the session of focus-groups I operated with a discussion plan drawn in advance. The supposed questions mainly concerned women, their typical features and traits, values, value hierarchy, norms of behaviour, their attitudes and preferences, gender and women issues on the whole, and women's types of social character, concretely. In the emotive, deep-felt answers the students express what they respect and what they are annoyed with, what they believe and what they don't believe, what they like and what they dislike, what they are interested in and what they are indifferent to, what they care for and what is very significant to them. Their ideas are very interesting and important for the research. Some of the students have valuable experiences of living in regions. They are aware of social, economic, political, demographic, cultural conditions and problems of their own regions. During the sessions of the focus-groups it was a great pleasure to observe how the students tried to dig into their personal experience. Their responses, mainly, were frank and competent.

Talking about women of modern Georgia the students pick out some of their characteristic features and traits, both positive and negative ones. Practicalness, friendship, activity, tolerance, rationality, loyalty, indulgence, tact, devotion, love of family, care of others, optimism, readiness to help others, ability of cooperation, patience, romantism, etc. are considered to be positive characteristics by them. Love of family, care of others, patience and tolerance were mentioned by the students very frequently.

According to the students, the following negative characteristics are typical for some modern Georgian women: aggressiveness, pessimism, feeling of dissatisfaction, impatience, imitation, etc. It is remarkable that such features, as ambition, striving for career, self-confidence are considered by some students as positive ones, and by other students – as negative ones.

Characterizing their peers the students point out that they are purposeful, career-oriented, autonomous, rational, subjective, optimistic, active, business-like, efficient, ambitious, frank,

open, individual, free, smart, independent, etc. At the same time a small number of the students are critical to some young women and mark out their such negative features, as: narrow-mindedness, indifference, lack of education, hard-heartedness, vanity (vainglory), aggressiveness, provinciality, envy, etc. As we see, students are more critical to their peers than to women generally.

On the question: “To your opinion, what is private happiness for modern women?” students’ answers, mainly, are the following: 1. Good family (husband, children), 2. Good job (career), 3. Financial well-being (prosperity), 4. Success and achievement, 5. High social status, 6. Careless life, ect. It is obvious that for women, including representatives of young generation, family is one of the highest value, though there is a tendency among some of them to postpone marriage and childbearing.

It is notable that majority of the focus-groups’ participants consider themselves career-oriented persons (education for them is a means of advancing in career), but, despite this, family is a very significant socialization agent for them.

On the question: “Which socialization agents are dominant in Georgian women’s life?” the students have delineated the following picture: 1. Family (I place – 33 students, II – 4, III – 1), 2. Peer group (friends) (I place – 4 students, II – 29, III – 15) /for 2 students family and peer-groups are of the same importance/, 3. Mass media (I place – one student, II – 2, III – 1), 4. School (education) (I place – 0, II – 3). It is remarkable that 4 students consider religion the most important agent of socialization (I place – 2 students, II – 2).

As the data show, for modern Georgian women family is very important. They underline that family is a place where they acquire values and norms of behaviour, internalize their aims and goals.

When making significant decision young women (generally, women) take into consideration their family’s (22 students) and friends’ (11 students) advices. Some students stress that in such cases both family’s and friends’ advices have the same importance for them. Though, sometimes, circumstances, situation and issues determine their choice. Some students point out that for them their spiritual father’s advice is the most important for them (4 students). As to teachers and lecturers, they have little influence on their decision (only 2

students from 40 students consider their mentors' advices very valuable). The focus-groups' participants declare that mass media is becoming a very important factor in their lives, but traditional mass media – press, television and radio – have little influence on young generation's personality formation. Social media (social webs) impact modern society, especially teenagers and students, greatly. According to the students, one of major "charms" of social media is feedback. "Modern society is "webbed", as almost everyone is included in one web at least," – one of the students thinks. The students consider that social media are attractive because of its different functions: entertainment, getting and transmitting information, self-assertion. They are frank and open when stating that they are addicted to social webs. The students think that in spite of this, mass media generally have not much effect on women.

