Changing
Societies &
Personalities

Founder and Publisher:

Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia Boris N. Yeltsin.
Address: 19 Mira street, Yekaterinburg, Russia, 620002

Journal contact information:

51 Lenin Avenue, room 240, Yekaterinburg, Russia, 620000
Phone: +7 (343) 389-9412
E-mail: editor@changing-sp.com
Web: https://changing-sp.com

The Journal is registered by the Federal Agency for Supervision in the Sphere of Telecomunication, Information Technologies and Mass Communication, Certificate of Registration: ПИ № ФС77–65509 from May 4, 2016

Aims and Scope:

Changing Societies & Personalities is an international, peer-reviewed quarterly journal, published in English by the Ural Federal University. *CS&P* examines how rapid societallevel changes are reshaping individual-level beliefs, motivations and values – and how these individual-level changes in turn are reshaping societies. The interplay of personality traits and sociocultural factors in defining motivation, deliberation, action and reflection of individuals requires a combination of theoretical and empirical knowledge. Since an interdisciplinary approach is needed to understand the causes and consequences of the contemporary world's changing socio-political institutions, moral values, and religious beliefs, the journal welcomes theoretical and empirical contributions from a wide range of perspectives in the context of value pluralism and social heterogeneity of (post)modern society.

Topics of interest include, but are not limited to

- value implications of interactions between socio-political transformations and personal self-identity;
- changes in value orientations, materialist and post-materialist values;
- moral reasoning and behavior;
- variability and continuity in the election of styles of moral regime and/or religious identity;
- the moral bases of political preferences and their elimination;
- social exclusion and inclusion;
- post-secular religious individualism;
- tolerance and merely "tolerating": their meanings, varieties and fundamental bases;
- ideologies of gender and age as variables in political, moral, religious and social change;
- educational strategies as training for specific social competences;
- social and existential security.

The journal publishes original research articles, forum discussions, review articles and book reviews.

https://changing-sp.com/ojs/index.php/csp/index

CONTENTS

Editor's Note

The articles in the current volume of *Changing Societies & Personalities* explore the main theme of the journal – value changes – from different perspectives. Aurea Mota and Peter Wagner in *The Rhino, the Amazon and the Blue Sky over the Ruhr: Ecology and Politics in the Current Global Context* consider the rise of ecological issues as a global concern. They state that the tremendous socio-political transformations of last fifty years, which gave born to a notion of "multi-polar" globe, did not change the depletion of the earth resources, and concentrate the analysis on the political and social aspects of the ecological crisis in a global context. The article draws examples from different regions in the world, namely, the threats to Amazon rainforest, rhino poaching in RSA, on one hand, and improvement of air and water in Europe, on the other hand, and discuss ecological issues in the light of "de-industrialization" of so-called "advanced industrial societies", which in practice was the industrial relocation from there to other regions all over the globe. The main concern of the authors is asymmetric externalization of environmental damage, especially in climate change; they assume that it "imposes an interpretation that recognizes that the instrumental transformation of the earth is strongly related to past domination and appropriation", and interpret the Paris Agreement of 2015 as the recognition of historical injustice done by developed countries to developing countries. The article raises an important question concerning the ways of the shift towards post-material values including ecology in "developing" countries.

Ekaterina Purgina's paper *Spatial Imaginary in "Western" Travelogues about Russia* analyses three travel narratives about Russia, which are focused on specific aspects of the life in the country and its background. Purgina describes the features of travelogue as personal account of a journey, which expresses the individual vision, as well as her/his context, providing the picture of an alien place through the lens of another culture, thus making it perceptive by the native audience of the writer (narrator). She underlines that spatial imaginary of the travelogue is unique due to the use of "vivid images, gripping stories that are told by those who have the first-hand experience" in the described realities. Purgina is particularly interested in revealing the image of Russia's type of modernity as it is presented in travelogues. Through the analyses of the centre/periphery, past/present, and political/personal dichotomies, she demonstrates both the peculiarities of the picture given in travelogues and the reality behind them, thus provoking the reader of the paper to justify or judge the controversial image of Russia from her/his own perspective.

In her provocative paper *Self-Shooting Uterus-Owners: Examining the Selfies of Pregnant Transmen within the Politics of Human Reproduction*, Aireen Grace T. Andal analyses transpregnancy from philosophical point of view. She stresses that in spite of the fact that transpregnancy is seen by many as a deviation, in the age of digital media it becomes public and requires adequate interpretation. Examining transpregnancy through selfie as new visual genre, Andal argues for the need to analyze its character and raises the question of its place "in the struggle for trans-identity expression in the context of a constant digital public scrutiny". She reviews various discourses on transbody and transpregnancy and underlines that they are usually seen as "problematic relationship between trans-identity and health". In the course of the paper, Andal makes interesting conclusions concerning the nature and goals of transmen selfies as digital images, and proves that they go beyond the issue of trans-identity and recognition being the way of self-reflection of modernity's individuals.

The RESEARCH NOTE section presents Neža Prelog, Fayruza S. Ismagilova, and Eva Boštjančič with the paper *Which Employees are Most Motivated to Share Knowledge – the Role of Age-Based Differentiation in Knowledge-Sharing Motivation.* The authors explore the problem of age diversity in the workplace in the light of intergenerational knowledge sharing. Based on interviews with the employees of several Slovenian companies, the authors review different knowledge-sharing mechanisms and models and explain the reasons of choosing cognitive model as the foundation for the empirical part of the research, which is aimed at studying "the correlation between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation, that is, the willingness of employees of different age groups to share their knowledge". This is a pioneer approach since there are no studies based on correlation of these two concepts. The results prove significant differences between age groups in their motivation of knowledge-sharing, and explain the reasons for them.

The current issue of CS&P also includes two book reviews. The first one is of *Hate, Politics, Law: Critical Perspectives on Combating Hate* (2018), by Andrey Menshikov. The reviewer questions the reduction of discriminatory attitudes and bias-motivated violence to "hate", and strengthens the need to approach the dangers of hate in contemporary society more reasonably.

The second review is of Kelly, Mark G. E. (2018) *For Foucault: Against Normative Political Theory* by Daniil Kokin. The reviewer makes some critical remarks on the book and recommend it to those who are interested in Foucault's political thought, as well as in normative political theory and its alternatives.

Discussions on the topics raised in the current issue will be continued in the subsequent issues of our journal, and new themes will be introduced. We welcome suggestions for thematic issues, debate sections, book reviews and other formats from readers and prospective authors, and invite them to send us their reflections and ideas!

For more information, please visit the journal web-site: https://changing-sp.com/

Elena A. Stepanova,
Editor-in-Chief

ARTICLE

The Rhino, the Amazon and the Blue Sky over the Ruhr: Ecology and Politics in the Current Global Context[1]

Aurea Mota
Centre for the Study of Culture, Politics and Society at the University of Barcelona, Spain

Peter Wagner
Catalan Institute for Research and Advanced Studies; University of Barcelona, Spain
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

ABSTRACT

The past half century has witnessed major socio-political transformations across the globe. The end of formal European colonialism, basically achieved except for small pockets in the aftermath of the Carnation Revolution in Portugal in 1974, was followed by the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991 in parallel to the one of Keynesian organized capitalism in the Northwest and of "state-led development" in much of the South, but also the rise of Asian economies, starting with Japan and now featuring China. The subsequent era of globalization and individualization was short-lived and has given way to the notion of a "multi-polar" globe marked by the at best half-intended withdrawal of the US from hegemony and the loose association of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa under the name of BRICS. What has not changed across this half century is the depletion of the earth's resources and the pollution of the environment. This article retraces the rise of ecological issues to become a global concern, and it does so by relating shifting

interpretations of the issue to assignments of political responsibility in the changing global context. Emerging from a comparative research project on Brazil, South Africa and Europe, it draws its examples from these regions, but aims at developing a more general argument about the current impact of historical power asymmetries on ways of dealing with the ecological crisis.

KEYWORDS
Brazil, climate change, ecology, Europe, industrialism, responsibility, South Africa

Introduction

The past half century has witnessed major socio-political transformations across the globe. The end of formal European colonialism, basically achieved except for small pockets in the aftermath of the Carnation Revolution in Portugal in 1974, was followed by the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991 in parallel to the one of Keynesian organized capitalism in the Northwest and of "state-led development" in much of the South, but also by the rise of Asian economies, starting with Japan and now featuring China. The subsequent era of globalization and individualization, associated with the "Washington consensus" and neo-liberalism in politico-economic terms, was short-lived and has given way to the notion of a "multi-polar" globe – a counter-intuitive image that will need to be rethought – marked by the at best half-intended withdrawal of the US from hegemony and the loose association of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa under the name of BRICS. What has not changed across this half century is the depletion of the earth's resources and the pollution of the environment. This article retraces the rise of ecological issues to become a global concern, and it does so by relating shifting interpretations of the issue to assignments of political responsibility.

Taking a global perspective and focusing on asymmetries, the article is situated in the context of the debate about "ecological debt", exploring the notion that the early industrializing countries are indebted to those countries, from which they drew their natural – and also human – resources and on whom they imposed the negative external effects of industrialization (for a recent overview, see Warlenius et al., 2015). The concept of "ecological debt" arose from within environmentalist social movements from the 1980s onwards, including at major global environmental debates such as the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. To some extent, it has also been taken up in academic debate, mostly either in economic and financial terms, trying to calculate the debt, or in legal and moral terms, trying to assess responsibilities and needs for remedy. Beyond these terms, the focus is here on political and social aspects of the ecological crisis in a global context, in which interconnectedness has considerably increased, thus also ecological relations with their specific asymmetries have become more dense,

but in which states remain the key actors and the only ones potentially able to assign responsibilities.

To assign responsibilities, one needs to provide an interpretation of the problem that is both adequate and convincing. To resort to remedial action, actors have to be capable of acting according to such interpretation. In the current global constellation, the consequences of resource depletion and environment destruction keep being experienced to highly different degrees across world-regions, even though the threats to living conditions on the planet have become global. However, any plausible interpretation will identify a large discrepancy between the sites of causes and the sites of consequences, making effective action difficult to achieve. One of the paradoxes of the current situation is that this discrepancy at the core of the current ecological crisis tends to become more problematic the more accountable state governments are to the domestic citizenry, as we will try to show.

Emerging from a comparative research project on Latin America, Southern Africa and Europe, this article draws its examples mostly from these regions (for more detail, see Mota & Wagner, 2019, on which this article builds), but it aims at developing a more general argument about the current impact of historical power asymmetries on ways of dealing with the ecological crisis. Let us add immediately that, for want of better terms, we will sometimes use the expressions "global South" and "global North" to identify spaces and actors, even though they do not neatly describe the current global divide (for reflections on locations in global space, see Wagner, 2016). Considering the BRICS members Brazil and South Africa, for instance, one needs to add, first, that these countries are the base of companies in the areas of agriculture and mining that operate in rather the same way as those with a base in the North; and, second, that these relatively powerful members of BRICS have themselves acquired some capacity to displace conflicts elsewhere in the South, a move otherwise more characteristic for Northern societies.

A Truly Global Issue

What we now call environmental concerns used to be very local issues. Industrial factories and urban agglomerations were sites of high emissions of pollutants. These pollutants usually stayed close to the sources of emission and caused environmental impact there, mostly endangering human health. The air pollution in London in 1952, called the Great Smog, using the neologism coined by combining "smoke" with "fog" in the early twentieth century, was among the first events that both caused a public outcry and triggered quick and rather effective action. Obviously, it was not the first one to cause major health effects. Air and water had increasingly been used to dilute pollutants, but in many cases the pollutants only become less easily perceived, but not necessarily less poisonous, especially over the long- and medium-term. Furthermore, when the people whose health was affected were from the lower classes, such as mineworkers or agricultural workers, their situation used to cause little concern and even much less action. Thus, the reason why the London event stood out in terms of publicness and action was that it took place in a capital city of metropolitan Europe. As

such, it also was an important event in terms of emerging discrepancies in perception and interpretation that would persistently haunt the environmental debate.

After the Great Smog, environmental issues rose quickly to become an important part of public debate in Europe. In 1960, the Social Democrat candidate for head of government in West Germany, Willy Brandt, included into the national election campaign the slogan about "the blue sky over the Ruhr", a river in the main coal and steel region of the country, referring to the ambition to reduce air pollution. Thus, he made environmental concerns a key issue of the national policy agenda (we return to this campaign below)[2]. In 1962, Rachel Carson published her book *Silent Spring in the US*, pointing to the large-scale consequences of the use of pesticides, even far away from the source. In 1972, the Club of Rome published its report *Limits to Growth*, emphasizing the risk of depleting the natural resources of the planet earth, thus developing a fully global perspective on the consequences of industrialization.

These two last-mentioned books are often referred to as turning environmental issues global, the one in terms of large-scale damaging impact on the environment, the other in terms of resource extraction. In 1986, the accident in the nuclear power station at Chernobyl (Soviet Union, now Ukraine) had radioactive fall-out that stretched far beyond given state borders. From the 1990s onwards, and increasingly so, the effects of emitting so-called greenhouse gases into the atmosphere have moved into the centre of attention. By now, climate scientists largely agree that there is a long-term change of the planetary climate due to humanmade emissions. Current environmental phenomena like the increasing number and strength of hurricanes, or the steady rise of average temperatures in some world-regions are attributed to humanmade climate change. With this debate, a point has been reached where a diffuse global phenomenon, not traceable to a single source like a nuclear power station, has a diffuse global impact. Thus, the identification of causes and the assigning of responsibilities has become as complex an issue as the assessment of damages. At the same time, there has been a drastic increase in the significance of the problem, namely the risk of making large areas of the planet uninhabitable together with the long-term nature of the process and the difficulty of halting it, not to speak of partially reversing it. Climate change has become a prime example for demonstrating the high degree of interconnectedness of world-regions today.

Shifting Responsibility: the Rhino and the Amazon

It is peculiar, though, that the apparently recent "globalization" of ecological issues along the main lines of debate was preceded by a specific North-South discourse. After 150 years of industrialization in the North and domestication of Northern flora and fauna, well-intended Northern observers recognized that nature was at risk in the South. An early example is the engagement of the German veterinarian and zoo

[2] The Social Democrats lost this election, but Brandt remained their candidate and was successful in 1969. During his period of office, the government adopted a comprehensive environmental programme, passed several laws for the protection of the environment, and created a Federal Agency for the Environment.

director Bernhard Grzimek and his son who focused on the Serengeti region in what is now Tansania. They did not deny the marvels of civilization, including industrial civilization, but underlined that everything humanmade could be reproduced whereas natural wildlife, once extinct, could not[3]. Their film "Serengeti shall not die" from 1959 was a great public success and won the US Academy Award for Documentary Feature in that year. It had the form of a documentary and an appeal, suggesting the need for outside intervention, thus implying that the local authorities – both colonial and post-colonial – would neither have the intention nor the capacity to do so. This kind of Northern ecological discourse that focuses on Southern regions that require intervention for reasons of environmental protection has since then become very common. Two of its more recent examples, addressing Latin America and Southern Africa, are the Amazon rainforest and the rhinoceros.

The Amazon region contains the largest contiguous area of rainforest on the globe. It is inhabited by a great diversity of fauna and flora, with many species being unique to the area. Furthermore, it acts as the "lung" of the planet by reducing the carbon-dioxide content of the atmosphere. Thus, there are good reasons to see the region as of global interest, and not of interest for Brazil and neighbouring countries alone. At the same time, the forest is threatened by deforestation and dispossession of small land-holdings to allow for large-scale agricultural use and for mining. In the course of these acts, the livelihood of indigenous communities is also threatened. It is common to see reports about the threats to the rainforest and their global impact in Northern media. Often it is accompanied by the observation that the national authorities – with Brazil at the centre – are unable or unwilling to stop the destruction. However, it is less often added that much of the invasive production is oriented towards exportation to the North, the incentive thus being provided by Northern economic "pull". Nor has the fact been much observed that the close connection of the Brazilian environmental movement with the governments led by the Workers' Party (PT) under president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003–2011) and, to a somewhat lesser extent, his successor Dilma Rousseff (2011–2016), resulted in a considerable slowing down of deforestation.

Something similar can be said about rhino poaching in South Africa, in which there has been a sharp spike over the past years. Eighty percent of the 80,000 rhinocerosses in the world live on South African territory. While in 2007 thirteen of them were killed, the number rose to 1,214 in 2014 and has not fallen below 1,000 since. The spike is connected to rising demand for rhino horn, in particular in Asia where it is believed to have aphrodisiac and medicinal qualities. The demand is driven, in turn, by rising incomes in Asia and by the fact that, with greater market integration across the globe, such demand is relatively easy to meet in today's world. While the rise in killings has been associated with corruption of government officials, South Africa did intervene quite forcefully in suppressing poaching and has been able to stabilize the rhino population (Bale, 2018).

---

[3] In some way, they may be proven wrong at some point: human hubris has started entertaining the idea of "de-extinction", that is reproducing extinct animal species based on retrievable DNA information.

If we look at Northern discourse on these topics, we recognize that Brazil and South Africa are seen as being responsible for key aspects of global sustainability. At the same time, especially the left-leaning governments of PT in post-military dictatorship Brazil and the African National Congress (ANC) in post-apartheid South Africa have been critically observed with regard to their capacity of enhancing economic activities. In the latter regard, the material, substantive core of natural-resource extraction and land dispossession disappears behind the numerical, statistical contribution of these processes to economic growth. Thus, these governments are placed under the dual prerogative of protecting nature for the whole globe's sake, on the one hand, and enhancing economic performance, on the other. They risk being criticized of neither doing the one nor the other to the required degree. To paraphrase what former president Dilma Rousseff, then still in office, once said to the Spanish newspaper *El País*: Here "they detain you for having a dog and for not having a dog" (Jiménez Barca, 2016).

Northern Complacency: the Blue Sky over the Ruhr

In these discourses, Europe holds multiple positions. First of all, its voice is the one of the guardian of the common good. Europe recognizes the peril of environmental destruction and urges for action. This voice is often not free of paternalistic, neo-colonial overtones: it is Europe that recognizes the necessity, and it is the South that does not fully recognize it and/or fails to efficiently act according to this insight. Secondly, Europe may contribute to solving the issue, but it would do so voluntarily, since this is not within its responsibility. This is so for two reasons. First, both the right and the responsibility for environmental protection action resides with the sovereign powers over the respective territory. And even in global terms, secondly, the responsibility to act lies elsewhere because Europe has already done its duty (for the general shift in discourse within European development policy, see Karagiannis, 2004). The London air is relatively clean because effective action was taken in the Clean Air Act of 1956 and its followers. The sky over the Ruhr is blue again, and one can even swim again in the river after 46 years of bathing prohibition (IWW Water Centre, 2017). Generally, air and water quality has considerably improved in Europe since the beginnings of explicit environmental policies. Materials are more and more recycled for re-use; and energy production is increasingly based on renewable sources.

Statements like the above can be found abundantly in official publications from the local level of municipalities to the supranational one of the European Commission. And they are largely true. They allow European governments at all levels to present themselves "at the forefront"[4] of all action to save the planet and to improve human living conditions on it. However, this discourse is also extremely complacent. It seems to say, true, we have created the problem due to industrialization, but we

---

[4] See, for instance, the European Commission on the Paris Agreement to combat climate change: "The EU has been at the forefront of international efforts towards a global climate deal". Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/international/negotiations/paris_en

have also recognized it in time and, there where we are responsible, have largely resolved it.

At the same time, the discourse ignores – or claims to ignore, since the knowledge is not lacking at all, – that the reasoning only holds if the results of environmental policies are attributed to individual world-regions and their state actors and, at the same time, the chains of action that cause environmental damage are ignored. If we look again at the case of the Ruhr river, the first successes were reached by using so-called end-of-pipe technologies, such as filters placed on the chimneys of coal-fired power stations and steel production plants, but they were very limited. Breakthroughs in the improvement of environmental quality were achieved when the German iron and steel industry was largely closed down. In public and scholarly debate, such closing down of plants was seen as part of a general tendency towards "de-industrialization", a radicalization of the earlier theme on the transition towards "post-industrial society"[5]. Within Germany, de-industrialization and the concomitant improvement of environmental quality were accelerated with the dismantling of industry in the former German Democratic Republic from 1990 onwards.

Globally, though, there is no evidence of de-industrialization at all. Global industrial output has been steadily rising over the past decades, with the only exception of a rather minor dip in 2009, namely with the onset of what is now called, with Western bias, the Great Recession after the default of Lehman Brothers in the US. However, the sites of industrial production have changed radically, being almost stagnant in Europe after a steep decline in 2010, at only slightly higher levels in the United States after three years of decline from 2007 to 2009, and uninterrupted growth at high rates in China[6]. Thus, rather than "de-industrialization" what happened was industrial relocation from sites in the formerly so-called "advanced industrial societies" towards other regions, predominantly in Asia (in a way, already starting with Japan much earlier), but increasingly also elsewhere. The observation of these shifts has given rise to the term "emerging economies" and also to the acronym BRICS, followed by the creation of an association between those five countries, indicating a possible shift in economic power relations. Our concern here, though, is that the industrial relocation also entails an externalization of environmental damage.

At a closer look, namely, the improvement of environmental quality in Europe, is directly related to the deterioration of environmental quality elsewhere. While producing less, Europe remains a high consumer of industrial products, and they are produced elsewhere with most of the environmental charge arising at the site of production or earlier at the site of extraction of raw materials. The sky over the Ruhr is blue because iron and steel for industrial products used in Germany are no

---

[5] The "post-industrial society" theorem already arose during the 1960s, but it was then seen as a relative shift from employment in the industrial sector towards the third, or service sector. Under assumptions of high general growth rates, typical of the 1960s, the advent of "post-industrial society" did not necessarily mean less industrial employment in absolute terms. In contrast, "de-industrialization" is at least partly a crisis discourse, as it requires adaptive measures often not welcomed by those concerned (for a recent discussion see Pichierri & Pacetti, 2016).

[6] South Africa had high growth until 2009, but considerable lower ones since then. Brazil had moderate growth rates before 2009, and faced a second recession in 2016.

longer produced in Germany. Such externalization occurs across the whole chain of production and consumption[7]. Thus, Europe uses an enormous amount of global soil for the production of foodstuffs required to feed animals for European consumption of meat. Decades after the end of formal colonialism, it keeps "occupying" space outside its own territory for its needs and purposes. At the other end, China used to accept a large part of European recyclable waste materials since the early 1990s, mostly paper and plastic. But it has recently refused to continue to do so, taking European policy-makers by surprise and without any effective response. It is an indication that relations of power have started to change to such extent that externalization becomes more difficult.

Climate Change and Historical Injustice

The problematic of asymmetric externalization becomes particularly clear when one looks at the debate about climate change and policy action with regard to it. This is so because the global dimension is immediately central with regard to the contemporary consequences of the instrumental transformation of the earth. Let us briefly summarize the argument introduced earlier. Industrialism in all its aspects – mass production, mass consumption, transport infrastructure – is the main cause for climate change and its likely consequences in terms of deteriorating living conditions on the earth. It was developed by the early industrial powers in North-Western Europe and later North America for their own benefit, but dependent on the creation of an Atlantic division of labour involving African labour and American soil in the European "take-off" of industrialism (this is a broad debate, see recently Stråth & Wagner, 2017; Mota & Wagner, 2019). When the environmental effects of industrialism were recognized from the 1960s onwards, they were seen as health risks caused by pollution in the vicinity of industrial production and consumption. Remedial action through environmental policies was effective, but it stayed close to these sites. In addition, the emerging new global division of labour from the 1970s onwards entailed the dislocation of heavily polluting industries as well as nature-transforming extractive industries to other parts of the world.

This is the constellation that we have outlined. For a long time, it was largely assumed that it could be analysed in politico-economic terms, underlining not least that the industrial dislocations were an important cause for economic growth in the so-called "emerging" societies and the dangers to the environment a "price to pay" for this growth. Then, "externalization" would be nothing else then the application of market logics. The "comparative advantage" of many societies of the South would then be the fact that they have the soil available to provide the North with raw materials and foodstuff, as well as to dump the garbage of the North. The earnings from these activities might lead these societies to "emerge" in the future and then deal on a par with the earlier industrialized societies. Once climate change comes into the picture,

---

[7] Stephan Lessenich (2016) coined the term "externalization society" for a constellation, in which one type of society systematically shifts the negative consequence of its production and life-style onto other societies.

however, that interpretation, doubtful as it always was, can clearly no longer be sustained. Climate change radically alters the perspectives for the future. As such, it imposes an interpretation that recognizes that the instrumental transformation of the earth is strongly related to past domination and appropriation.

Therefore, the interpretation of the issue as temporal is what is new in the present. "Modernist" and colonial discourse had relegated the colonized societies to a "not yet", had denied them coevalness in the present, as anthropological and postcolonial scholarship has long critically pointed out (e.g., Fabian, 1983; Chakrabarty, 2000). The argument had been displayed in a variety of forms – reaching from immaturity to be overcome by education to the missing institutional preconditions for an industrial take-off. It did not normally include the notion that the "backwardness" was induced by the relation of domination between colonizers and colonized (as dependency theory would underline). Whatever the past had been, the discourse of the "not yet" suggested an exit from this situation in the future. But the climate change debate has altered this situation: because of the urgency, so the argument goes, emissions in the South cannot be allowed to rise to Northern levels. Apparently, the benefits of industrialism that were historically reaped by the "advanced" societies need to be denied to the "emerging" societies for the sake of keeping the earth inhabitable. Thus, societies that had been confined to the "not yet" during colonization and the hegemony of modernization discourse are now condemned to a "never". If so, in this respect, historical injustice could no longer be remedied in the future.

As of today, the debate on climate change has two official points of reference. The state of knowledge on the phenomenon is monitored and summarized by the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which by now brings together the common assessment of the overwhelming majority of competent scientists in the field, opposed only by a small number of persons who deny the existence of climate change or at least of its humanmade nature. And the state of action has been formulated in the so-called Paris Agreement of December 2015, by now signed by almost all states on the globe and in effect since November 2016. The Paris Agreement is in many respects an amazing achievement. It brings together the almost entire global political community to agree on a complex scientific diagnosis, itself operating with considerable degrees of uncertainty and indeterminacy, and to accept the urgency of acting in common by radically limiting the so-called greenhouse emissions, and thus avoiding significant future increases in global temperatures. All signatories of the agreement, furthermore, commit themselves to quantitatively specified targets for emission reduction. The agreement does not foresee any mechanism to enforce these targets, but it includes not only a monitoring process, but also further steps to be taken to increase the target levels and to concretize them in line with future observations and estimates on climate development by the IPCC.

Next to praise, the agreement has also received criticism, mostly because of setting the targets too low and lacking enforcement mechanisms. While both of these critical observations are pertinent, emphasizing them risks losing out of sight the enormous change in discourse brought about by the contract. With this document,

the international political community moves away from the assumption that all states are equal and are equally called upon to act in this highly urgent matter. Rather, it is recognized that "developing countries" need to take longer in reaching the moment when emissions will fall, and it commits "developed countries" to provide resources for developing countries to protect themselves from, or compensate, damage due to climate change. Even though the agreement avoids being explicit, this is *de facto* a recognition of historical injustice done by developed countries to developing countries[8]. A sense of this may have provoked the fury of US president Donald Trump, his announcement of the withdrawal of the US from the agreement, and the insistence that a better deal for "America" was needed.

The problems with the agreement reside less in its quantitative insufficiency and its non-binding nature, because both of these are recognized within the agreement itself. Germany, for instance, which prided itself to be "at the forefront" even within Europe, is falling behind in reaching its self-set target objectives for 2030, and there are calls by politicians to be more "realistic". But this falling behind has triggered a wide critical debate with reference to the Paris Agreement. The fact that the commitment for 2050 has been explicitly made within a formal international agreement makes it discursively difficult to just renounce fulfilling it. Thus, this implementation hesitancy was expected and is part of the explicit monitoring and adjustment process set in motion by the agreement. The more crucial problems reside rather in that which is significant yet not formally recognized. Three such elements are rather easily identifiable at a closer look.

First, the Paris Agreement counts emissions according to the territorial site where they occur. This seems reasonable in light of the fact that governments can control more easily what occures on their territory. However, this way of accounting attributes the emissions for products always at the site of their production, not of their consumption. This means, as hinted at above, that the commodities exported from China for use in Europe are "counted" in the environmental balance sheet of China, whereas it would be more appropriate to count them there where the realization of their value occurs (using Sadian's 2018 terminology). In the externalizing "consumer societies" of the North, the difference between "consumption emissions" and "territorial emissions" is considerable (McManus, 2015).

Secondly, there is a rather great reliance on voluntary action in the agreement, certainly due to the fact that the explicit and specified commitments fall short of what is considered necessary. However, voluntary action by unspecified volunteers is difficult to achieve, in particular in situations, in which the advantages and disadvantages fall to different actors. We can give one example that also goes back to a theme addressed earlier. Globally, it should not be too difficult to renounce the exploitation of some oil reserves, given that oil is at the moment rather abundant and that the climate objectives foresee an exit from the use of fossil sources of energy. It is a much more difficult question to decide, which reserves are to be exploited and

---

[8] The wording is "common but differentiated responsibilities", *Paris Agreement*, preamble and article 2.2, 4.19, 4.3. The notion goes back to debates at the Stockholm and Rio de Janeiro environmental summits of 1972 and 1992 respectively.

which not, given that they are found in states of very different forms of government and levels of wealth and inequality. Reasonably, one should aim at renouncing the exploitation there where important counter arguments to it exist. This is the case in Ecuador, where considerable exploitable oil reserves were discovered in a territory that is both an important natural reserve – a rainforest area of very high biodiversity – and the area, in which two indigenous "isolated" societies live, the Yasuní National Park. The government of Ecuador headed by then president Rafael Correa proposed in 2007 that the area would be left untouched if the international community provided half the income that the state would renounce. The proposal was active until 2013 when Correa withdrew it after only a tiny fraction of the requested money had been promised (Murmis & Lorrea, 2015; see also *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 2018). The reserves are currently exploited by the Ecuadorean national oil company Petroecuador. Hardly any Northern volunteer felt a sense of responsibility for contributing to reach this sensible and rather feasible objective.

Thirdly, quite understandably given its nature, the agreement underestimates the possibilities of displacing the issue. Once signed, and even before, many of those concerned by it started considering what can and needs to be done to continue doing the same and living the same way. A case in point is the German motor industry. Cars built by nominally German manufacturers are predominantly up-market products, which contain numerous special features. They are rather heavy and expensive, but are successfully sold on world-markets to more well-to-do customers. It had been known for a long time that it would be difficult to make these cars meet more strict emission standards. Successive German governments intervened at the European Commission to avoid standards getting too tough, but this was apparently not successful enough. In 2015, the US Environmental Protection Agency detected devices to manipulate emissions under test conditions and started investigating the cases. At the current moment, numerous legal cases are still ongoing in various countries. Considerable fines have already been imposed. However, little attention has been given to the increased number of casualties and illnesses due to air pollution and the contribution of millions of cars to climate-change emissions. All of this was happening while the international negotiations that would lead to the Paris Agreement were ongoing.

Environmental Action under Adverse Circumstances

Thus, as we see, environmental crime in Europe is very much "white-collar" crime. It happens in the managerial offices of the large companies, and the intention is to secure sales and profits despite existing regulations that aim to protect the environment. As the car emission scandal shows, some of this activity is truly criminal, and once discovered, it is being prosecuted by the competent judicial institutions. While some executive officers violate environmental laws, others merely ignore or neglect the rising environmental concerns. They pursue projects of resource extraction or of environmentally and/or socially detrimental agricultural production, often on large scale and with high impact. Much of this activity is planned in the

North but executed in the South. Thus, the politics of externalization operates by a territorial displacement of conflicts.

Environmental protection laws in Brazil and South Africa are today very similar to those in Europe. The high degree of global interconnectedness has given many environmental threats a global significance, as argued at the outset of this article, and it has also facilitated the rise of global environmental consciousness. The – relative and temporary – success in slowing down deforestation in the Amazon region and protecting the rhino in Southern Africa is testimony of the strength of environmental action in the South. But such success is achieved under highly adverse circumstances. Illegal deforestation and illegal killing of rhinos happen every day. These are not white-collar crimes; they are committed by local people, often in need of the resources being made available through those deeds. As a consequence, a picture emerges, in which the combination of poverty and social inequality with the inability of Southern states to enforce their laws, in particular in more remote regions, are seen as the cause of uncontrollable anti-ecological activity. Put like this, the issue is firmly placed in the South, and the North is nothing but a concerned onlooker.

However, this is a highly distorted picture. True, in some cases deforestation and poaching are driven by local interests. In many more, however, a global chain of responsibility is attached to them. This is particularly clear in the cases of assassinations of environmental activists, an increasingly frequent phenomenon, of which knowledge and awareness have risen not least thanks to the systematic reporting of the UK-based daily newspaper *The Guardian*. In most of these cases, the killers acted not on their own behalf but for the interest of companies, often with a base in the North, developing large-scale agricultural or mining projects (Watts, 2018). Thus, the picture above, while not false, needs to be placed into a larger frame, in which two elements of the global context become visible: the capacity of Northern societies to displace environmental damage to the South while maintaining corporate profits and general way of life, and by and large the incapacity of Southern societies to effect a similar displacement, because very often there is no space in reach, towards which the conflicts could be displaced.

Little Innovation on the Path to "Social Progress"

As hinted at above, the PT- and ANC-led governments after the end of dictatorship in Brazil and of apartheid in South Africa embarked on rather ambitious programmes of social transformation (for detail, see Mota & Wagner, 2019). In particular, the social-policy programmes have reduced poverty and – to a minor extent – social inequality and have created a new "middle class" among the formerly poor and excluded. At the same time, these programmes showed social limits due to the lack of addressing the entrenched structures of inequality that date from the long historical periods of formal hierarchy and exclusion. For our purposes here, we underline further limitations inherent to the projects of political transformation as designed by these actors.

One pillar of the transformative programme in both countries was economic growth. Such growth was meant to increase tax revenue, and a part of this revenue

was to be redistributed with a view to alleviate poverty and enhance the income of the lower classes more generally. Given the world-market conditions in the early twenty-first century, economic growth in Brazil and South Africa could mostly be achieved through the intensification of ecologically "heavy" production in the primary and, to some extent only, secondary sectors. In Brazil, one even talks about a "re-primarization" of the economy after the relatively successful industrialization through import substitution policies earlier in the twentieth century (Paulani, 2016). This observation concerns the production side, and another problematic feature emerges from the consumption side. A considerable part of the social-policy programmes consisted in increasing the amount of money in the hands of the lower classes. This emphasis has some sound reasons. On the one side, handing out monetary benefits is relatively easy. It does not place high demands on public administration. On the other side, it is immediately positively perceived by the beneficiaries. Thus, it is likely to enhance "mass loyalty" towards the government, according to a widespread theorem in political science (see already Narr & Offe, 1975, for an overview). However, the increased availability of money leads to an increasing demand for consumer goods, especially durable consumer goods. Both in Brazil and in South Africa, private cars have come to be seen as a sign of upward social mobilty, enhancing life satisfaction and serving as a status symbol, the latter particularly in South Africa. In production and even more so in use, though, cars are a significant contributor to environmental damage. This aspect of the political transformation, therefore, has generated negative ecological side-effects.

The alternative would have been to achieve social progress by placing the emphasis on the improvement of public infrastructure. This objective could as well have been financed by the revenues from economic growth, but it would have required the development of the relevant administrative capacity, and not all of it would possibly have been as immediately recognizable as a benefit as the increasing availability of money. We need to underline that both the PT- and the ANC-led governments have invested considerably in public infrastructure, thus we talk about an imbalance rather than an absence. And this imbalance is more pronounced in Brazil than in South Africa, where significant effort has been made to improve the infrastructure in the residential areas of the black African population, systematically disadvantaged by the prior apartheid governments. Nevertheless, the imbalance is telling for the overall design of the political transformation. We want to illustrate this in the form of an anecdote, of which, though, we have good reasons to believe that it is true.

The first large demonstrations against the PT-led governments in Brazil were the protests against the rise of the fare in urban public transport in June 2013. These protests became significant because they were the beginning of a larger series of protests that ended breaking the hegemony that the PT programme of political transformation had acquired over more than a decade. Known as *Movimento Passe Livre* (Free Fare Movement), the protests started out as a clear single-issue contestation, and as such they could have been addressed rather easily. Even before the rise of these protests, a proposal had been made by a leading member of the PT to keep the fares stable by subsidizing the cost of public transport through raising the

gasoline tax. The proposal came fully budgeted, demonstrating its feasibility and even calculating the effect on the official inflation rate, of constant concern for governments, to be minimal. Nevertheless, it met full and immediate rejection by the PT presidency, even refusal to discuss it.

An Unholy Alliance

From the late 1970s onwards, sociological value research suggested that material values would give way to post-material values once material needs are largely satisfied (Inglehart, 1977 and elsewhere). This has been seen as another step of "modernization" and was congruent with the ecological debate, assuming a linear trend towards greater ecological consciousness. Like for other general aspects of global social change, there is considerable validity to this insight. At the same time, the picture gets distorted owing to the fact that the survey research findings, on which the theorem is based, work with data from individual societies that are treated as if they were moving separately across global history[9]. As we have shown throughout this article, though, this is not at all the case.

To again provide a larger picture, we need to, on the one hand, read the findings on the move to post-materialism as something that has indeed to some extent – which should not be exaggerated either[10] – taken place among the global rich, who live predominantly, but not exclusively, in the North. And they live there with the "false consciousness" of having changed their societies and ways of life by having improved the quality of the environment and decreased their burden on the planet, while as a matter of fact they continue to live over the means the planet can sustainably provide and have displaced the immediate effects of this way of life on the global poor. Framed as an evolutionary theory of modernization, on the other hand, the findings, without intending to do so explicitly, also sustain the expectation of the global poor that they would first reach the level of material satisfaction that the rich have now to later move to post-material values. In South Africa, for instance, where the benefits of material affluence had formally been denied to the majority of the population for a long time, any suggestion of "jumping over" the material phase is easily denounced as a new form of neo-colonial imposition. In a very implicit way, such evolutionary staging is expressed in the assumption of the Paris Agreement that the peak of greenhouse emissions will occur later in the "developing" countries than in the "developed" ones. It is difficult to object to such assumption, since it marks a recognition of historical injustice, as argued above. But at the same time, it shies away from any attempt of a more profound rethinking of the ways, in which material needs can be met, a rethinking that is urgently needed.