The students show and analyse women's attitudes towards some major values of modern Georgian society. According to them, the hierarchy of the values, respected by women, is the following: 1. Family (I place – 33 students, II p. – 7 st.), 2. Religion (I place – 4 students, II – 13, III – 7, IV – 7, V – 5, VI – 4), 3. Friends (I – 1, II – 9, III – 19, IV – 8, V – 2, VI – 1), 4. Work (career) (I – 2, II – 13, III – 10, IV – 13, V – 1, VI – 1), 5. Leisure (play, entertainment) (I – 0, II – 0, III – 5, IV – 6, V – 17, VI – 12), 6. Politics (I – 0, II – 1, III – 9, IV – 6, V – 12, VI – 21).

The students have tried to explain their indifference towards politics. Some stress that they are new-style indifferents that means, they have certain political knowledge and organizational abilities, but in spite of this, they are not concerned with politics. It is caused by the fact that "today Georgian politics are in difficult situation. It is necessary to improve this situation, but now I can't take part in this process" – (M. G. – from Gori, a girl). "Majority of women (also, men) are indifferent politically. Such situation is caused by one reason – this is disappointment with politics, with lot of frauds of elections." (N. I. – Tbilisi, a girl) "I belong to that "wing" of indifferents who think that Georgian politics are "destroyed". That is no concern of mine. Today politics is made by incompetent people." (N. M. – from region, a girl). "Modern women are indifferents of a new style. They have access to all kinds of information, but they are not interested in it. In spite of this, I think, a lot of people are inside-dopesters. Now women don't take part in politics. I hope, in future we see more women in politics." (R. A.) "I am indifferent. Everyone should unite to improve the political situation. Unfortunately, a lot of people consider

that the situation is so bad, that nothing will be changed” (T. K. – from Kakheti). a new-style indifference is characteristic to both inner-directed and other-directed women. As to *indifference* an old-style indifference it is typical for the women living in different regions of Georgia.

Discussing the universal types – adjusted, anomic and autonomous – the students argue that is very difficult to attribute women to any concrete type. Most of the women are adjusted, but in some spheres of social life they may be autonomous, very seldom- even anomic.

According to the students, modern Georgian women try to be autonomous, especially in private life and career. The participants of focus-groups consider that economic conditions sometimes make women anomic, who are victims of socialization and bad social-economic conditions. The students underline that generally “no people exist without infringement of some standard norms of behavior.”

In consequence of this research I may conclude that in modern transitional Georgia women are representatives of different social characters. They are tradition-directed (especially in regions), inner-directed (mainly in cities, in prosperous families) and other-directed (majority of them are young ladies). No type of social character is dominant. All three ones coexist and every woman, generally, is somewhat tradition-directed, inner-directed and other-directed in different spheres of social life.

Of course, the information got by means of focus-group is not representative. It does not express different women’s – from all regions of Georgia, of all social strata, social groups and ages – opinions about types of women’s social character in modern Georgian society, but more or less it adequately delineates the trends occurring in our society.

Women’s types of social character in modern Georgia in experts focus. In V paragraph of III chapter I analyse the experts’ ideas of the women’s types of social character in modern Georgia.

During the interviews the experts consider not only women’s social types but gender problems, women’s agism and their political activities.

They assert that women's majority are indifferents from the standpoint of politics: traditional and new style. In Georgia political *indifference of old style* is widespread in tradition-directed groups, especially in regions. It is caused by different factors: there women's general education is low, they have no information, political and organizational experience and, above all, they have no time for any activity, except work. Such women think that politics is no ~~concern~~—business of theirs. As to the indifferent women of new style, their number is considerably large. Some of them consider that “the political situation in the country is so unbearable that no activity will cause any improvement.” According to some women (their number is very few) they don't take part in politics “because everything is very well from the political standpoint.” As to the inner-directed women (they are modern women's majority in cities), some of them are “moralizers” and some – indifferents. Other-directed women, mainly, are indifferents, but some of them belong to inside-dopesters' group.

Women's stories have given rich information for analysing women's types of social character in modern Georgian society. The authors of the mentioned stories are active women living, mainly, in different regions of Georgia. In spite of their diversity (different age, education, social status, marital status, background, culture, ect.) they have common features – their actions are determined by inner motive and directed to generalized, but strictly defined objectives. In the stories the women relate not only about their lives, they, mainly, focus their attentions on different problems existing in Georgia, on the whole, and in their regions, particularly: unfavourable social-economic, legal and cultural conditions, violence, health defence, etc.