The capacity of the North to displace its ecological impact to other regions of the globe combines with the incapacity of the South, until now, to develop a different

---

[9] Such methodological nationalism, it needs to be underlined, is not a conceptual assumption in this approach, but an effect of data and methodology.

[10] The average per capita use of resources and impact on the environment remains considerably higher in Europe than in most other parts of the world, with the main exception of the United States.

path to social progress than the one regionally taken in the North earlier to an unholy alliance that endangers the living conditions on the planet earth. The 1972 report on *Limits to Growth* did not lead to reduced consumption of resources, but to intensified search for extractable raw materials. The current risk is that the climate change debate will not do so either, but that instead technical solutions will be searched for that, on the one side, protect those who can afford to install them but not others, and on the other, that mark another step in the combination of technological hubris and economic expansion for expansion's sake.

References

Bale, R. (2018, 25 January), More Than 1,000 Rhinos Killed by Poachers in South Africa Last Year. *National Geographic.* Retrieved from https://news. nationalgeographic.com/2018/01/wildlife-watch-rhino-poaching-crisis-continues-south-africa/

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2018). Amazon rainforest.

European Commission. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ international/

Fabian, J. (1983). *Time and the Other*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1977). *The Silent Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

IWW Water Centre. (2017, 24 May). *It is Possible Again to Swim in the Ruhr*. Retrieved from https://iww-online.de/en/it-is-possible-again-to-swim-in-the-river-ruhr/

Jiménez Barca, A. (2016, 25 March). La Presidenta Rousseff: "Quieren Que Renuncie Para Evitar Echarme Ilegalmente". *El País.* Retrieved from https://elpais. com/internacional/2016/03/24/actualidad/1458847577_766990.html

Lessenich, S. (2016). *Neben uns die Sintflut. Die Externalisierungsgesellschaft und ihr Preis. Munich: Hanser.*

Narr, W., & Offe, C. (Eds.). (1975). *Wohlfahrtsstaat und Massenloyalität.* Neuwied: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

McManus, M. (2015, 5 June). Why Countries Need to Count their "Outsourced" Emissions. *World Economic Forum*. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/ agenda/2015/06/why-countries-need-to-count-outsourced-emissions/

Mota, A., & Wagner, P. (2019). *Collective Action and Political Transformations. The Entangled Experiences of Brazil, South Africa and Europe*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Murmis, M. R., & Lorrea, C. (2015, 9 February). We can Start Leaving the Oil in the Ground Right Now – Here's How. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.

theguardian.com/environment/andes-to-the-amazon/2015/feb/09/we-can-start-leaving-the-oil-in-the-ground-right-now-heres-how

Paris Agreement. Retrieved from https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement

Paulani, L. (2016). Modernity and Capitalist Progress in the Periphery: The Brazilian Case. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 19(2), 210–227. DOI: 10.1177/1368431015600018

Pichierri, A., & Pacetti, V. (2018). Le Ristrutturazioni Industriali e il Territorio: Crisi, Declino, Metamorfosi? In E. Armano, A. Dondona & F. Ferlaino (Eds.), *Postfordismo e Trasformazione Urbana* (pp. 27–43). Turin: Regione Piemonte.

Sadian, S. (2018). Consumer Studies as Critical Social Theory. *Social Science Information*, 57(2), 273–303.

Stråth, B., & Wagner, P. (2017). *European Modernity: a Global Approach*. London: Bloomsbury.

Wagner, P. (Ed.). (2016). *The Moral Mappings of South and North, Annual of European and Global Studies* (Vol. 4). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Warlenius, R., Pierce, G., Ramasar, V., Quistorp, E., Martínez-Alier, J., Rijnhout, L., & Yanez, I. (2015). *Ecological Debt: History, Meaning and Relevance for Environmental Justice*. EJOLT Report No. 18.

Watts, J. (2018, 2 February). Almost Four Environmental Defenders Killed Each Week in 2017. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/feb/02/almost-four-environmental-defenders-a-week-killed-in-2017

ARTICLE

Spatial Imaginary in "Western" Travelogues about Russia[1]

Ekaterina S. Purgina
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

ABSTRACT

Travel literature provides the readers with access to the most remote places but also reproduces the so-called "traveler's gaze", thus connecting and separating people at the same time. Through individual travel narratives globalization processes get inscribed into an individual identity of the author and the reader. This article analyzes how Russia is presented in three travelogues written by American journalists: Andrew Meier (2003); David Greene (2014); and Anne Garrels (2016). These narratives are considered by focusing on the three dichotomies, around which the characteristics of modern societies are constructed: centre/periphery, past/present, and political/individual. Russia's trajectory of modernity, according to Western travelogues, is predominantly oriented towards the country's past – the legacy of the Soviet Union and Russian Empire, which means that virtually no place is left for the "future", associated with democratization, liberalization, individualization, and environmental awareness. As the narrators see it, the centre's priority is to maintain control over the periphery and to hold the country together at any cost, which makes all other considerations, including the well-being of the people, secondary. Therefore, there is a constant struggle between the political and the individual, with people seeking to protect their private worlds from the encroaching power of the government.

KEYWORDS

spatial imaginary, modernity, travelogue, Russia, travel narrative

Globalization transforms modern society in different ways: several waves of democratization swept across the globe; a global market and global capitalism emerged as well as global networks of communication and transport. Among these diverse and disparate processes, the development of travel industry has brought globalization in the flesh to everyone and contributed to the growing global connectivity.

Travel literature, developing alongside the thriving travel industry, on the one hand, provides the reading public with access to "faraway", exotic countries and, on the other, helps maintain the spatial differentiations such as the distance between the West and the Rest and the reproduction of the "traveler's gaze". Therefore, travelogues connect and separate people at the same time. But unlike travel guides and standard tour descriptions, travelogues or personal accounts of journeys, generally told in the first person, offer an individualized view on the destination and present experience of an independent traveler. Thus, globalization processes are inscribed into an individual identity and the life story of the author, as well as the reader. Travel writing is known for its hybridity, both in terms of form and content: today, available on-line and in print, in textual, audio or video format, it constitutes spatial imagination as much as traditional ways of spatial construction, such as geography lessons, maps, geopolitical debates, and so on.

Travelogue as a genre began to crystallize in the sixteenth century, and the whole travel book industry boomed in the late eighteenth century. Originally, travel writing was an important source of information available to the mass public about the non-European world, which explains why this genre is so sensitive to the delicate balance between truth and fiction. This "built-in" anxiety or the search for authenticity (the true and genuine socio-cultural experience) lies at the core of modern travelogue (Zilcosky, 2008). Authenticity is associated with the otherness of a place but also with its remoteness, both in space and time. Judging by the unrelenting interest of the Western public towards travel books about Russia – these books keep being published and keep ranking high on national and international bestsellers' lists, Russia still has not lost its "exotic" flavour. A good example of a travelogue playing on Russia's exoticism is hugely popular Peter Pomerantsev's "Nothing is True and Everything is Possible: The Surreal Heart of the New Russia". Even though this book mostly focuses on Moscow and the central part of Russia, it attracts attention by exploring its "darker" and "glamorous" side – private life of Russian oligarchs, suicides of Russian super-models, the ways of Russian mafia, and its connections to high government officials.

Within the theory of modernity, there seems to be some uncertainty as to Russia's place within the established East-West/North-South dichotomies: as Madina Tlostanova puts it, Russia "disrupts" this binarism by being at once 'the colonizer and the colonized, unable to join any of the extremes, and generating oxymoronic subcategories instead, such as the poor north of the south of the poor north' (Tlostanova, 2012). This "in-betweenness" of Russia – between Europe and Asia, the intelligentsia and the people, Orthodoxy and science – is also discussed by Maxim Khomyakov, who contends that it is precisely this search for the "middle way in modernity" that constitutes Russian modernity (Khomyakov, 2017). Tlostanova

refers to this phenomenon as "dependent and mimicking modernity" (Tlostanova, 2012). "Inscribing Russia" into modernity can be done on different levels and with different purposes: by social theorists, by politicians, or by journalists. Yet, the spatial imaginary is not formed by analytical schemes or political strategizing alone, it lives due to vivid images, gripping stories that are told by those who have the first-hand experience of Russian realities. This direct, ethnographic, though not academic, experience recounted in travel literature is mass printed and accessible to the widest audience. It is read by cultural elites, as well as by ordinary people. Travel writers often provide the reader with reflections on Russian history and generalizations about Russia's future that exceed the scope of narrated anecdotes. Thus, travel literature greatly contributes to spatial imaginary and the way Russia's path to modernity is perceived.

Travelogue's emphasis on individuality of travel experience brings to the fore the figure of the narrator (subject/observer). In the studies of the colonial or post-colonial travelogue, therefore, much attention has been given to the narrator with regard to their race, gender, social status, education, and so on. The term "narratorial persona" highlights the fact how elaborately "crafted" the image of the narrator is: authors can assign to their personae specific "poses" and "points of view" in order to produce the desired effect on the reading audience, creating, on the one hand, a feeling of smooth and spontaneous narrative and, on the other hand, making the text persuasive and maintaining their authority on the matters they are writing about (for more on narratorial persona see, for instance, Dickinson, 2007). In the classical colonial travelogue, the dominant narratorial persona was that of a white man – the "traveler" and "explorer", who sought to "discover" and "master" the yet unknown land ("I am monarch of all I survey"). Therefore, any changes in the narratorial persona attracted scholarly interest as to whether the resulting narrative supports or, on the contrary, undermines colonial discourse (see, for instance, the seminal works on the ambivalence of women's colonial travel writing by Sara Mills and Mary-Louise Pratt). In modern travelogue, which is generally characterized by constant oscillations between the "colonial" and "cosmopolitan" modes, there is much greater diversity in the types of narratorial personae although the "white male" type still prevails, which results in criticisms directed against such prominent modern travel writers as Bruce Chatwin and Paul Theroux, who allegedly "failed" to be truly cosmopolitan and instead reproduced in their narratives the same colonial "white male gaze" (see Johnson, 2002; Lisle, 2006). In our study, we have not found any significant differences in the narratives that could be explained by the gender of the narratorial personae, although Anne Garrels does tend to give more attention to the life of Russian women than her male colleagues. In our view, what is much more crucial for the narratives in question is the national and professional background of the narrators: representatives of American culture and professional journalists.

For our study, we have chosen three travelogues: Andrew Meier's "Black Earth: A Journey Through Russia After the Fall" (2003); David Greene's "Midnight in Siberia: A Train Journey into the Heart of Russia" (2014); and Anne Garrels' "Putin Country. A Journey into the Real Russia" (2016). Both David Greene and Anne

Garrels worked for the American radio station NPR (National Public Radio) while Andrew Meier was a correspondent for "Time" magazine. Each of these journalists spent a considerable amount of time in Russia: for instance, David Greene was the chief of the NPR's Moscow bureau for three years, while Andrew Meier worked as a Moscow correspondent for "Time". To the best of our knowledge, despite their success at home, none of these books has yet been translated into Russian.

All of the three travelogues are well-researched and well-crafted as they skillfully fit together interviews, facts and figures, biographical information, journalistic investigations, historical descriptions, and reflections on Russia's present, past and future. Greene's travelogue is formally organized around his journey on the Trans-Siberian railway and thus progresses linearly, following what can be called a more 'traditional' mode of travel writing with clearly defined points of departure and arrival. Garrels' book focuses on one city and the surrounding region – Chelyabinsk – and summarizes several trips made to this area between the 1990s and 2010s. Meier's book is the most versatile and comprehensive of all, as it covers the author's multiple trips to various cities and regions of Russia – apart from Moscow and St. Petersburg, these include Chechnya, Siberia, Sakhalin, and the Arctic. It should be noted that after careful reading of Greene's travelogue, it becomes evident that his narrative is also based on several trips rather than one, which he also made clear in one of his interviews, stating that he had actually made three trips to different parts of Russia.

Since all of the travelogues are dealing with a wide range of "sensitive" topics, each of the writers stresses the importance of the rapport and trust that they had managed to build with their "contacts", which makes the question of the language crucial. As Colin Thubron, an author of the earlier travelogue "In Siberia" (1999), pointed out in his interview to BBC Book Club, the knowledge of the Russian language was essential to gain the trust of his respondents, so he had to make use of whatever limited Russian vocabulary he had rather than to resort to a translator's help as all of his respondents were extremely wary of any strangers being present at the interview (Flynn, 2018). The caution shown by many respondents, who were afraid of the police, Federal Security Service (FSB), and troubles at work if their names got disclosed, is on many occasions also stressed by Anne Garrels (one of her respondents actually escaped while she was dealing with the unexpected visitors from the police). Although some of the Russian people described in the travelogues could speak English, the vast majority couldn't. Both Anne Garrels and Andrew Meier are fluent speakers of Russian while David Greene travelled together with his friend and NPR colleague Sergey, who also introduced Greene to his own family and friends in Nizhny Novgorod, thus acting as a translator and as an intermediary between the writer and the local community. In all the three travelogues, the authors maintain their authority and expertise by demonstrating their intimate knowledge of Russian life and the "authenticity" of their experience of Russia, gained through years of living in the country and through contacts with Russian people, not only as respondents, but also as acquaintances and close friends. (We should note here that the word "Russian" is used here as a general term for all the people living on the territory of the Russian Federation as the authors of the travelogues in question make a special point of involving representatives of

various ethnic minority groups in their narrative – Tatars, Bashkirs, Chechen, Udmurt, and so on). All the three authors have managed to create a narrative that seems to be sufficiently authentic and trustworthy to the "domestic" public, which becomes obvious if one looks at the readers' comments to these books on web-sites such as "Goodreads". For instance, the predominant response to Andrew Meier's book was that even though there is a lot of "gloom and doom" in this story and the book is not to be taken "lightly", it manages to provide an accurate picture of present-day Russia, the "mindset" of its people and their struggles.

Each narrative is characterized by its own individual intonation – in David Greene's travelogue it is of a more non-judgmental, sympathetic and at times humorous kind; Andrew Meier strives for more "drama" and includes fictionalized accounts of historical events and "behind the scenes"; he also often resorts to accentuated symbolism while Anne Garrels seems to be much more critical and uncompromising in her evaluations of what is happening in Russia without making allowances for the difficult past or national mentality. Nevertheless, all the three authors to different degrees share the sense of wonder, confusion and dismay at the perceived "failure" of Russian people to adopt Western values such as democracy, human rights, equality, and freedom, even though the Russians are aware of these values and even though they had a "window of opportunity" open for them after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

We are going to consider the three travelogues by focusing on the following aspects constituting modern societies:
 – Centre/periphery;
 – Past/present;
 – Political/personal.

In the travelogues, the centre/periphery dichotomy can take different forms: the West vs. Russia; Moscow vs. the regions; urban vs. rural areas. The dichotomy between the West and Russia mostly comes up in the narrators' conversations with their Russian respondents, who refer to the West as Russia's chief opponent. As one of Anne Garrels' respondents puts it, "the United States applies one law to itself and another to everyone else" (Garrels, 2016, p. 34) and, therefore, would not "allow comparable Russian interference in its own affairs or in its sphere of interest" (Garrels, 2016, p. 35). On the other hand, the West is also used as the norm and the measure of economic prosperity, to which Russia should aspire.

Much more explicit is the opposition between the capital and the regions: the movement away from the centre to the periphery, that is, from the more "European" regions of Russia eastwards or northwards is often described as the movement backwards in time, the writers emphasizing the vastness of the Russian territory and the time it takes to reach different places. This feeling of vast space enhances the feeling of remoteness and isolation of its towns and settlements scattered along the way. It was also this vastness of the country's territory that allowed Russian and Soviet governments to use Siberia and the Far East as places of exile and penal labour, which now turns them into the repositories of their dark and tragic past and makes them unable to "move on" to the present or to the future:

> On our wall map at home Norilsk loomed *at the edge of civilization*. It seemed a place at once ominous and illuminating, a corner of Russia where one could measure not only the gap between the newly rich and the long poor but the *haunting legacy of the unfinished past*, the past had been exhumed, laid bare, only to be abandoned, unexamined and unburied. *Nothing had resettled right*. In more cosmopolitan corners, life had of course moved on. In Moscow and Petersburg, sushi bars, casinos, and soup kitchens had quickly appeared. But Norilsk, for all its riches, *remained a severed world*, *a Pompeii of Stalinism* that the *trapped heirs of the Gulag* still called home (Meier, 2003, p. 182) (*italics mine – E. P.*)

In some regions, this travel back in time "lingers" on the comparatively recent past of the Perestroika period, in some, on the Soviet era, while in others, it goes back to the nineteenth century or even further. There are layers of historical time distinguishable within the urban landscape of Russian cities and towns. For instance, this is how Krasnoyarsk is described by Andrew Meier:

> Instead of *post-Soviet* industrial decay, *an unexpected sense of the past prevailed*. Downtown offered a tidy array of narrow thoroughfares – *Lenin, Peace, and Marx streets* – that paralleled the river. There were more *nineteenth-century* private houses than twentieth-century apartment blocks (Meier, 2003, p. 183) (*italics mine – E. P.*)

One of the typical tropes used in travelogues is the metaphorical comparison of the country's territory to a body and travelogues about Russia are not an exception. One of their common features is pointing to the fact that the travel is made right to the "heart" of the country (Anne Garrels' "A Train Journey to the Heart of Russia" or another recent book entitled "Russia: A Journey to the Heart of a Land and its People" by Jonathan Dimbleby). Where this "heart" exactly lies is left to the author's choice and imagination: it can be the central part, Urals, Siberia, or further to the east, the only definite thing is that it should be in the "outback", that is, not Moscow or St. Petersburg. The vastness of the country is combined with the lack of internal order or interconnectedness as the country seems to consist of disorganized fragments artificially held together by some external force lest this "body" should start to disintegrate: for example, David Greene refers to the Trans-Siberian railway as the "spine", "a thin line of constancy that holds this unwieldy country together" (Greene, 2014, p. 8), "the link that connects so many disparate places" (Greene, 2014, p. 64). This is how he describes his perception of Russia's space while being on a train:

> By far, Russia takes up more of the earth than any other country. I knew this. But the earlier Trans-Siberian trip I did back in 2011 made me *feel* it. Four, five, six hours would pass, and all we would see outside was empty, white wilderness. Then a forest. Then a small city, with some decaying buildings – often an empty Soviet factory. Then hours more of nothing (Greene, 2014, p. 78)

Throughout his travelogue, Greene returns to this idea on several occasions:

Moscow seems so very far away as we push eastward. The feeling of disconnect grows, making it seem unsurprising that having people scattered in such remote places is a drag on a nation's economy. Politically the disconnect works in different ways. Many people in Siberia feel little if any relationship to Moscow and the Kremlin, and throughout history, people have felt relatively more free to think for themselves. And yet, distance is also an impediment for any serious opposition movement to grow and thrive (Greene, 2014, p. 223)

This feeling of imminent disintegration of the "old empire" is conveyed in Andrew Meier's text, a considerable part of which is devoted to Chechnya and to the gruesome stories of the first and second Chechen wars told by Russian and Chechen soldiers and civilians. The desperate attempts of the Russian government to maintain its control over this region and keep it within Russia had disastrous consequences both for the Russian and Chechen sides. The conflict has not been fully resolved, and has given rise to extremism and radicalization of Muslims, which, in its turn, led to increased counter-terrorism efforts on the part of the government and to extra pressure on Muslim communities not only in the Caucasus but also across other regions of Russia (Garrels, 2016, pp. 116–117). The title of Andrew Meier's book alludes to Leo Toltsoy's novel "Hadji Murad" and in the chapter on Chechnya Meier makes it clear that he subscribes to Tolstoy's view about "all sorts of villainy" that a large state with a considerable military strength can commit against "small peoples, living their own independent life", under the pretext of self-defense or a civilizing mission (Meier, 2003, p. 164). Thus, Meier condemns the imperial ambitions of the Russian state, bringing nothing but suffering and deprivation to "small peoples" but also to the Russian people – the Chechen war veterans and their families and to the families of those who lost their fathers and sons to this war.