As the analysis of the stories show, their authors, mainly, are inner-directed persons. They are business-like, self-confident, racional, active, mobilized, mobile, full of initiative, oriented to changes. They take an active part (or want to take) in the social life of their regions in order to adopt to new changes occuring in the country and solve some problems of their regions. One of their objectives is to help other women and improve their social-economic, political and cultural conditions. They underline that most of the women living in regions are dependent on their families and their life style is traditional. In the regions only a small part of young women are other-directed.

Conclusion. The objective of my thesis has been to explore and ascertain women's types of social character in modern transitional Georgian society. David Riesman's, the outstanding American sociologists's, typology of social character has served for the theoretical basis of my scientific work.. The famous French scholar Pierre Bourdieu considers that no theory is valuable if we can't make use of it for real empirical researches. It is necessary that all sociological conclusions should be based on the data of sociological researches. I entirely share his view. In order to determine Georgian women's types of social character I've conducted a sociological investigation. To carry out any research successfully it is important to determine relevant methodology. As a rule, choice of sociological research method depends on four main factors: research theme, objectives and goals,time and money. Taking into consideration these criteria, in the process of research I have used triangulation approach – combination of some research methods. I've conducted semistructured interviews with students and experts, focus-groups with students, analysis of women's stories and observation. The methods used by me are qualitative ones. Of course, the data collected using them are not representative, but they give deep and wide information about research issue.

The research has shown that a lot of changes are happening in modern Georgian society. Transformational processes are connected with key economic and political shifts. Changes of conditions cause formation and development of relevant values and behavioural norms. This processes are long-term and difficult.

The change of society's type is accompanied by the change of social character, as each society creates such a social character, which determines its functioning and developing. Although social character is dependent on the society it is more persistent than society itself.

In modern transformational Georgian society women's three social characters coexist: traditional-directed, inner-directed and other-directed. It is remarkable that none of them is dominant. It is caused, somewhat, by diversity of constituent parts of social structures.

The research has confirmed D. Riesman's conception that in real life no personality represents only one social character.

During the analysing of research data I have been guided not only by interviews with students and experts, by information got from focus-groups, by women's stories, but also by my life experience – as a social agent.

I want to underline that I have no claim that the study of women's social character does not require further investigation. In every science, including sociology, conclusions, as a rule, never are considered to be final. Inferences concern only the information got by means of research. They always are open for questions and further explorations. No investigation can exhaust the subject; there are always additional aspects for further researches to explore.

Bibliography

1. ბახტაძე, ლ. (2006). გარდამავალი ხანის ეკონომიკა. თბილისი. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა ცენტრი (CSS).
2. გაფრინდაშვილი, ლ. (2006). ქართული კულტურის გენდერული პარადიგმები: ინტერდისციპლინური და ინტერტემპორალური პერსპექტივა. ავტორეფერატი. თბილისი.
3. განსხვავებული აზროვნება, სახელმძღვანელო ევროპულ ქალთა კვლევებში. (2005). თბილისი. „ბაკურ სულაკაურის გამომცემლობა“.
4. გენდერი და საზოგადოება. სამეცნიერო კონფერენციის მასალები. (2006). თბილისი.
5. გენდერი, კულტურა, თანამედროვეობა. (2005). თბილისი. პოლიგრაფიული საწარმო „დობერა“.
6. გენდერის აქტუალური საკითხები. (1998). თბილისი. გაეროს განვითარების პროგრამა „ქალები განვითარების პროცესში“.
7. გენდერული თეორიების ანთოლოგია. (2002). თბილისი. „ბაკურ სულაკაურის გამომცემლობა“.
8. ზურიკაშვილი, ფ., მალრაძე, გ., ჭანიშვილი, ნ., ხუციშვილი, გ. და ჯორბენაძე, რ. (2003). კონფლიქტი, გენდერი და მშვიდობის მშენებლობა. თბილისი. შპს „პოლიგრაფი“.
9. თევზაძე, გ. (2002). ინსტიტუციური ცვლილებების სოციოლოგია.
10. კიკნაძე, თ. (2001). ქალი და პოლიტიკა. პოლიტოლოგია (ლექციების კურსი). თბილისი. თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა.
11. კიკნაძე, თ. და დონაძე, ნ. (2006). გენდერი – სოციალური და პოლიტიკური სწავლებანი. თბილისი. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა ცენტრი (Centre for social sciences).
12. მალრაძე, გ. (2007). სოციალური გავლენების ფსიქოლოგია. თბილისი. გამომცემლობა „უნივერსალი“.
13. მელქაძე, ვ. (2006). მსოფლიო პოლიტიკის გლობალიზაცია. თბილისი. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა ცენტრი (CSS).
14. ნადირაშვილი, შ. (1975). პიროვნების სოციალური ფსიქოლოგია. თბილისი. თბილისის უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა.

15. პიროვნება, კულტურა, საზოგადოება. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა აქტუალური პრობლემები. (2010). ახალგაზრდა მეცნიერთა და დოქტორანტთა სამეცნიერო კონფერენციის მასალები. თბილისი. გამომცემლობა „უნივერსალი“.
16. პიროვნება, კულტურა, საზოგადოება. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა აქტუალური პრობლემები. (2010). ე. კოდუას დაბადების 80 წლისთავისადმი მიძღვნილი სამეცნიერო კონფერენციის მასალები. თბილისი.
17. პოსტ-საბჭოთა ტრანსფორმაციული პროცესი საქართველოში. (2002). თელავი. სამოქალაქო განათლების პროექტი. (CEP).
18. საბელაშვილი, თ. (2006). ქალთა უფლებების ისტორიული ასპექტები. თბილისი. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა ცენტრი (CSS).
19. სურმანიძე, ლ. (2001). ინდივიდუალისტური და კოლექტივისტური საზოგადოებები. თბილისი. გამომცემლობა „ნეკერი“.
20. ქალები. სიტუაციის პროფილირება საქართველოში. (2002). თბილისი.
21. ძალაუფლება და საზოგადოება საქართველოში. სტატიების კრებული. (2009). თბილისი. გამომცემლობა „უნივერსალი“.
22. წერეთელი, მ. (2000). ქალთა უფლებები მათი ღირებულებების თვალსაზრისით. თბილისი.
23. წერეთელი, მ. (2006). გენდერი – კულტურული და სოციალური კონსტრუქტი. თბილისი. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა ცენტრი (CSS).
24. ხომერიკი, ლ. (2006). გენდერი და პოლიტიკა. თბილისი. სოციალურ მეცნიერებათა ცენტრი (Centre for social sciences).
25. ხომერიკი, ლ. და ჯავახიშვილი, მ. (2005). ქალთა საზოგადოებრივი საქმიანობა საქართველოში. თბილისი. ფონდი „ღია საზოგადოება – საქართველო“.
26. Ageism. Stereotyping and prejudice against Older Persons. (2002). Massachusetts. A Bradford Book.
27. Allerbeck, K. R. (1972). Some structural conditions for youth and student movements. International Social Science Journal. Volume XXIV. No. 2.
28. Balliet, B.J. (2002). Women, Culture and Society. New Brunswick. Kendall /Hunt Publishing Company. (Original work published 1992).
29. Bonvillain, N. (1998). Women and Men. Cultural Constructs of Gender. New Jersey. Prentice Hall.
30. Bytheway, B. (1995). Ageism. Philadelphia. Open University Press.

31. Calasanti, T.M., and Slevin, K.F. (2001). *Gender, Social Inequalities, and Aging*. New York. Alta Mira Press. (Original work published 1998).
32. *Caucasus Higher Education in Transition*. (2004). Tbilisi. Published by the Civic Education Project – Caucasus. Printed by SMARt Std.
33. Cole, S. (1975). *The Sociological Orientation. An Introduction to Sociology*. Chicago. Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
34. Disch, E. (2003). *Reconstructing Gender. A Multicultural Anthology*. New York. McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1997).
35. Elder, G. H. (1972). *The Social Context of Youth Groups*. *International Social Science Journal*. Volume XXIV. No. 2.
36. Goffman, E. (1966). *Encounters. Two Studies in the Sociology of Interactin*. Indiana. The Bobbs-Merrill company, Inc. (Original work published 1961).
37. Hale, S. M. (1990). *Controversies in Sociology*. Toronto. Copp Clar Pitman Ltd. A Longman Company.
38. Hughes, M., Kroehler, C.J., and Vander Zanden, J.W. (2002). New York. McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1986).
39. Inglehart, R. and Baker, W. E. (2000, February). *Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Tradictional Values*. *American Sociological Review*. Volume 65. Number 1.
40. Inkeles, S. (1964). *What is Sociology?* New Jersey. Prentice-Hall. (Original work published 1961).
41. *Issues and Approaches for the Caucasus*. (2000). Tbilisi. Civic Education Project – Caucasus.
42. Katz, R.S. (2006). *The Georgia Regime Crisis of 2003-2004, A Case Study in Post-Soviet Media Representation of Politics, Crimeand Corruption*, Stuttgart, ibidem-Verlag.
43. Katz, R.S. (2006). *The Georgian Regime Crisis of 2002-2004. A Case Study in Post-Soviet Media*. Stuttgart, Ibidem-Verlag.
44. Kirk, G. and Okazawa-Rey, M. (2004). *Women’s Lives. Multicultural Perspectives*. New York. McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1998).
45. Lindsey, L.L. (2005). *Gender Roles. A Sociological Perspective*. New Jersey. Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1997).
46. Lorber, J. (2001). *Gender Inequality. Feminist Theories and Politics*. Los Angeles, California. Roxbury Publishing Company. (Original work published 1998).
47. McIntyre, L. (2002). *The practical skoptic. Core Concepts in Sociology*. New York. McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1999).