All authors touch upon the question of the Chechen wars as they meet the survivors of these wars from both sides. It is largely the Russian military campaign in Chechnya that leads the narrators to point out that the interests of "Moscow" and "Kremlin" are inimical to the interests of other Russian regions and the interests of the multi-ethnic communities inhabiting them. The idea that Moscow is not "truly" Russian, that is fails to embody Russianness is raised in Andrew Meier's travelogue:

"Moscow is not Russia". It is the refrain of Westerners and Russians alike who have ventured into the Russian outback and returned to tell of its miseries. But what, then, is Moscow? (Meier, 2003, p. 24)

The urban/rural dichotomy also corresponds to that of rich/poor and new/old. The "old" Russia, also often referred to as the "dead" empire or the "ruins of the empire", that is, the remnants of the Soviet period, is contrasted with the "new Russia" and the "new opulence" of the post-Soviet period. Travelogue "Black Earth" takes this line a bit further by drawing the distinction between the "New Russians" and "most Russians, being Old Russians", who "naturally hated the New Russians", and thus revealing the great divide within the Russian society (Meier, 2003, p. 31).

The stark contrast between Russia's urban areas and countryside is described by Anne Garrels the following way:

> If you were to take a helicopter ride over Russia's countryside, you might think a war had recently ravaged the landscape. The former state and collective farms, each of which employed hundreds against all economic sense, are in ruins (Garrels, 2016, p. 175)

Interestingly enough, even though being further away from the capital means having less access to resources, funding and power, it also means more autonomy, which the regions enjoy:

> Krasnoyarsk told another story. It testified to the adage I had heard so often in Russia's remote corners: "The farther from Moscow we live, the better" (Meier, 2003, p. 187)

Although in travel literature, the chronotope usually tends to be space dominated, in the case of travelogues about Russia, its temporal side is much more dramatic. The past/present dichotomy leaves little place for the future since, as David Greene puts it, "modern Russia seems to be living in a void", "careering down an uncertain path" (Greene, 2014, pp. 26–27). Yet another, more depressing view is best summarized by the final scene in Colin Thubron's book:

> Yuri says: "We're not the same as you in the West. Maybe we're more like you were centuries ago. We're late with our history here. With us, time still goes in circles" (Thubron, 1999, p. 341)

David Greene quotes the writer Mikhail Shishkin, who offered his own updated version of Gogol's troika and emphasized the repetitive pattern in Russia's historical development by comparing the country to a metro train that "travels from one end of a tunnel to the other – from order dictatorship to anarchy democracy, and back again" (Greene, 2014, p. 24). Thus, in the case of Russia, there is no linear development towards the Western-style modernity but, rather, there is a spiral or, in a worse scenario, a circle as the modernization is largely "mimicked" rather than actually achieved.

One of the points made by all the authors is the perceived inability or reluctance of Russian people to deal with the past ("confront the horror of the past") and to reflect about it, which, as is logically presumed, makes the Russians unable to achieve any kind of closure ("unburied past"). In his interview to BBC Book Club, Colin Thubron expressed his puzzlement over the way the former GULAG sites are treated in Russia and compared it to the way former concentration camps are turned into museums in Germany: in Russia, these sites just lie abandoned (Flynn, 2018). The same comparison is drawn by Andrew Meier, who, nevertheless, points out that "Germany started to examine its past only after an economic miracle", while Russia is still "economically, socially, and ideologically adrift" (Meier, 2003, p. 240).

David Greene, however, believes that it is precisely this inability to come to grips with the past that prevents the Russians from addressing the questions of the future, in fact, even prevents them from asking any questions about their current life:

> And across this vast country the emotion that remained constant was an uneasy frustration: Here are millions of people across different landscapes, climates, and communities, all with families they love and ideas to offer, but almost universally unable to answer some simple questions: Where is your country going? And what do *you* want for its future? (Greene, 2014, p. 27)

The word that frequently comes up in Greene's text is "mind-boggling" and the recurring theme in his travelogue, something that he finds particularly "mind-boggling" is the fact that while his and his wife's immediate reaction to things that seemed absurd or meaningless was to start asking questions, Russian people simply went through the whole process without questioning the reason for doing so (e.g. an episode of going through the unmanned security checkpoint at the railway station):

> Not everyone is a fighter. But there is a sense at home that if something seems unfair in life, there are places to turn – at work, or in a community. Maybe you won't get your way… Our system is far from perfect, and people are mistreated. But the overall spirit, the sense of possibility, the sense that you can raise your voice and have a chance to bring change, is something that exists at home, but not so much in Russia (Greene, 2014, p. 108)

This acceptance, patience and willingness to endure is one of the features that is described by all the authors as constituting the core of the Russian mentality, and summarized by Andrew Meier in the "hollow comfort" of the Russian word "*normal'no*":

> Everything in Russia after all was always normal. It was the understatement of the cosmonaut ascribed to his crash in space – and the recovery that followed. It was the charity the miners and survivors of Norilsk lent to their impossible lives. It was the illusion shared by the Russian soldiers who sorted the corpses from the Zone and the Chechens who bathed and buried the dead in Aldy (Meier, 2003, p. 483)

While villages are mostly depicted as archaic and derelict, half-abandoned places, devoid of any hope for the future, Russian cities are shown as having all the usual attributes of globalization such as McDonalds and international hotel chains, sitting side by side with Soviet-style blocks and a few older, nineteenth-century buildings. Anne Garrels describes the centre of Chelyabinsk, which looks completely Westernized and has a replica of an American diner "Pretty Betty", "elegant eateries in the neighbourhood with names like Venice, Basilio, Deja-Vu, Avignon, and Titanic", "the more sophisticated Wall Street Café", "full of young professionals sipping cappuccinos and single malt", clubs and bars (Garrels, 2016, p. 15). The mimicking character of this "Western-style" glamour becomes apparent when she tries to interview local musicians,

who are signing "Oh, Pretty Woman" in "flawless English" and are "indistinguishable from their Western counterparts in jeans and T-shirts" (Garrels, 2016, p. 16). As it turns out, apart from the songs' lyrics, they cannot speak any English at all. Another remarkable detail is that they get to sing British and American songs at "annual fests such as Police Day, Metallurgical Day, and Tank Day" (Garrels, 2016, p. 16), which immediately gives the story an unmistakable "Soviet-Russian" flavor.

In a similar way, the people from the "solid" Russian middle-class whom Anne Garrels interviewed demonstrate a mixture of "Western" tastes and preferences (they consume Western goods and technologies, get their education in the West and send their children to foreign schools and universities), but at the same time strong anti-Western views: they "harbor resentment, almost an outright hatred of the West" (Garrels, 2016, p. 27). Anne Garrels explains these contradictory sentiments by the search for modern Russian identity: "Russians are trying to figure out who they are and where they fit into the world. They embrace much of Western culture and the selective denial of what doesn't fit into the official "Russian" model seldom makes sense" (Garrels, 2016, p. 26). She criticizes this "Russian" way of blaming others instead of trying to accept responsibility and take care of the tasks at hand. Like Greene and Meier, she is also highly critical of the current political regime as it is becoming "increasingly totalitarian and returning to former dreams of empire" (Garrels, 2016, p. 33).

Russia's ambition to "out-West the West" is depicted in Andrew Meier's passage about the building of the "city of the future" – "Moscow Siti". In the travelogue, the story of this ambitious project is imbued with symbolism as the narrator describes a scene of a young Russian couple looking at the miniature model of this future city with "a set of translucent skyscrapers that burst from the city's heart":

> Like so many of the pilgrims who came to see this model of Moscow, they were eager and hopeful witnesses to the birth of the new Siti. They tried to locate their apartment in the model city, but it spun too fast…
> "Think it'll ever be built?" the elfin girl… asked her companion.
> "No", he replied. "Of course, not" (Meier, 2003, p. 29)

Similarly, attempts of other regions to modernize are presented as bound to failure due to greed and corruption of the authorities and passivity of the locals. This is how Andrew Meier describes Vladivostok:

> In 1992, the locals surveyed their bountiful inheritance – a huge merchant fleet and a cornucopia of timber, fish and furs – and dreamed of becoming a Russian Hong Kong. They envisioned a free economic zone blooming as freighters filled the ports, forming a bridge to the Asian markets close by. …Primorye, no longer a pliant colony of Moscow, said the new optimists, will join arms with the Pacific Rim, and, in a case study of globalization's fruits, arise from its post-Soviet slumber… sadly, a decade after opening up again, Vladivostok still awaited its revival. Instead of a boomtown, the traveler found the corrupt heart of the far eastern frontier, the modern update of the unbridled market that nineteenth-century visitors discovered (Meier, 2003, p. 266)

In the eyes of the Western observer, even the modern look of Russian cities is no more than "window-dressing". Andrew Meier quotes the opposition reporter Yuliya Latynina:

> "Don't expect any Renaissance", she liked to say. Russia had never even seen the Enlightenment. To understand the present morass, she argued, you needed to look only to the Middle Ages (Meier, 2003, p. 358)

All the narrators highlight the fact that they were seeking to interview members of the "young generation" and found them as passive and uninterested in "moving on" as the older generation:

> Zhenia may better fit the mold of a more prevalent young Russian – struggling to get by, satisfied to be near family, educated and familiar with the West but not clamoring to see or be part of it (Greene, 2014, p. 118)

This inability of the country to achieve the desired future and prosperity is explained differently: Greene and Meier share the opinion that it is primarily the inability to deal with the past, the "genetic memory" of the past and the fears haunting the older and younger generations of Russians that prevents them from shaking off their inertia and taking active steps to change the things they dislike:

> People were not taught to raise questions – because doing so could be dangerous, and really there was nowhere to turn for answers anyway. A foundation of Communist ideology and Soviet power was keeping people convinced that they had to accept their fate as it was – and that, in the end, this would be better for everyone. But this philosophy remains in the DNA, passed from one generation to the next, including to a younger one that so far shows little sign of extinguishing it (Greene, 2014, p. 121)

However, as David Greene points out the threat is not entirely unreal:

> What a strange purgatory Russians live in. For so many years they could not travel freely and took a major risk if they wrote or said anything critical of the government or anyone well connected… Today many of those restrictions are gone. Life is more free and open. And yet the fear remains. The risk remains. In a way, maybe clear limits of toleration are less fearsome than erratic limits of toleration. Uncertainty about being punished is more intimidating than certainty (Greene, 2014, p. 247)

As for Anne Garrels, she sees the cause of the problem in the "identity crisis" of the Russian people "over where their country fits into the overall global scheme" (Garrels, 2016, p. 187) combined with their "belief in their rightful place in the world", "rooted in their turbulent history" (Garrels, 2016, p. 27):

> The Soviet identity was in many ways an artificial construct, but it existed for a long while, and by the time it collapsed, who knew what Russia was or what being Russian meant? It turned out that "Russia" was not all about being democratic and loving freedom, as some might have thought when the Soviet Union collapsed… Now there is a searching, on many fronts, for a definition of what it means to be "Russia" in the twenty-first century (Garrels, 2016, p. 187)

Like the previous two, the third dichotomy – political/personal – also deals with the question of collective and individual autonomy. All the authors point out the perceptible lack of communal feeling and atomization of society. As the state encroaches on the rights of private citizens and increases its control over all spheres of social life, people seem to be satisfied with stoically enduring the hardships, preserving whatever individual freedom they have and not striving for more or trying to unite. This is surprising for a Western observer, who would expect an open protest, especially in blatant cases of social injustice, of which numerous examples are discussed in the texts. The atomization of society results in the lack of grassroots initiatives of any kind, although Anne Garrels takes care to describe several individual "success" stories of human rights and environmental activists and entrepreneurs. These, however, are far outnumbered by stories of once successful people who had to quit their businesses or campaigning because of the joint pressure from corrupt government officials, police and criminals. The virtually non-existent community life makes some respondents look back nostalgically at their life in Soviet communal apartments, in which their neighbours became a kind of "extended family" (Greene, 2014, p. 73).

In the atmosphere of general mistrust and the absence of any close ties within the local community, family remains the only form of close interactions between the people: their struggle with the state and the criminals (which often go hand in hand) begins and ends with the protection of their family. The coldness and alienation of people when in public creates a stark contrast to their warmth and hospitality when at home. David Greene tells the story of the Ural village of Sagra, whose inhabitants "took up hunting rifles and pitchforks on a summer night in July 2011 and defended the community against an approaching criminal gang" (Greene, 2014, p. 171). Not only did the villagers manage to scare away the intruders, but afterwards they also had to fight with the authorities that intended to press charges against them. However, even though the villagers had won both of these fights, to Greene's surprise, Andrei, one of the villagers he befriended, "didn't draw a connection between the battle his village waged and some broader fight for a different future for Russia" and demonstrated the general distrust of public activism and "democratic values" (Greene, 2014, p. 173). Thus, yet another paradox of Russian life is that being aware of the widely spread corruption and social injustice, most of the respondents still voice their preference towards "stability" and "strong leader" over democracy and freedom.

Thus, the dilemma of maintaining individual freedom vs. maintaining order and stability in the country is approached differently by different Russian people. The two figures that can serve as a litmus test in this choice are Vladimir Putin and Joseph Stalin as the embodiments of "strong power" or "strong leaders". As David Greene puts it, "Putin,

popular as ever, shrewd as always, also embodies a Russian soul that is unfamiliar to many in the West" (Greene, 2014, p. 14). In his interviews with Russian people of different social backgrounds, Greene tries to probe into the "secret" of Putin's popularity. After talking to Alexei, a successful US-educated businessman from Novosibirsk, Greene comes to the conclusion that "there's a window into what Putin is managing: something resembling democracy, a system that keeps him in power and makes people such as Alexei … satisfied, happy, and, so far, quiet" (Greene, 2014, p. 252). A similar view is expressed by one of Anne Garrels' respondents, who praises Putin as "a man who will restore the country's industry and its international standing", concluding with the saying: "When there is a fire, you don't ask who the fireman is" (Garrels, 2016, p. 35).

The narrators in all three travelogues seem to be much more mystified not by Putin's popularity, but by the lingering popularity of Joseph Stalin, seen as the notoriously evil dictator in the West. Greene's conversation with Taisiya, an activist for Baikal, gives him a sudden shock when to his question "What's the solution for today's Russia?" she "walks over to her bookcase and pulls out a book. It's called *Generalissimo*" (Greene, 2014, p. 274). Greene concludes this episode by saying:

> I came to visit Taisiya expecting to get a vision toward Russia's future. Here is a woman who has been inspired to take on the government, to challenge power. I am stunned to hear that she – of all people – has Stalin nostalgia. What a reminder of how complicated this Russian puzzle really is (Greene, 2014, p. 275)

Even being aware of the scale of persecutions in the Stalin era (Taisiya admits that "it was very bad"), many people are driven by the nostalgia for "order", believing that all it takes to eradicate corruption, lawlessness and abuse of authority is a truly "strong leader" and "discipline". This sentiment is supported by the rhetoric of the state media ("Putin's spin doctors", as Greene puts it), emphasizing Stalin's military and economic "achievements".

The last but not least, in the dichotomy between the personal and political, it is necessary to consider the environmental question, which is discussed at length by Anne Garrels. Since Soviet times, this has been one of the most sensitive issues of the Urals and the side effect of this region's industrial development. As Garrels points out, Chelyabinsk region has the reputation of "the most contaminated place on the planet" (Garrels, 2016, p. 162). Apart from the major environmental disaster caused by the accident at the plutonium-processing plant "Mayak" (also known in different periods as "Chelyabinsk 40"/"Chelyabinsk 65") and comparable to that in Chernobyl, in the Soviet and post-Soviet period there has been a continuing practice of dumping radioactive waste into the Techa River and Lake Karachay. The exact damage done to the local and regional community and to the environment remains unknown. The environmental activists Garrels interviewed maintained that this practice continued well into the 2000s. To make matters worse, some of the riverside villages, affected by the radiation, were never evacuated and remain there. "Most of those left behind were Bashkir or Tatar – a fact that has led over the years to charges of ethnic genocide" (Garrels, 2016, p. 170). There is an abundance of other examples of criminal negligence

and irresponsible behavior of the regional authorities and industrial enterprises. On the other hand, local communities are afraid to protest for the fear of even greater economic deprivation since shutdown of such enterprises might mean the loss of jobs for many members of these communities.

The alarming trend, according to Garrels, is that "Mayak" is now involved in the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel from Russian and foreign reactors and there are plans to expand this business while the fate of radioactive waste "remains unclear" as the regional authorities refuse to provide information about the ongoing proceedings and refuse to grant access to the complex to any Russian or international observers and experts (Garrels, 2016, p. 174). The authorities keep a close watch on the few environmental activists and are ready to stifle any dissent should the need arise. Similar to other cases of human rights violations, most of the regional community, though aware of the deteriorating environmental situation, choose not to protest and avoid open confrontations with the government.

References

Dickinson, S. (2007). Women's Travel and Travel Writing in Russia, 1700–1825. In W. Rosslyn & A. Tosi (Eds.), *Women in Russian Culture and Society, 1700–1825* (pp. 63–82). London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230589902_5

Flynn, D. (Producer). (2018, January 11). *Colin Thubron – In Siberia*. [Audio podcast]. Retrieved from: https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b09kx890

Garrels, A. (2016). *Putin Country. A Journey into the Real Russia*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Greene, D. (2014). *Midnight in Siberia. A Train Journey into the Heart of Russia*. New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company.

Johnson, C. (2002, June). Crossing the Border: Bruce Chatwin and Paul Theroux. *Antipodes*, 16(1), 59–63.

Khomyakov, M. (2017). Russia between East, West and North. In P. Wagner (Ed.), *The Moral Mappings of North and South* (pp. 72–106). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lisle, D. (2006). *The Global Politics of Contemporary Travel Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meier, A. (2003). *Black Earth. A Journey through Russia after the Fall.* New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company.

Thubron, C. (1999). *In Siberia*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Tlostanova, M. (2012). Postsocialist ≠ Postcolonial? On Post-Soviet Imaginary and Global Coloniality. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 48(2), 130–142. DOI: 10.1080/17449855.2012.658244

Zilcosky, J. (Ed.) (2008). *Writing Travel: the Poetics and Politics of the Modern Journey*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

ARTICLE

Self-Shooting Uterus-Owners: Examining the Selfies of Pregnant Transmen within the Politics of Human Reproduction

Aireen Grace T. Andal
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

ABSTRACT

This work examines how transmen pregnancy is found within the discourse of moralizing and pathologizing reproductive health. Moralization criticizes the "artificial" character of transpregnancy, and pathologization sees transpregnancy as rather "abnormal". This work analyses these discursive contentions with case of the increasing public visibility of pregnant transmen through selfies. A commonplace reading of these transpregnant selfies can be, on the one hand, extended forms of othering or, on the other hand, emancipation from moralization and pathologization. However, this work argues that the visual display of transpregnant bodies is neither a form of othering nor gaining recognition but rather a suspension to moralization and pathologization of trans-identities. Transmen pregnancy has the character of both disrupting the concept of pregnancy-as-usual and at the same time evokes a very familiar experience of human reproduction. This thus gives transpregnant selfies their liminal character of both abnormal and normal at the same time. Given that transpregnancy is still a new subject for philosophical inquiry, this work hopes to contribute to the literature by surfacing some of transpregnancy's ethical dimensions when juxtaposed in the cyberspace.

KEYWORDS

transpregnancy, transman, selfie, moralization, pathologization, transbody

Human Reproduction in the Digital Public Spectacle

A pregnant body is found under the public's constant monitoring, and is "by no means a private matter" (Hanson, 2004). With the gaze of the public eye, the pregnant body serves as a "text of culture… [and] practical, direct locus of social control" (Bordo, 1989), with a temporary identity that co-exists with a multiplicity of other identities in a single person, which are experienced simultaneously and are jointly constitutive. As such, while pregnancy is a biological process that is ascribed to the female sex and even to a gender role and performance (Kang, 1997), deviations from this expectation is evident such as in the case of transpregnancy. Pregnant trans people[1] are under special gaze of the public because they are considered as a transgressor of nature who deviate from reproductive norms such as "natural" female pregnancy (Lindner et al., 2012). In the age of the digital media, transpregnancy has even become more public than it has ever been. For one, the digital media is of particular interest for transpregnancy as they are both criticized for being "unreal"; the former being filtered/edited, and the latter being a modification of natural biological features. But more importantly, unlike the limited discussions in LGBT community forums, the academe, or non-government organizations, transpregnancy as content has expanded through social media sites, which has implications on how the body operates in a wider range of public. However, little attention has been given to the examination of the link between transbodies in the cyberspace.

This work examines transpregnancy under a specific form of digital media – the selfie. Within the online realm, the selfie "ha[s] changed… public behavior. It's become a new visual genre" (Saltz, 2014). With the pervasive use of smartphones with cameras, "extensive taking of self-portrait photographs has become a global phenomenon" (Duggan, 2015), which "has shifted from third person professional authors and editors towards the first-person authors of the selfie" (Čuš Babič et. al., 2018, p. 2). While not as many as photos compared to online news, selfies from pregnant transmen[2] are surfacing in social media such as Instagram, Pinterest, Twitter and Tumblr with #transpregnancy or #pregnancy for all as the main hashtags for such posts. Taking a selfie as one of the main means of sharing images online has become popular in pregnancy documentations, mommy blogging and other social media activities including transpregnancies. It is within this context that this work investigates on how transpregnant selfies reveal how the body can be "known, understood and experienced through images" (Coleman, 2008, p. 168).

This work also sees the relevance of analyzing transpregnancies as manifested in selfies for this dynamic it offers a window to see the connection

[1] The use of the term "trans" both refer to trans sexual and transgender people; the former refers to those that had undergone sexual reassignment surgery and the latter are those that practice gender-based transitions (Skidmore, 2011).

[2] Individuals who identify as men but were assigned female sex at birth.

between two ventures that seem to be under tension, though not necessarily incompatible – (1) self-expression and recognition, and (2) extended objectification. Posting transpregnant selfies can serve as an emancipatory activity of expressing one's identity (Kozinets et al., 2017; Marwick, 2010; Schwarz, 2015) but at the same time it may also mean placing oneself under the objectifying gaze of the digital public (Lindner et al., 2012). What complicates selfies as means of either self-expression or objectification is its personal character. Note that unlike images from news shot by professionals, selfies are taken by the transpregnant persons themselves, which is a personal and voluntary act. A selfie is not just an ordinary "self-portrait photograph of oneself (or of oneself and other people)"; it has a personal effort of being "taken with a camera or a camera phone held at arm's length or pointed at a mirror, which is usually shared through social media" (Sorokowski et al., 2015, p. 124).

Since selfies involve "control over the final look of portrait photographs, at least on social media" (Čuš Babič et. al., 2018, p. 2), it raises the question whether or not this seeming "control" is a sign of empowerment or further self-policing. As a response to the gap in the literature that frames transpregnancy as falling into the category of either only objectification or only emancipation, this study argues for the need to analyze the dynamics of the selfie's double-edged character. An analysis of either only the objectifying or emancipating character of selfies is rather limited since selfies operate under the dynamic culture of sharing, following, reacting and commenting as facilitated by the online environment. This work therefore asks what is the selfie's place in the struggle for trans-identity expression in the context of a constant digital public scrutiny. In theoretical terms, the contribution of this analysis rests on its attempt to regard the transbody as a venue of the interplay between the transbody and the digital media. The text is structured in such manner: (1) classic moralizing and pathologizing tendencies to objectify the transbody; (2) objectifying and emancipatory potentials of transpregnancy through selfies; (3) synthesizing the two interpretations through analyzing the implications of the presence of pregnant transmen selfies on social media.

Unnatural and Abnormal: Classic Discourses on Transbody

Reproductive health is not new to moral and pathological imperatives, the former pertains to viewing actions into the categories of good and evil rather than merely unpleasant, impractical or senseless (Skitka et al., 2018; Rozin, 1999), and the latter being a process of viewing subjects as psychological issues (Stritzke & Scaramuzza, 2016). Morality and pathology are interconnected such that both feed discourse of seeing natural processes as being an exceptionally well-suited domain for everyone to adhere to. As such, framing "natural" as desirable makes the case for both moral and pathologization of any condition that deviates from what is deemed as natural. For instance, pregnancy out of wedlock is moralized as ethically undesirable and pathologized as mental health problems to maintain monogamy. Another example is the age of getting pregnant, which

has a set of moral acceptability, and when someone failed to comply can be seen as aggression. Who gets pregnant by whom is also taken as a moral and pathological issue especially in the context of incest and professionalism (i.e. teacher-student issue).

In the case of transpregnancy, the concept of the "natural" is very pertinent as trans people are usually described as "[a]nything that disrupts, denaturalizes, rearticulates, and makes visible the normative linkages… between the biological specificity of the sexually differentiated human body, the social roles and statuses that a particular form of body is expected to occupy" (Stryker, 2018, p. 3). With this comes a combined implication of moralization and pathologization to transpregnancy is when it is seen as both wrong and deviant. While moralization and pathologization of transsexualism and transgenderism have not escaped criticisms (i.e. oppressive and controlling), most of these criticisms were raised before the medical field started to talk about the possibility of pregnancy for the trans community. So, while there is greater degree, to which gender diverse people experience social inclusion, in terms of pregnancy, transsexualism and transgenderism has not gone far. Understanding these patterns allows for seeing how emerging social practices can offer insights and contribute to understanding of identities, and their relation to societal constructions of reproduction and gender (Cockerham, 2012). Critical findings in this study will hopefully provide a measure of the magnitude of what has been achieved thus far by surfacing out the often-marginalized voices in the socio-political arena.

Against the Artificial: Moralization of the Transbody

Activities of trans people are of particular interest to moralization because some of trans people's affairs are ambiguously morally contentious such as changing names and sex identification in their documents. However, when it comes to bodily alterations such as sexual reassignment surgery and taking up hormones, trans people activities can be seen as controversial enough to enter the moralization discourse. This moralization is contained within one side of a natural/unnatural and familiar/strange binary opposition, seeing the natural and familiar as "good" and seeing the unnatural and strange as harmful as with the "invalids," "defectives," and "mutants". This artificiality is not a new issue deeply ingrained in the reproductive health domain. From using contraceptives to fetal surgery and gene editing or "designer babies," embarking on the artificial sparks ethical concerns. It is therefore not surprising to expect moralization of transpregnancy. As such, being thought of as only possible among females, transpregnancy carries with it an embedded controversy in taking part on something artificial. The literature has not been silent on the issue on artificiality, albeit scarce. The most common research found concerning transsexualism and transgenderism and pregnancy is on surrogacy. In the past decade, the literature has paid attention on the experiences of pregnant transmen. Indeed, the most salient discussions are linked to the artificiality of trans people in themselves, followed by the artificiality of being parents.

Given that trans people have not "permanently changed their social genders without permanently altering their genitals" (Stryker, 2018, p. 123), the issue lies in its "incompatibility" to foster an offspring. This incompatibility can be deemed as undesirable under the discourse that what is unnatural is likely to be threatening and ugly as opposed to what is deemed as natural. Transpregnancy is unnatural not in the sense of not existing, but by being too different and something other than pregnancy-as-usial, therefore a possible harmful situation. Indeed, one of the issues that usually attract moral discourse is related to activities considered as harmful to be not moral (Schein & Gray, 2016). For instance, smoking is a case that had been moralized from being seen as an individual choice to being morally debatable (Rozin, 1999). Much of the moralization of transpregnancy rests on this issue on conflating the unfamiliar as harmful. This also touches the (presumed) issue on some "unnecessary dangers" that trans people practice (i.e. hormones replacement). Put differently, the associated artificiality to the lifestyles of trans people frames trans-identity as unpleasant thereby legitimizing any moral judgment against it. Framing artificiality in terms of incurring risks renders "naturalness" as a well-deserved standard for moralization, which subjects trans-identity against moral norms. Consequently, being viewed as antagonistic to nature comes together with trans people's "symbolic annihilation" or their lack of representation within the larger public (Gerbner, 1972, p. 43). Through moralization, transpregnancy fulfils a role for the "normal" in confirming themselves as put together and appropriate. When viewed in this context, transpregnancy functions to reinforce categories of normality, in which types of pregnancy seem to be either excluded from or included. That is to say, it facilitates the "othering" of the transpregnant person, as establishing social processes that identify certain categories of people in society as less "normal" than others.

Abnormal Body and Desire: Pathologized Transpregnancy

Transpregnancy is pathologized in terms of being seen as an abnormal fertility situation and desire arising from expectations that trans people cannot reproduce. Observing abnormalitiies has also been a common sex and gender issue. For instance, wherever possible, surgeries are made available to "correct" cases that are outside the binary norms (e.g. intersexuality) as soon after birth as possible. Trans people who desire to desire and/or become pregnant then are pathologized because their situations are seemingly incompatible with the usual pregnancy processes even though "[n]ew reproductive technologies have particularly challenged our ways of thinking about human reproduction" (Cranny-Francis et al., p. 192 cited in Stritzke & Scaramuzza, 2016). For instance, desiring pregnancy for non-parent transwomen is seen as encounters of "non-innate concepts" or a non-default for transwomen. Framing the non-innate discourse against trans people establishes the norm of an exclusive desire for pregnancy among those who were assigned as females at birth. It normalizes the concept of modifying the body as a legitimate pathological issue. Transpregnancy is not only desired by transwomen,

transmen also decide to retain their uterus, get pregnant, and give birth but their case is also seen as problematic eve to the point of "threatening or attempting to remove their children from their care" (Hoffkling, Obedin-Maliver & Sevelius, 2017, p. 12). This relies on pathologizing desires of trans people to be pregnant as deviations from what is ''normal''.

As much as transpregnancy is pathologized as an abnormal desire, it is also linked to disability, which has not yet achieved that cultural recognition comparable to other gender-related issues (Garland-Thomson, 1997). Hence, pathologizing transpregnancy promotes a portrayal of trans people as both physically and psychologically inferior. This type of pathologizing can conflict with the goal of psychiatry itself, that is, to foster healthy mental states, as it may appear to do the exact opposite. According to STP, International Campaign Stop Trans Pathologization[3], an international activist initiative working for trans depathologization, the practice of pathologizing activities of trans people increases the sources of anxiety or insecurity that the trans-community might have with their identity. Moreover, this framing also comes with pressuring those who have female bodies (reproductive organs and hormones) to have the responsibility of bearing children. So, as it transgresses biological normativity, transpregnancy remains outside the boundaries of moral and mental comfort and expectations. This type of rhetoric, connecting desire and disability, sees transpregnancy as a problematic relationship between trans-identity and health. Transpregnancy then is framed as a health risk, which situates the transbody as unfit to carry out the process of pregnancy compared to a "healthier" female pregnancy. The pathologization gains legitimacy especially when expressed in the form of medical diagnosis.

Amateur Self-Shooters: Transpregnancy Enters the Online World

In bringing the moralizing and pathologizing discourses of transpregnancy to the space of digital media, two main trajectories immediately surface (1) a continued moralization and pathologization take place in a cyber platform; or (2) the digital media offers a means to lessen, if not eradicate, objectification by being a space of self-expression. Indeed, there is reasonable grounds to both claims. On the one hand, studies show that selfie postings and viewings encourage body policing and self-regulation (Jeffreys, 2014), which create higher levels of self-objectification (Lindner, Tantleff-Dunn & Jentsch, 2012), body dissatisfaction, and feeling the need for positive comments (McLean, Paxton, Wertheim & Masters, 2015; Chua & Chang, 2016). But on the other hand, recent research has suggested that posting selfies serves more communicative purposes of self-expression (Schwarz, 2010) or self-embellishment (Marwick, 2015), than mere reifying the neoliberal pathos of narcissism. For instance, Kozinets et al., (2017) suggest that selfie postings are not necessarily self-referential acts of vanity, but rather an innovative means of communicating one's inner state. Moreover, feeling in control of one's image is found to be the key for those who take

---

[3] https://www.stp2012.info/old/en

selfies feel as though they are in control of their own images. For instance, women posting sexualized selfies on Tumblr felt liberated as they were able to express themselves (Tiidenberg & Cruz, 2015).

However, this work considers the case of transpregnant selfies a manifestation of trans-identity agency that veers away from the binary interpretation of being either othering or empowering. This work argues that selfies of transcend this dichotomy by having a unifying character of both normal and abnormal at the same time. Within a digital space that sets a range of what is "normal, natural and inevitable" (Gill, 2007, p. 114), the selfies of transpregnant bodies serve as a pinch point where personal meanings converge with both the normative and deviant. Because of a personal and amateur character, the transpregnant's images reflect what Barthes (1981) call the "punctum" or the subtle properties of an image that are provoking, vexing and "piercing" on both the normal and abnormal character of transpregnancy.

Beyond Othering as Experience

Due to the popularity of activism and advocacy in the cyberspace, it is no wonder to read a compilation of analytical clichés about the objectification of the unreflective pregnant transmen. Critics of displaying transbodies also bring out the issue of ableism and the concept of freakery wherein transbodies participate in an exhibition of human abnormality (Bogdan, 1996), appealing directly to "our most fundamental categories of self-definition and boundaries dividing self from otherness" (Grosz, 1996). While it can be argued that the transbodies are en-freakened and objectified due to their unorthodox corporealities, this work argues that the tendency of transpregnancy to be spectacularized as freakish is not merely a form of "othering" but rather an "affirmative freakery" (Fancy, 2018), that is, an affirmation of difference and freakiness outside of discourses of "non-normativity" and pathology (Fancy, 2018, p. 159). Note that the transpregnant body is different from bodies with inborn or congenital abnormality. Having an inborn body abnormality is seen with "authenticity" while having a trans-identity is rather "self-made", choosing to forgo a normal status (Stulman-Dennett, 1997).

Moreover, to interpret the transpregnant selfies as further objectification is to assume pregnant transmen as passive narrators rather than active participants in the digital public sphere who are capable of reflection. These immediate reading of pregnant transmen selfies as a form of objectification, while has its own merits, nullify preceding practice of agency by pregnant transmen. These antecedent forms of agency have at least two levels. First, the transition towards manhood is a form of agency to defy the moralized and pathologized view against trans-identities. Second, being pregnant takes transmen identities to another level of agency by transgressing another set of expectations of manhood, allowing for a more complex understanding of trans-identities. Thus, visually displaying the transpregnant body, the products of transmen agency, cannot be interpreted as passivity because to do so is to ignore the antecedents from where this public display of their transpregnant bodies took off.

Beyond Recognition as Goal

Just because transmen pregnancies sidestep "othering", does not mean that it is a form of gaining recognition either. These selfies are not new ways to defy the moralized and pathologized trans-identities. On the contrary, these selfies emphasize the similarities among uterus-owning bodies, thus transcending issues of recognition. The visual display of the transpregnant body focuses on how being pregnant is a shared experience by those who share similar biological prerequisite for human reproduction. Given that visibility does not necessarily equate to social power (Phelan, 1993), the selfies of pregnant transmen have more to do with transcending the natural-artificial dichotomy than with seeking recognition of the artificial transbody. The pregnant transmen's presentation of their bodies is an example of how letting go of a "normal" status does not preclude them from utilizing their female organs, just like any other person with a womb. Whereas transmen's visible physical transformation can seem excessive, shocking, and socially "out of place", the ways, in which transpregnancy intersects with freakery occurs with an amount of security and not offered up to "the voyeuristic property of the non-disabled gaze" (Hevey, 1992, p. 72). This raises the question: what kind of connection does this practice forge to the moralizing and pathologizing tendencies of transpregnancy? There are at least three aspects of transpregnancy that do not signify any trans-identity-seeking recognition among the transmen selfies: 1) beyond trans-identity issue 2) beyond enhancement-related procedure and 3) beyond issues of victimhood.

First, just because transmen have public displays of transpregnancy does not mean that transpregnancy is only an issue of trans-identities. This practice extends to all uterus-owning bodies that do not satisfy bodily conventions such as, but by no means limited to, agender, bigender, demiboy/girl, genderfluid, genderfuck, genderqueer, and intergender. The language, under which transpregnancy thrives is the language of a maternal organism with terms such as "maternity", "birth", "offspring" among others, which are definitely not restricted to trans people. It is in this shared sense of reality with other womb owners that transpregnancy does not fall into simple trans-identity issues. Additionally, the accumulation of selfie uploads among pregnant transmen take place in the context of a relatively high level of advocates of "body-positive" online where the issue is about pregnancy shaming in general rather than gender politics. This highlights that as much as gender is politically-charged, transpregnancy is not exclusively grounded on gender struggles.