48. Richardson, L., Taylor, V., and Whittier, N. (2004). *Feminist Frontiers*. New York. McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1983).
49. Riesman, D. (with Glazer, N.) (1965). *Faces in the Crowd*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. (Original work published 1952).
50. Riesman, D. (with Glazer, N., and Denney, R.) (1953). *The Lonely Crowd*. New York. Doubleday Anchor Books. (Original work published 1950).
51. Roszak, Th. (1969). *The Making of a Counter Culture. Reflections on the technocratic society and its youthful opposition*. New York. Anchor Books Edition.
52. Rush, R. G. (1972). The radicalization of middle-class youth. *International Social Science Journal*. Volume XXIV. No. 2.
53. Sabedashvili, T. (2002). *Women in the decade of transition: The Case of Georgia*. Tbilisi. Publishing House "Lega".
54. Schneider, L., and Silverman, A. (2003). *Global Sociology*. New York. McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1997).
55. Searle, J. (1972). *The Campus War. A Sympathic Look at the University in Agony*. Middlesex. Pelican Books.
56. Smelser, N.J. (1995). *Sociology*. New Jersey. Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1981).
57. Spates, J. L., and Levin, J. (1972). Beats, hippies, the hip generation and the American middle class: an analysis of values. *International Social Science Journal*. Volume XXIV. No. 2.
58. Spencer, M. (1981). *Foundations in Modern Sociology*. Scarborough. Ontario. Prentice-Hall. Canada Inc.
59. Stone, L., and McKee, N.P. (2002). *Gender and Culture in America*. New Jersey. Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1999).
60. Zygmalski, K. (1972). Sociological approaches to the culture of youth. *International Social Science Journal*. Volume XXIV. No. 2.
61. *Американская Социология*. (1972). *Социология, Перспективы. Проблемы. Методы*. Москва. Издательство «Прогресс».
62. *Антология Гендерной Теории*. (2000). Минск. Профилей.
63. Гидденс, Э. (1999). *Социология*. Москва. Издательство «Эдиториал УРСС».
64. Гидденс, Э. (2001). *Социология*. Москва. Издательство «Эдиториал УРСС».
65. Кикнадзе, Т. Р. (2002). *Социально-культурная и духовная трансформация современного общества: Гендерной аспект*. Москва. «Социально-гуманитарные знания».
66. Кон, Т. С. (1967). *Социология личности*. Москва. Издательство политической литературы.

67. Мэсионис, Дж. (2004). Социология (9-е издание). Москва, Санкт-Петербург. Издательский дом «Питер».
68. Некоторые вопросы воспитания студенческой молодежи. (1975). Тбилиси. Издательство Тбилисского Университета.
69. Руткевич, Е. Д. (1993). Типология социального характера Д. Рисмена. Социологические исследование. №3.
70. Руткевич, Е. Д. Социальной характер и его проявление, основная личность. Личность как социальный феномен. <http://arjom.ru/wiki/djeidkismem/>
71. Смелзер, И. (1994). Социология. Москва. «Феникс».
72. Томпсон, Дж. Л. и Пристли, Дж. (1998). Социология. Москва. Издательство «Инициатива».
73. Фромм, Э. (1992). Душа Человека. Москва. Издательство „Республика”
74. Холл, К., Линдсей, Г. (1997). Теория Личности. Москва.