Second, while selfies cannot be completely isolated from aesthetic recognition, the transformation of the transpregnant body itself is not primarily about enhancement. Unlike documenting enhancement bodily transformations for trans people such as plastic surgery, moralizing and pathologizing norms do not have strong penetrative power over the photos of transpregnancy. As Kozinets et al., (2017) emphasize, selfies are more than mere narcissistic displays of the self, making it beyond moral and pathological discourses on trans-identity, which are

usually concerned with issues of authenticity. Since transmen are uterus-owners, there is little, if any, to moralize and pathologize about their transpregnancy selfies. And hence, there is nothing to gain recognition about. The selfies of pregnant transmen come with impulses to observe one's corporeal transformation beyond retaliation.

Finally, these selfies are rather displaying the similarities among bodies that share the same reproductive features than it is about highlighting the need to recognize diversity in gender and sexuality. By taking selfies, the transpregnant body expresses its connection to other bodies rather than presenting the struggles of an "interiorized" body (Bartky, 1990). While transpregnant selfies can be forms of advocacy and activism, these images do not come as suffering, pain or anything unpleasant. Rather, transpregnancy demonstrates that gender categorization does not justify disparate treatment among uterus-owning bodies. By presupposing a normative difference and not a hierarchy, transmen pregnancy exposes the political nature of that difference and counter its devaluation. Note that that some online interactions are potentially victimizing against pregnant transmen such as discriminating comments and trolls. However, these tendencies are much less about cis-pregnancy normativity than it is about the culture of feedback-giving and feedback-seeking on the online community (Leibold & Schwarz, 2015).

Suspending the Politics of Uterus-Owners

This work argues that, as an affirmative freakery, transmen pregnancy is rather a suspension of moralization and pathologization of transsexualism and transgenderism. It espouses a momentary dismissal of a gendered take of the body by serving as a reminder that pregnancy is not only women's concerns but a "uterus-owner's issue" (Stoffer, cited in Burkett, 2015). The pregnant transman's body, in its presumed state of a maternal organism, deviates in a way that the other transbodies cannot (i.e. transwomen, intersex), that is, it "arouses the contradictory responses of denial and recognition, disgust and empathy, exclusion and identification" (Shildrick, 2002, p. 17). Transmen pregnancy has the character of both disrupting the concept pregnancy-as-usual but at the same time demonstrates a very familiar experience of human reproduction that in itself "breaks with the conventions of desirability at any historical moment garners an unseemly attention for itself as the very product of its deviance" (Mitchell & Snyder, 2000). Compared to other trans people bodily alterations such as surgeries and hormone replacements, transpregnancy gains the most empathy because it as much as it can be strange, pregnancy is not treated as "simply exotic outliers to be sought for thrill, thrall, and titillation" (Fancy, 2018, p. 156).

Trans-identity bodily alterations may indeed justify normative gender performance by subscribing to some binary categories, but it does not mean that transbodies are always subject to this categorization. Whilst not without criticism and doubt about transmen's sense of agency, pregnant transmen's public images are neither subscription to cis-normativity nor what Foucault would call "voluntary

inservitude, of reflective indocility" (Foucault, 1996, p. 386). Rather, these images are representations of an active engagement of one's transbody to an audience wherein the transpregnant body "not an object, but a full-fledged participant of the dialogue with the viewer. She is turned to us and looks active" (Kress and Theo van Leeuwen, 2001 cited in Orekh & Bogomiagkova, 2017). Hence, the transpregnant self-shooting reflects the experiences of transmen, which cannot be easily reduced to either "othering" or to gaining recognition, but which exceeds the possibilities of what are constituted as normative corporeality of pregnant bodies in contemporary societies.

Transmen's conscious "self-made" freakery is coupled with the given knowledge that uterus-owners can be pregnant. Transmen pregnancy resists the constraining and contorting role that moralizing and pathologizing discourses on reproduction; and through selfies, it enforce upon bodies an agency through "renarrativization... and shifting to different narratives than ones of victimhood" (Fancy, 2018, p. 158). Through this "renarrativized" identities, transpregnant body defers the fetishized categorizations of corporealities, outside of morally and pathologically restricting reproductive embodiment and self-definition. The transpregnant body continues to interrupt the normative character of cis-pregnant bodies' privileged status among the reproductive health discourses thereby the "process of exotification, channeled anxiety and projection are challenged" (Fancy, 2018, p. 159). Transpregnant selfies leaves away the binary opposition of bodies and images as subjects and objects "because the practice merges the subject and the object already on the material level" (Tiidenberg & Cruz, 2015). By taking selfies of their pregnant transbodies, the transmen self-shooters initiate a self-narration and affirmation of their transformation.

Further Issues on Reproductive Freedom(s)

Beyond the issues of the objectifying nature of moralization and pathologization, or the potentials of gaining empowerment via selfies, the entire activity of transpregnant self-shooting, posting and sharing might fall into the same trap that oppressed and marginalized the trans community. Transpregnant selfies may have suspended layers of dichotomous view on reproduction norms but it may also contain oppressive elements towards the other end of uterus-owners-the childfree by choice. If there is something to be vigilant of transpregnant selfies, it is its potential to place pronatalism on the pedestal and idealize pregnancy as a desirable end for all womb owners (e.g. #pregnancyforall campaign). Voluntary childlessness, or an active choice, commitment, and permanence regarding the decision not to parent (Houseknecht, 1987; Park, 2002), has been stigmatized by the same rhetoric of reproductive norms that marginalized the practice of transpregnancy. This takes the same normal vs abnormal argument whereby the decision to be childless is "deviant" or abnormal while choosing to be a parent is "normal" (Gillespie, 2000; Graham et al., 2013). Indeed, childfree individuals have been subjected into various constructions outside of the normal realm,

such as (1) deficient or meaningless people; (2) psychologically unstable; or (3) selfish individuals (Morison & Macleod, 2015). The moralizing and pathologizing tendencies towards voluntary childlessness take effect through applying the same normative expectation of parenthood to those who opt not to bear children (Moore, 2014). Moreover, not all trans people have the desire to experience transpregnancy. And if they expressed even a little hostility against transpregnancy, they will be labelled not only as against transpregnancy but against trans-identities themselves. It is in this sense of embracing the norm of pronatalism that the digital visibility of transpregnancy becomes rather oppressive of others. The real potential violence of the self-taken photo sharing online is that it can further displace some uterus-owners control over their own desires and bodies.

Fortunately, the same space of the digital media has become hospitable for uterus-owners, to construct their identities through childfree communities. These online communities have become a venue for disrupting the governing constructions of female identity, to which pregnancy is central (Shapiro, 2014). What this suggests then is the importance of vigilance in seeing how images in the online world create forcible framings of the trans-identity for self-presentation and idealization in an economy of attention and rating (i.e. "likes" and 5-stars). The selfie as a visual code shapes and reshapes our ideas of what is worth sharing, what is worth looking at, and what should garner our attention to notice and comment on. The selfies have created a particular grammar and, even more importantly, criteria of seeing. For the pregnant transmen, the most grandiose result of the selfie enterprise is to give them the sense that they can somehow hold and choose their own realities as a compendium of digital images.

Conclusion

Transpregnancy has the potential to provide a levelling discourse to neutralize worshipping the natural, as supported by technological innovations in the medical field, and the rising popularity of de-pathologization of disability. From an ideological standpoint, however, the selfies will continue to be scrutinized. When looking for signs of agency and emancipation, a selfie may not be the most useful kind of frame of references. However, with a focus upon the dynamic between the self-shooter and cultural context, and with an interest in how pregnant transmen establish trans-identity, the selfie's function takes on more complex dimensions, and the idea of valuing a typical selfie is more tenable. Rather than defining the pregnant transmen's selfies as just another trite expression, we might define the transpregnant selfie as a commonplace figurative expression that displays an immediate interaction of two polarized entities: (1) the unusual transbody, and (2) the ordinary discourse of the online culture. Such an interpretation does not applaud the selfies, but at the same time, it does not instantly assign limited expectations to the function of the selfie. The selfies from those who stand outside the sphere of society's definition of acceptable childbearers forged in the crucible of difference are reflective of the various ways the body could be different and the same, in various levels, all at once.

Giddens (1991) notes that individuals of modernity tend to be "self-reflexive" in resolving who they are and who they should be. This in turn makes the trans self to be "project" that individuals have to build thereby creating a biographical "narrative" that allows them to understand themselves, and hence sustain a coherent and consistent identity. The selfies add layers to this project by allowing the pregnant transmen to leave behind the moralized and pathologized take on trans-identities. The selfies prove to show that "bodies are involved more actively, more intimately, and more intricately in social processes than theory has usually allowed. Bodies participate in social action by delineating courses of social conduct – the body is a participant in generating social practice" Nagoshi (2010). Whilst images can reify gender biases through ways of participating in pregnancy, and therefore, help propagate unyielding limits placed on maternal and paternal roles, nevertheless, images, especially selfies also transcend normativity of the body. Finally, the selfies of transpregnant bodies also demonstrate that identity as constructed and changing rather than fixed (Giddens, 1991). Not all trans people may have strong political interest in the trans-identity struggle or not see gender as a political identity but what the selfies reflect is the "lived experience" of the trans body as it is constructed into the digital world.

References

Barthes, R. (1981). *Camera Lucida*. New York, NY: The Noonday Press.

Bartky, S. L. (1990). *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bogdan, R. (1996). The Social Construction of Freaks. In R. G. Thomson (Ed.), *Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body*. New York & London: New York University Press.

Bordo, S. R. (1989). The Body and the Reproduction of Femininity: A Feminist Appropriation of Foucault. In Alison M. Jaggar and Susan R. Bordo (Eds.), *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing* (pp. 13–33). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Burkett, E. (2015, 6 June). What Makes a Woman? *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/07/opinion/sunday/what-makes-a-woman.html

Chua, T. H. H., & Chang, L. (2016). Follow Me and Like My Beautiful Selfies: Singapore Teenage Girls' Engagement in Self-Presentation and Peer Comparison on Social Media. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 55, 190–197. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.09.011

Cockerham, W. C. (2012). The Intersection of Life Expectancy and Gender in a Transitional State: The Case of Russia. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 34(6), 943–957. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01454.x

Coleman, R. (2008). The Becoming of Bodies. *Feminist Media Studies,* 8(2), 163–179. DOI: 10.1080/14680770801980547

Čuš Babič, N., Ropert, T., & Musil, B. (2018). Revealing Faces: Gender and Cultural Differences in Facial Prominence of Selfies. *PLoS ONE*, 13(10), 1–12. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0205893

Duggan, M. (2015). Mobile Messaging and Social Media 2015. *Pew Research Center.* Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/19/mobile-messaging-and-social-media-2015

Fancy, D. (2018). Affirmative Freakery, Freaky Methodologies: Circus and Its Bodies Without Organs in Disability Circus. *Performance Matters,* 4(1-2), 151–162.

Foucault, M. (1996). What is Critique? In Schmidt (Ed.), *What is Enlightenment?* (Kevin Paul Geiman, trans.) (pp. 382–398). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Garland-Thomson, R. (1997). *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Gillespie, R. (2000). When No Means No: Disbelief, Disregard and Deviance as Discourses of Voluntary Childlessness. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 23(2), 223–234.

Gillespie, R. (2001). Contextualizing Voluntary Childlessness Within a Postmodern Model of Reproduction: Implications for Health and Social Needs. *Critical Social Policy*, 21(2), 139–159. DOI: 10.1177/026101830102100201

Gerbner, G. (1972). Violence and Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions. In G. A. Comstock & E. Rubenstein (Eds.), *Television and Social Behaviour* (pp. 28–187). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Gill, R. (2007). *Gender and the Media*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Graham, M., Hill, E., Taket, A., & Shelley, J. (2013). Why are Childless Women Childless? Findings from an Exploratory Study in Victoria, Australia. *Journal of Social Inclusion*, 4(1), 70–89.

Grosz, E. (1996). Intolerable Ambiguity: Freaks as/at the Limit. In R. G. Thomas (Eds.), *Freakery: Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body*. New York & London: New York University Press.

Hanson, C. (2004). *A Cultural History of Pregnancy: Pregnancy, Medicine and Culture, 1750–2000*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hevey, D. (1992). *The Creatures Time Forgot: Photography and Disability Imagery*. London: Routledge.

Hoffkling, A., Obedin-Maliver, J., & Sevelius, J. (2017). From Erasure to Opportunity: a Qualitative Study of the Experiences of Transgender Men Around Pregnancy and Recommendations for Providers. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 17(Suppl 2), 332. DOI: 10.1186/s12884-017-1491-5

Houseknecht, S. K., (1982). Voluntary Childlessness – Toward a Theoretical Integration. *Journal of Family Issues*, 3, 459–471.

Jeffreys, S. (2014). *Beauty and Misogyny: Harmful Cultural Practices in the West* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge.

Kang, M.-E. (1997). The Portrayal of Women's Images in Magazine Advertisements: Goffman's Gender Analysis Revisited. *Sex Roles*, 37, 979–996. DOI: 10.1007/BF02936350

Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London, UK: Routledge.

Kozinets, R., Gretzel U., & Dinhopl, A. (2017). Self in Art/Self as Art: Museum Selfies as Identity Work. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 8, 731. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00731

Leibold, N., & Schwarz, L. M. (2015). The Art of Giving Online Feedback. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, 15(1), 34–46.

Lindner, D., Tantleff-Dunn, S., & Jentsch, F. (2012). Social Comparison and the "Circle of Objectification". *Sex Roles*, 67, 222–235. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-012-0175-x

Marwick, A. E. (2015). Instafame: Luxury Selfies in the Attention Economy. *Public Culture*, 27(175), 137–160. DOI: 10.1215/08992363-2798379

McLean, S. A., Paxton, S. J., Wertheim, E. H., & Masters, J. (2015). Photoshopping the Selfie: Self Photo Editing and Photo Investment are Associated with Body Dissatisfaction in Adolescent Girls. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 48(8), 1132–1140. DOI: 10.1002/eat.22449

Mitchell, D. T., & Snyder, S. L. (2000). *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Moore, J. K. (2014). Reconsidering Childfreedom: A Feminist Exploration of Discursive Identity Construction in Childfree Live Journal Communities. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 37(2), 158–180. DOI: 10.1080/07491409.2014.909375

Morison, T., & Macleod, C. (2015). *Men's Pathways to Parenthood: Silences and Gendered Norms*. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

Mulder, L. B. (2008). The Difference between Punishments and Rewards in Fostering Moral Concerns in Social Decision Making. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 44(6), 1436–1443. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2008.06.004

Nagoshi, J., & Brzuzy, S. (2010). Transgender Theory: Embodying Research and Practice. *Affilia*, 25(4), 431–443. DOI: [10.1177/0886109910384068](10.1177/0886109910384068)

Orekh, E., & Bogomiagkova, E. (2017). "Being on Trend": Selfie as a Social Phenomenon. *International Journal of Digital Society*, 8(1), 1238–1243.

Park, K. (2002). Stigma Management among the Voluntarily Childless. *Sociological Perspectives*, 45(1), 21–45. DOI: [10.1525/sop.2002.45.1.21](10.1525/sop.2002.45.1.21)

Phelan, P. (1993). *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London, UK: Routledge.

Rozin, P. (1999). The Process of Moralization. *Psychological Science,* 10(3), 218–221. DOI: [10.1111/1467-9280.00139](10.1111/1467-9280.00139)

Saltz, J. (2014). Art at Arms' Length: A History of the Selfie. *New York Magazine*, 47, 71–75.

Schein, C., & Gray, K. (2016). Moralization and Harmification: The Dyadic Loop Explains How the Innocuous Becomes Harmful and Wrong. *Psychological Inquiry*, 27(1), 62–65. DOI: [10.1080/1047840X.2016.1111121](10.1080/1047840X.2016.1111121)

Shapiro, G. (2014). Voluntary Childlessness: A Critical Review of the Literature. *Studies in the Maternal*, 6(1), 1–15. DOI: [10.16995/sim.9](10.16995/sim.9)

Shildrick, M. (2002). *Embodying the Monster: Encounters with the Vulnerable Self.* London: Sage.

Skidmore, E. (2011). Constructing the "Good Transsexual": Christine Jorgensen, Whiteness, and Heteronormativity in the Mid-Twentieth-Century Press. *Feminist Studies*, 37(2), 270–300.

Skitka, L. J., Hanson, B. E, Washburn, A. N., & Mueller, A. B. (2018). Moral and Religious Convictions: The Same or Different Things? *PloS ONE*, 13(6), 1–18. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0199311

Sorokowski, P., Sorokowska, A., Oleszkiewicz, A., Frackowiak, T., Huk, A., & Pisanski, K. (2015). Selfie Posting Behaviors are Associated with Narcissism among Men. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 8(5), 123–127. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.004

Stritzkea, N., & Scaramuzza, E. (2016). Trans, Intersex, and the Question of Pregnancy: Beyond Repronormative Reproduction. In S. Horlacher (Ed.), *Transgender and Intersex: Theoretical, Practical, and Artistic Perspectives* (pp. 141–164). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan US. DOI: [10.1057/978-1-349-71325-7_6](10.1057/978-1-349-71325-7_6)

Stryker, S. (2018)*. Transgender History.* Berkeley: Seal.

Stulman-Dennett, A. (1997). *Weird and Wonderful: The Dime Museum in America*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Schwarz, O. (2010). On Friendship, Boobs and the Logic of the Catalogue: Online Self-Portraits as a Means for the Exchange of Capital. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 16(2), 163–183.

Tiidenberg, K., & Cruz, E. G. (2015). Selfies, Image and the Re-Making of the Body. *Body & Society,* 21(4), 77–102. DOI: 10.1177/1357034X15592465

Wilchins, R. A. (2004). *Queer Theory, Gender Theory: An Instant Primer*. Los Angeles: Alyson.

Verlinden, J. (2012). Transgender Bodies and Male Pregnancy: The Ethics of Radical Self-Refashioning. In M. M. Hampf & M. A. Snyder (Eds.), *Machine: Bodies, Gender, Technologies* (pp. 107–136). Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

RESEARCH NOTE

Which Employees are Most Motivated to Share Knowledge – the Role of Age-Based Differentiation in Knowledge-Sharing Motivation

Neža Prelog
University of Ljubljana, Republic of Slovenia

Fayruza S. Ismagilova
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

Eva Boštjančič
University of Ljubljana, Republic of Slovenia

ABSTRACT

The problem of age diversity in the workplace is becoming increasingly important, especially because of the ageing workforce. Knowledge-sharing should therefore be encouraged among employees of different ages. The topic of this research is the role of age-based differentiation or intergenerational differentiation in motivation to share knowledge. Participating in this study were 202 employees of six Slovenian companies. The participants filled out the *Knowledge-sharing Motivation Measure*, translated into Slovenian for the purposes of this study, and *The Intergenerational Differentiation in the Workplace Measure*. Our objective was to find out how three different age groups differ in the subjective perceptions of knowledge-sharing motivation and how the perception of intergenerational differentiation is correlated with knowledge sharing motivation. The results show that the youngest age group of employees feels the most discriminated against due to their age, but is also the most motivated to share knowledge when compared to the other two age groups. The correlation between the two measured constructs is not significant. The main findings are that it is important to acknowledge the younger

nezka.prelog@gmail.com
f.s.ismagilova@urfu.ru
eva.bostjancic@ff.uni-lj.si

age group of employees, since it seems to be the most vulnerable to intergenerational differentiation. Also, it is important to encourage older workers to share their valuable knowledge.

KEYWORDS
intergenerational relationships, diversity in the workplace, knowledge, employees, older workers

Introduction

The knowledge of workers of all ages is important and should be shared and preserved. If this does not happen, knowledge disappears, and the knowledge level of an organisation will become unbalanced (Floor, 2007). In every organisation, there are several types of knowledge in connection with different aspects of the work process. Polanyi's taxonomy of knowledge (1966) is the most well-known theory and it classifies knowledge into tacit and explicit knowledge. An organisation's knowledge depends on the interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge during the processes of socialisation, internalisation and externalisation. Explicit knowledge is knowledge that can be coded and transferred through documentation (Nonaka, 1994), and it can be recorded, for instance in a manual, description or instructions (Reychaw & Weisberg, 2009).

Tacit knowledge exists within an individual's experiences and judgements, and as such is not easily coded. It exists in an individual's mind and is deeply imbedded in personal actions, which are not easily transferrable (Nonaka, 1994). Practical knowledge does not convey information clearly and is difficult to be put into words (Zupančič, 2009). It is an example of tacit knowledge, and can represent a source of permanent competitive advantage. Since it cannot easily be coded, it is impossible for a competitive company to obtain such tacit knowledge, but at the same time, it is also transferred within an organization with greater difficulty due to this feature (Rannuci & Souder, 2015).

Knowledge-sharing among employees as a form of cooperation is important in creating the competitive advantages of an organisation (Jiacheng, Lu & Francesco, 2010a). It encompasses behaviour, which facilitates the sharing of knowledge an individual has acquired or established within an organisation (Hsu, 2006). Cummings (2004) defines knowledge-sharing as receiving knowledge through information, procedures, and feedback. Nine knowledge-sharing mechanisms are defined at the intra-organisational level (Mahmood, Qureshi & Evans, 2015). They include both formal and informal levels: documentation, education and training, reading standard operating procedures, recognition of work, routine and non-routine meetings, seminars and conferences, show and tell, staff updates and voluntary mentoring.

In knowledge management discussions, passing on knowledge from generation to generation is gaining significance. This is evident from the growing amount of research that has discussed the factors influencing knowledge-sharing (Casimir, Lee & Loon, 2012; Hsu, 2006). Several researchers have examined the issues of the generation

gap and intergenerational learning (Floor, 2007; Piktialis & Greenes, 2008). The most common changes at work in present-day and future society are the ageing workforce, and the pressure exerted on organisations to take advantage of existing knowledge by applying efficient knowledge management (Arnold et al., 2005). These issues are thus gaining more significance in work and organisational psychology. No research has been found in literature that might focus on intergenerational and age differences in connection with knowledge-sharing from the subjective point of view of an individual.

Model of Knowledge-Sharing Motivations

Jiacheng et al. (2010a) formed an individual cognitive model of knowledge-sharing motivation. The model depicts differential cognitive processes based on an individual's motivation towards knowledge-sharing. These processes show how an individual's intrinsic motivation derived from social and personal norms, and extrinsic motivation derived from reward and punishment, make concerted efforts to shape the ultimate intention of knowledge-sharing. External influences, such as social norms, are first projected to one's interior interface. They then undergo the influence of internal cognitive mechanisms before being displayed as external behaviour. The insight into an individual's cognitive mechanism towards knowledge-sharing motivation can reveal the principle of individual perceptions towards knowledge-sharing (Jiacheng et al., 2010a). The cognitive knowledge-sharing model described below was the foundation for the empirical part of this research. The model's theory includes individual cognitive mechanisms of knowledge-sharing motivation, which makes it suitable for research of subjective willingness to share knowledge.

Jiacheng et al. (2010a) suggested a cognitive model that depicts an individual's motivation acting upon various cognitive processes. The outcome of these processes is the ultimate intention to share knowledge. The model connects the functional mechanisms of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The researcher's intention was to seek predictive indicators on the intention to share knowledge, and it refers to the degree, to which people are willing to make efforts to engage in knowledge-sharing (Ajzen, 1991). The functional mechanism of knowledge-sharing can be integrated into four psychological processes:

– internalisation: these motivation mechanisms are from within an individual. People value knowledge-sharing behaviour and appreciate the values of knowledge-sharing if it accords with their own values. An individual can realise their own self-worth when they believe their knowledge-sharing would improve team work processes and increase work efficiency (Bock, Lee, & Zmud, 2005);

– identification means the degree, to which people can envision the maintenance of satisfying and interpersonal relationships with those who are involved in knowledge reception (Jiacheng et al., 2010a);

– conformity occurs when an individual accepts knowledge-sharing owing to the blind reliance on other people's attitudes. Since conformity is always linked to social norms, it was defined in the research as the degree, to which one believes that others expect one to share knowledge (Jiacheng, Lu & Francesco, 2010b);

– compliance: An individual's behavioural decision is influenced by others so that they adopt others' opinions or decisions instead of their own (e.g. in a situation where an individual's knowledge-sharing attitude is only an echo of the majority's opinions).

Jiacheng et al. (2010b) define social (or subjective) norms as an individual's perception pertaining to important expectations of others regarding their knowledge-sharing (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), and they operate through an individual's beliefs as to whether others who are of importance to them think they should share knowledge. The concept of social norms acts as an individual's interior interface reflecting external influences. In contrast to personal norms, social norms are a source of conformity and compliance. The reward incentive in compliance is the likelihood that people believe they can obtain rewards for their knowledge-sharing. The intention to share knowledge cannot be forced simply by tangible and explicit punitive measures mainly referred to as latent punishment. It can be defined as the degree, to which people believe they can be excluded from or disapproved of by a team for not sharing their knowledge. Knowledge-sharing is a self-determined activity, and it cannot be mandated (Bock et al., 2005). In practice, it is hard to detect the extent, to which employees engage in knowledge-sharing, so it is impossible for the management to quantify the tangible incentive to control employees' knowledge-sharing. Individuals thus perceive the controlling aspect of rewards in knowledge-sharing only to a low extent. Some case studies of knowledge-sharing practices indicate that appropriate rewards have a symbolic function and can represent reputation and recognition, which leads to more active knowledge-sharing (Hsu, 2006; Taylor, 2006). When receiving an appropriate reward for their knowledge-sharing, employees perceive organizational recognition, which strengthens their perceived competence.

Management of Older Workforce

Senior employees can be reticent in sharing their knowledge with younger employees for fear of becoming redundant (Floor, 2007). Younger employees need new knowledge upon starting at a new workplace as they do not have much experience. They gain the largest amount of knowledge and know-how from experienced senior employees. Coaching is a very appropriate leadership style for senior employees. When the manager makes time for them and shows them that the organisation appreciates them, this consequently increases their willingness to share knowledge (Floor, 2007). Career planning is often done only with younger employees, but this can also be an important tool to motivate senior employees. Senior employees want to feel useful in their workplace, which can be achieved when they share their active knowledge and experience with younger employees. Managers do not often give senior employees the opportunity to engage in further training since they do not consider it beneficial for the organisation. Other factors that are significant for senior employees are trust, respect, acknowledgment, and a sense of security (Floor, 2007). Trust is an important factor in knowledge-sharing. It is important that senior employees feel secure in their work environment and that they do not have the feeling they will become superfluous for the managers and the organisation when

they share their knowledge. Flexible working hours and the feeling their knowledge is appreciated are also very valuable to the (Taylor & Walker, 1998).

Finkelstein, Ryan, and King (2013) explored stereotypes and meta-stereotypes in different age groups and found that the middle-aged group is the least exposed to age differentiation and is treated as the normative group of the workforce. In this research, the group of younger workers included employees aged 18–35 and the group of senior workers included workers older than 55. The research aims to answer the question whether individual age groups differ in their motivation to share knowledge.

The Role of Older Workforce in Knowledge Sharing

There is a strong positive correlation between age and level of knowledge. Tacit knowledge needs to be transferred from an older employee to a younger one, since older employees have built up a lot of experience and organizational know-how (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004). On the other hand, younger employees also possess a lot of knowledge, be it on the advancing information technology, new work approaches or the newest theories and research. L. Finkelstein et al. (2013) state that stereotypical beliefs about different age groups may have serious consequences for knowledge-sharing as they restrict communication between younger and older employees, as well as creativity, due to the lack of psychological security. Managers should be aware of such stereotypes and should aim to connect different generations for successful knowledge-sharing in an organisation. Remery, Henkens, Schippers and Ekamper (2001) have found that managers associate older employees with higher costs, but also with greater experience and useful, practical knowledge. Zupančič (2009) states that middle-aged employees may later become experts in their fields, which is associated with a high level of efficiency at problem solving. This depends on practical or tacit knowledge. Intergenerational learning and the significance of knowledge transfer between generations have already been researched.

Managers should form teams or workgroups that consist of both older and younger employees. This way, cooperation between younger and older employees is encouraged as they can inspire each other and learn from each other by sharing their knowledge. Mentorship may also develop, in which know-how is transferred and shared. Managers should encourage intergenerational knowledge transfer. It is important to build an environment, in which older employees feel secure and do not fear they will become redundant. Managers must be aware of the fact that older employees have different needs and therefore maintain a life-phase oriented HR development strategy (Floor, 2007).

The Research Subject

This research aims to study the correlation between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation, that is, the willingness of employees of different age groups to share their knowledge. No studies that would connect the correlation between these two concepts have been conducted so far. Similar studies state that what is

essential for the successful sharing of knowledge and expertise is a trustful environment (e.g. Nottingham, 1998), recognition and respect (e.g. Floor, 2007), and positive relationships (e.g. Reychav & Weisberg, 2009). Knowledge within an organisation and knowledge sharing are essential for successful cooperation among employees within an organisation and form an organisation's competitive advantage (Floor, 2007; Jiacheng et al., 2010a). Age diversity, and even more so an ageing workforce, is one of the changes that is very much present in modern times (Arnold et al., 2005), which makes this study very topical. Increasing age diversity in modern times is connected to an increased awareness of an age discriminatory climate (Finkelstein et al., 2007).

In order to better understand the potential differences between age groups in a subjective experience of intergenerational differentiation, the following research question was posed: *Does knowledge-sharing motivation differ in individual age groups of employees*? The objective of this research is to determine the potential specific characteristics of individual groups in both measured constructs before a conclusion on differences in the perception of intergenerational differentiation can be made.

The second step was to form a hypothesis: *Individuals will perceive intergenerational differentiation in the workplace more if they are less willing to share their knowledge with others.* The social comparison theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) presupposes that the differences in demographic characteristics of individuals within a group will limit interaction and the sharing of knowledge. If these differences are emphasised or perceived by an individual, they might influence the individual's willingness to share their knowledge. Trust, good relationships, communication, the feeling of belonging and perception may be compromised if individuals feel discriminated against due to their age. In earlier research, these factors have been recognised as significant for a facilitated sharing of knowledge (e.g. Arnett & Wittman, 2014; Cai, Li & Guan, 2016; Lauring & Selmer, 2012). The expectations of age differentiation of employees by members of other age groups may impede knowledge transfer, as well as contribute to decreased performance success and increased anxiety (Finkelstein et al., 2013). Older employees, for example, possess great knowledge and experience, which they have gained through years of work. If they fall victim to age differentiation and discrimination due to their age, they will not have the opportunity to share their knowledge, and their need to belong and be respected by others will not be fulfilled (Braithwaite, 2004; De Guzman, 2014). Individuals that will perceive age differentiation more will likely be less willing to share their knowledge. Considering the results of earlier research, it is expected that this correlation will be the most obvious in the older age group.

Methodology

Participants and the Procedure
A total of 202 workers from six Slovenian companies participated in the research. The sample consisted of 73 men (36%) and 129 women (64%). Their average age was 44.6 years (*SD* = 8.8 years), and the participants were aged from 25 to 64 years old with an average of 20 years of work experience. 18% of them were younger than 35, 61% of them were included in the 35–54 age group and 21% of the participants

were older than 55. Most participants had a professional academic bachelor's degree (39%), nearly a third of them had a master of science or a doctorate degree (30%), and less than a quarter of participants had completed post-secondary or first-cycle higher education (22%).

The participants received the link to the questionnaires via e-mail and were granted full anonymity. The data was collected from April to June 2017.

Research Tools

Intra-Organizational Knowledge-Sharing Motivations Measure (Jiacheng et al., 2010b) is a self-assessment questionnaire with 34 items to assess an individual's cognitive mechanisms to share knowledge with the members of the organisation. An individual assesses the items of the questionnaire on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Items are combined into eight subsections: internalisation (e.g. My knowledge-sharing would improve team work processes), identification (e.g. My knowledge-sharing would strengthen my ties with existing team members), conformity (e.g. I always accept the majority's opinion on knowledge-sharing), reward incentive (e.g. I will receive monetary rewards in return for my knowledge-sharing), latent punishment (e.g. My private views about knowledge-sharing are different from those I express publicly), subjective norm (e.g. My CEO thinks that I should share my knowledge with other members of the organization), attitude towards knowledge-sharing (e.g. All things considered, my knowledge-sharing with other organizational members is good), and intention to share knowledge (e.g. I intend to share my ideas with team members as much as possible). Besides providing partial results in the subsections, the answers produce an overall result that indicates the overall knowledge-sharing motivation.

The Intergenerational Differentiation in the Workplace Measure (Jelenko, 2015) is a self-assessment questionnaire, which includes eight items. Two items comprise each of the four following subsections: management (e.g. My manager micromanages my work due to my age); communication (e.g. I feel that in communication, other employees look down on me and regard me as inferior because of my age); productivity (e.g. Other employees don't appreciate my knowledge and skills due to my age), and cooperation (e.g. In my workplace, I only cooperate with employees of my age). The participants assess the frequency of a behaviour on the following seven-point scale: 0 – never; 1 – almost never; 2 – rarely; 3 – sometimes; 4 – often; 5 – almost always; 6 – always). One of the items is assessed in a reversed order. The higher the total of the items, the more the intergenerational differentiation in the workplace is perceived. The internal reliability of the questionnaire was verified twice before it was used in this research and is adequately high ($N_1 = 109$, $α_1 = 0.72$; $N_2 = 20$, $α_2 = 0.74$) (Jelenko, 2015).

Results

The first step was to calculate the reliability coefficient of the *Intra-Organizational Knowledge-Sharing Motivations Measure,* which was satisfactory (α = 0.83). When comparing the reliability of the subsections of the *Questionnaire on knowledge-*

sharing motivation with the reliability of those used by the authors in their research (Jiacheng et al., 2010b), our research tool for the sample proved less reliable (Table 1). The reliability coefficient of the *Intergenerational differentiation in the Workplace Measure* is 0.79, which confirms the findings of the questionnaire's author (Jelenko, 2015).

Table 1. *Reliability Coefficients for the Subsections of the Questionnaire on Knowledge-Sharing Motivation in the Original Research (a_1; Jiacheng et al., 2010a) and in this research (a_2).*

Subsection	a_1	a_2
Internalisation	0.83	0.77
Identification	0.88	0.72
Conformity	0.78	0.60
Reward incentive	0.84	0.61
Latent punishment	0.78	0.36
Subjective norm	0.80	0.56
Attitude towards knowledge-sharing	0.84	0.60
Intention to share knowledge	0.89	0.76

Since the questionnaire data in the whole sample and in individual age groups is normally distributed, the ANOVA statistical method was used to determine the differences between age groups. Table 2 shows descriptive statistics of the results from the questionnaire on knowledge-sharing motivation per individual age group.

Table 2. *The Number of Participants in an Individual Age Group (N), Arithmetic Mean of the Answers in the Questionnaire on Knowledge-Sharing Motivation (M), and Standard Deviation (SD)*

Age group	N	M	SD
Younger (up to 35 years)	36	120.14	7.15
Middle-aged (35–54 years)	121	114.98	12.34
Senior (over 55 years)	42	112.98	14.14

As is evident from the table with descriptive statistics, certain differences between the groups exist. Detailed analysis showed that the differences are statistically significant ($F = 3.73$; $p < 0.05$). When determining differences between individual subsections of the questionnaire and the age groups, the only significant difference was found in the subsection of Identification ($F = 5.07$; $p < 0.05$).

Individual age groups were compared by using the independent samples *t*-test. The final result of the questionnaire revealed a statistically significant difference ($t = 3.15$; $df = 101.29$; $p < 0.05$) in knowledge-sharing motivation between the group of younger employees, and the middle-aged group. A significant difference was revealed in the subsection of the Identification ($t = 2.91$; $df = 158$; $p < 0.05$).

In order to verify the correlation between the perceived age differentiation and the willingness to share knowledge with others, Spearman's correlation coefficients were calculated for the final results, as well as the results of individual subsections. The perception of intergenerational differentiation and the willingness to share

knowledge are not connected. The other correlations between the subsections are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Spearman's Correlation Coefficients between Subsections and Final Results of the Intra-Organizational Knowledge-Sharing Motivations Measure (KSM) and the Intergenerational Differentiation in the Workplace Measure (IGD)*

	1	2	3	4	IGD	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. IGD Communication													
2. IGD Management	0.46**												
3. IGD Cooperation	0.19**	0.32**											
4. IGD Productivity	0.48**	0.66**	0.30**										
Intergenerational differentiation *(total)*	0.68**	0.65**	0.71**	0.73**									
5. KSM Internalisation	−0.08	−0.06	−0.04	−0.08	−0.03								
6. KSM Identification	−0.02	−0.08	−0.02	0.09	−0.03	0.49**							
7. KSM Conformity	−0.01	0.10	0.15*	−0.02	0.09	0.05	0.25**						
8. KSM Reward incentive	−0.03	0.15*	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.01	0.28**	0.12*					
9. KSM Latent punishment	0.24**	0.24**	0.14	0.23*	0.22**	−0.17*	−0.02	0.12	0.18*				
10. KSM Subjective norm	−0.17*	−0.02	−0.02	0.04	−0.06	0.34**	0.42**	0.09	0.23**	−0.07			
11. KSM Attitudes towards knowledge-sharing	−0.30**	−0.23**	−0.23**	−0.18**	−0.28**	0.48**	0.49**	0.12	0.14*	−0.13	0.37**		
12. KSM Intention to share knowledge	−0.13*	−0.07	−0.15*	−0.10	−0.14*	0.50**	0.38**	0.13*	−0.03	−0.30**	0.27**	0.58**	
Intra-Organizational Knowledge-Sharing Motivation *(total)*	−0.12*	0.04	−0.03	0.07	−0.02	0.65**	0.83**	0.42**	0.36**	−0.01	0.61**	0.70**	0.64**

* p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

No significant correlation between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation was determined; however, certain correlations have surfaced between individual subsections of both questionnaires. There is a moderate correlation between the perception of intergenerational differences and employees' willingness to share their knowledge. Quality communication ($r = −0.30$; $p < 0.01$), management ($r = −0.23$; $p < 0.01$), cooperation ($r = −0.23$; $p < 0.01$) and productivity ($r = −0.28$; $p < 0.01$) are correlated with increased willingness to share knowledge.

A new calculation of Spearman's correlation coefficient and a verification of the age variable proved the correlation between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation to be statistically significant ($r = -0.16$; $p < 0.05$), but nonetheless low. The increased correlation between the two constructs in the complete sample led to a re-examination of the correlation within individual age groups. The correlation of intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation in the younger group of employees was negative and medium high ($r = -0.41$; $p < 0.05$); in the other two groups, no statistically significant differences were observed.

Discussion

The objective of this research was to determine whether age groups differ in their knowledge-sharing motivation, and to examine the correlation between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation. The results of the translated *Intra-Organizational Knowledge-Sharing Motivations Measure* (Jiacheng et al., 2010b) were normally distributed in the sample and this was an adequate reason for a detailed analysis of the results. With the help of *The Intergenerational Differentiation in the Workplace Measure,* it was determined that the results are not distributed equally in the considered sample, and that the reliability of the questionnaire is comparable to the reliability as determined by its author Jelenko (2015).

The analysis showed that statistically, the group of youngest employees differs significantly from the other age groups, specifically the members of this group were more willing to share their knowledge than employees in other groups. Although other differences between the age groups were not significant, it is evident that the older the employees are, the less motivated they are to share their knowledge. As for the group of older employees, this can be explained by applying the findings of Kanfer and Ackerman (2004), who state that senior employees can be reticent in sharing their knowledge with younger employees for fear of becoming redundant. According to L. Finkelstein and colleagues (2013), middle-aged employees might perceive that younger employees are competing for their jobs, which leads to a protective attitude towards their knowledge. Younger employees are most likely to share their knowledge because they need to gain a lot of knowledge, and they expect that by sharing their knowledge, other employees will reciprocate. Social exchange theory posits that relationships between employees are based on the mutual expectation from both parties that voluntary acts will motivate reciprocity, which does generally occur (Blau, 1964). The fact that of all age groups senior employees are the least motivated is significant for work organisations; this is the age group with the largest amount of tacit knowledge, that is, knowledge that is difficult to transfer and write down. The only option for organisations to preserve such knowledge is by sharing this knowledge with younger employees. It is thus of key importance that senior employees are motivated to do so.

No significant correlation between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation was determined; however, certain correlations have surfaced between individual subsections of both questionnaires. The research shows

that employees who feel that their communication with their co-workers is limited due to their age are less motivated to share their knowledge.

The subsection *conformity* as knowledge-sharing motivation is positively correlated to the subsection *cooperation* from the intergenerational differentiation questionnaire. Both subsections show the employees' need to be accepted by others and the need to belong to a social group; two needs that exist in every social situation (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). An individual most likely feels most comfortable in their own social group, in this case their age group, and adopts the group's opinion.

The subsections *reward incentive* as knowledge-sharing motivation and *management* from the intergenerational differentiation questionnaire are also positively correlated, albeit on a low level. The authors of the cognitive model of knowledge-sharing motivation state that the reward incentive is in fact motivation to the employees as they may receive rewards for sharing their knowledge (Jiacheng et al., 2010a); rewards, which function symbolically and may come with recognition and reputation (e.g. Hsu, 2006; Taylor, 2006). When receiving an appropriate reward for sharing their knowledge, employees perceive organizational recognition, which is why individuals who feel the management's pressure in their workplace might be more motivated to share their knowledge provided they receive a reward from the management. Bock et al. (2005) found that the need for a reward might impede knowledge-sharing, and that rewards might have a negative influence on internal motivation or only lead to temporary obedience. This explains the positive correlation in this research, as individuals who perceive age differentiation from their management are more externally motivated to share their knowledge. This means that their motivation is economic and not socio-psychological or psychological (Bock et al., 2005).

The subsection *latent punishment* from the knowledge-sharing motivation questionnaire is positively correlated to three of the four subsections from the intergenerational differentiation questionnaire, specifically the subsections *productivity*, *communication* and *management*. The so-called punishment that is correlated with knowledge sharing mainly refers to latent punishment. It can be defined as the degree, to which people believe they can be excluded from or disapproved of by a team for not sharing their knowledge. This is external motivation, which is contrary to autonomous motivation (Ozlati, 2015), and which represents a significant factor in knowledge-sharing motivation. Individuals who perceive intergenerational differentiation in productivity and communication, as well as from their management, to a large extent will be more easily motivated to share their knowledge through punishment. Punishment or fear of punishment in an organisation cannot be an effective method of behaviour alteration (Arnold et al., 2005). For an individual, this merely means avoiding punishment, thus external motivation, and it cannot provide psychological security. With knowledge-sharing, certain behaviour is encouraged while with punishment, a reduction in unwanted behaviour is sought (Arnold et al., 2005).

Some research (e.g. Braithwaite, 2004; De Guzman, 2014) has presupposed that the perception of intergenerational differentiation represents a negative factor in knowledge-sharing motivation. The results of this research do not confirm

these assumptions due to the many potential variables correlated to knowledge-sharing. Such variables are for example co-workers' support (Soojin et al., 2015), communication (Nonaka, 1994), motivation (Ozlati, 2015) and trust (Arnett & Wittmann, 2014). An important part of willingness to share knowledge is an individual's internal motivation, their values and their subjective norms, which is included in the cognitive model by Jiacheng et al. (2010b). This model was the basis for the questionnaire used in this research. In her master's thesis on knowledge transfer within an organisation, Podobnik (2009) determined by means of group and half-structured interviews that employees consider the management key to knowledge management and transfer, and assign great significance to clear and honest communication. Knowledge-sharing motivation is thus a much more complex concept that can only be explained if the perception of intergenerational differentiation is present.

However, only a few authors so far have discussed in detail the transferring of knowledge between generations (Floor, 2007; Bjursell, 2015; Felicijan, 2015). However, nobody has focused solely on an individual's subjective experience; the focus was on organisational practices of knowledge management. This is why the most significant contribution of this research is the consideration of employees' subjective experiences. For the purposes of this research, a questionnaire based on socio-psychological theories was used, specifically on social influence theory (Kelman, 1958), the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), and social comparison theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and the social context of an individual's work environment was taken into account.

To further explore this field, more quality research would need to be conducted to clarify terms such as knowledge-sharing, age differentiation, and age stereotypes. All potential moderator variables in the relationship between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing should be taken into account, and the most significant ones should be emphasised not just in theory but in practice, including in organisations. The organisational environment would need to focus further on the expectations of younger employees and not underestimate them due to their age. Based on the results, it can be concluded that intergenerational differentiation as perceived by the younger group of employees is negatively correlated with their knowledge-sharing motivation.

Conclusions

This research established that senior employees are less motivated to share their knowledge than younger employees are. This raises concerns, as many authors (Floor, 2007; Lauring & Selmer, 2012) state that senior employees are the ones with the largest amount of tacit knowledge, which must be preserved within an organisation.

According to social influence theory, an individual accepts influence from the environment, they avoid punishments and gain rewards, and they adopt the induced behaviour to create beneficial relationships with others, which results in conformity. A certain behaviour might occur if an individual's values are congruent with the values of the environment. The theory of reasoned action explains the difference between an

individual's behavioural intention and actual behaviour. There are certain factors, which will prevent an individual from doing something despite wanting to. Social comparison theory posits that we determine our own worth based on how we compare against others. All these theories can be applied to the context of knowledge-sharing and age differentiation. If the external environment supports knowledge-sharing among employees of all ages, and if these employees feel that the incentive is congruent with their values, they will more likely share their knowledge. It will not remain an intention, which would happen if limiting factors, such as punishment, were present. Individuals compare themselves with other employees of all ages; this influences their behaviour towards others, and the motivation to share their knowledge. The differences in demographic characteristics of individuals within a group can impede knowledge-sharing, and if these differences are emphasised or perceived by an individual, this might influence their willingness to share their knowledge. This research aims to emphasise the significance of the social context when studying complex organisational concepts, which include both interpersonal and social interactions.

It should be pointed out that this research had certain limitations and that the conclusions based on the results are also limited. Selective sampling should be taken into account, as this research only included organisations and individuals that were motivated to participate, which is why the sample is not representative of the Slovenian population in its educational structure and gender. The subjectivity of reporting could also be a limiting factor, as objective data about organisational practices for the inclusion of employees of all ages and the encouragement of knowledge-sharing would provide further data about the actual situation in such organisations. The uneven samples of organisations should also be mentioned, as it means there are limitations in the conclusions of statistical analyses, as some of the samples of individual companies do not represent statistically strong groups. Age groups were formed artificially, based on preliminary research, even though age is a continuous variable without clear borders between different age groups. The main limitation of this research was the failure to consider significant factors from the environment and from an individual's point of view, as these can play an important role in the complex relationship between intergenerational differentiation and knowledge-sharing motivation. Some such factors are an individual's characteristics, the characteristics of the organisational climate and culture, communication, and the level of trust in an organisation's work environment.

With age diversity increasing in society, organisations face the challenge of restructuring learning processes. The concept of intergenerational learning includes a reciprocal learning process and knowledge development, as well as a shift from knowledge-sharing to co-creating knowledge, in the efforts to share knowledge. This shift is of key importance when the digital generation enters the labour market. The strategies for sharing knowledge in organisations should be adjusted to the methods and processes that include new generations and encourage the transfer of knowledge. The key features here are communication without age differentiation, trust, and an individual's intrinsic motivation to share knowledge. Nowadays, as many as five generations might work side by side in an organisation, and the co-existence of many generations brings an opportunity for intergenerational interactions and learning.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 50(2), 179–211. DOI: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Arnett, D. B., & Wittmann, C. M. (2014). Improving Marketing Success: The Role of Tacit Knowledge Exchange Between Sales and Marketing. *Journal of Business Research,* 67(3), 324–331. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.01.018

Arnold, J., Silvester, J., Patterson, F., Robertson, I., Cooper, C., & Burnes, B. (2005). *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behaviour in the Workplace.* Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Bjursell, C. (2015). Organizing for Intergenerational Learning and Knowledge Sharing. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 13(4), 285–301. DOI: 10.1080/15350770.2015.1108952

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Bock, G. W., Lee, J. N., & Zmud, R. W. (2005). Behavioral Intention Formation in Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Social-Psychological Forces, and Organizational Climate. *MIS Quarterly,* 29(1), 87–111. DOI: 10.2307/25148669

Braithwaite, V. (2004). Reducing Ageism. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Ageism: Stereotyping and Prejudice Against older Persons (pp. 311–337).* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Cai, H., Li, M., & Guan, P. (2016). Fostering Managers' Knowledge-Sharing Behavior: The Impact of the Employee-Organization Relationship. *Social Behavior and Personality,* 44(4), 669–678. DOI: 10.2224/sbp.2016.44.4.669

Casimir, G., Lee, K., & Loon, M. (2012). Knowledge Sharing: Influences of Trust, Commitment and Cost. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 16(5), 740–753.

Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work Groups, Structural Diversity, and Knowledge Sharing in a Global Organization. *Management Science,* 50(3), 352–364.

De Guzman, A. B. (2014). A Structural Equation Modeling of the Factors Affecting an Age-Friendly Workplace. *Educational Gerontology,* 40*,* 387–400.

Felicijan, J. (2015). *Prenos Znanja Starejših Zaposlenih na Mlajše Zaposlene v Organizaciji X* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Mednarodna Fakulteta za Družbene in Poslovne Študije, Celje.

Finkelstein, L. M., Ryan, K. M., & King, E. B. (2013). What do the Young (Old) People Think of Me? Content and Accuracy of Age-Based Metastereotypes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 22(6), 633–657. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2012.673279

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Beliefs, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research.* Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Floor, S. (2007). Knowledge Management Among the Older Workforce. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 11(4), 82–96.

Hsu, I. C. (2006). Enhancing Employee Tendencies to Share Knowledge – Case Studies of Nine Companies in Taiwan. *International Journal of Information Management,* 26(4), 326–338. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2006.03.001

Jelenko, J. (2015). *The Intergenerational Differentiation in the Workplace Measure* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana. Slovenia.

Jiacheng, W., Lu, L., & Francesco, C. A. (2010a). A Cognitive Model of Intra-Organizational Knowledge-Sharing Motivations in the View of Cross-Culture. *International Journal of Information Management,* 30(3), 220–230. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2009.08.007

Jiacheng, W., Lu, L., & Francesco, C. A. (2010b). Intra-Organizational Knowledge-Sharing Motivations Measure. *PsycTESTS.*

Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2004). Aging, Adult Development and Work Motivation. *Academy of Management Review,* 29(3), 440–459. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2004.13670969

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, Identification, and Internalization: Three Processes of Attitude Change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* 2(1), 51–60. DOI: 10.1177/002200275800200106

Lauring, J., & Selmer, J. (2012). Knowledge Sharing in Diverse Organisations. *Human Resource Management Journal,* 22(1), 89–105.

Mahmood, A., Qureshi, A., & Evans, N. (2015). Deterrents to Knowledge-Sharing in the Pharmaceutical Industry: A Case Study. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 19(2), 296–314. DOI: 10.1108/JKM-09-2014-0391

Nonaka, I. (1994). A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Organization Science,* 5(1), 14–37. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.5.1.14

Nottingham, A. (1998). Knowledge Management as the Next Strategic Focus. *Proceedings of the 8th Annual BIT Conference.* Manchester: Metropolitan University.

Ozlati, S. (2015). *The Moderating Effect of Trust on the Relationship between Autonomy and Knowledge Sharing: A National Multi-Industry Survey of Knowledge Workers. Knowledge and Process Management,* 22(3), 191–205. DOI: 10.1002/kpm.1474

Piktialis, D., & Greenes, K. A. (2008). *Bridging the Gaps: How to Transfer Knowledge in Today's Multigenerational Workplace.* New York: The Conference Board. Research Report R-1428-08-RR.

Podobnik, I. (2009). *Prenos Znanja v Organizaciji* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Fakulteta za management, Koper.

Rannuci, R. A., & Souder, D. (2015). Facilitating Tacit Knowledge Transfer: Routine Compatibility, Trustworthiness, and Integration in M & A's. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 19(2), 257–276. DOI: 10.1108/JKM-06-2014-0260

Reychav, I., & Weisberg, J. (2009). Good for Workers, Good for Companies: How Knowledge Sharing Benefits Individual Employees. *Knowledge and Process Management,* 16(4), 186–197. DOI: 10.1002/kpm.335

Remery, C., Henkens, K., Schippers, J., & Ekamper, P. (2001). Managing an Ageing Workforce and a Tight Labour Market: Views Held by Dutch Employers. *Population Review and Policy Review,* 22(1), 21–40. DOI: 10.1023/A:1023543307473

Soojin, L., Yongsu, Y., & Seokhwa, Y. (2015). Sharing My Knowledge? An Interactional Perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 30(8), 986–1002.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986) The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. *Psychology of Intergroup Relations,* 5, 7–24.

Taylor, E. Z. (2006). The Effect of Incentives on Knowledge Sharing in Computermediated Communication: An Experimental Investigation. *Journal of Information Systems,* 20(1), 103–116.

Taylor, P., & Walker, A. (1998). Policies and Practices Towards Older Workers: A Framework for Comparative Research. *Human Resource Management Journal,* 8(3), 61–76.

Zupančič, M. (2009). Spoznavni Razvoj v Srednji Odraslosti. In L. Marjanovič Umek & M. Zupančič (Ed.), *Razvojna psihologija* (pp. 728–744). Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.

BOOK REVIEW

Hate, Politics, Law: Critical Perspectives on Combating Hate (2018). Thomas Brudholm & Birgitte Schepelern Johansen, eds. Oxford University Press[1]

Andrey S. Menshikov
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

This volume comprises the essays, which provide critical perspectives on hate. The habitual usage in public discourse places hate in the context of all that opposes the good and links it to violence. The assumption is that violence is caused by hate and, therefore, if we wish to prevent violence it is our duty to counter hate. In turn, this idea justified the extension of state power by limiting freedom of speech and by letting the state to punish not only for criminal actions but also for views and attitudes behind those actions.

Thus, the authors claim, combating hate has itself become an ambivalent endeavor. This seemingly provocative thesis is, however, thoroughly substantiated by a wealth of historical and conceptual research on how hate was integrated into modern public discourse and legal system. The more attenuated picture emerges from the very beginning when the stages and national variation are described.

Hate's first appearance in law is traced to the International Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965), which decries "racial superiority or hatred", and to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), which calls to penalize "any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence". The international concern with racism across the globe in this period of decolonization, on the one hand, and apartheid, on the other, exerted significant pressure on national legal systems to condemn racial discrimination. In Europe, UK, Germany, and France introduced penalties for "hate speech", "although each of these three

countries responded to international pressures" to act against anti-Semitism and racism, "domestic differences" also affected the timing and precise wording of their laws" (p. 20).

These differences in national contexts stemmed from respective agendas: the growing numbers of immigrants in the UK and the recurrence of anti-Semitism in Germany and France. In the US, in the aftermath of the civil rights movement, it was hate crimes that draw the attention of the public and legislature rather than hate speech. Unlike Europe, the drive towards making "bias-motivation" an aggravating circumstance in the crime was mostly spearheaded by social activists in the US. As the editors put it hate discourse in the US was "the result of a political strategy by activists as a means to encourage media coverage and public sympathy" (pp. 3–4). Thus, although hate was an umbrella term for a number of different concerns and policies on it varied, hate has become an "organizing principle for understanding" certain kind of evil.

This notion flourishes in public use and was expanded to refer to new groups, which could be the object of hate (religion, gender identity, disability, etc.); new forms of expressing hate (genocide or Holocaust denial, etc.) and new venues to do so (Internet). Nevertheless, "hate is more a public construction than a formal legal term" (p. 33). Subsequent chapters discuss alternative ways of looking at what hate might mean in diverse cultural contexts such as ancient Greece and Rome; how it can be conceptualized on the basis of psychological knowledge; and in which ways art can contribute to mitigating hate through self-scrutiny.

Nevertheless, I would focus on further analysis of legal and political implications of the critical approach to hate. One important point the authors make is that in talking about hatred we might better use other terms such as group defamation and bias crime. Emotional and irrational connotations contained in the concept of hate tend to disguise what is at stake in fighting against hatred and hostility motivated by biased attitudes. With the development of history and sociology of emotions, we learn ever more about the interplay between innermost feelings and social arrangements. Thus, instead of suppressing or punishing individual emotional dispositions we should highlight their basis in "structures of prejudice, illegitimate power hierarchies, and discrimination". If the public agenda will continue to revolve around hate and measures against it rather than "structural embedding" of hate speech and hate crimes, we are probably fighting a losing battle.

Another reason to be suspicious about reducing discriminatory attitudes and bias-motivated violence to "hate" is, in my view, that punishing hate tips the shaky balance between material crime and "thoughtcrime" more towards the latter. It is clear that notions that refer to the mental state of individuals such as criminal intent or heat of passion exist in law. It is also obvious that hate attitude is surmised on the basis of observable expressions or actions, that is, on the basis of demonstrable evidence. Furthermore, it is not hate *per se*, not the emotion that is punished, but its presence in the deed, its enactment, which constitutes an aggravating offence. Yet, if an individual has the right to love s/he has equal right to hate. As Max Scheler once explained it, hate is just the other side of love: if you love something you necessarily

hate its opposite. Unconditional absolute love is a divine attribute and not human. M. Thorup specifically discusses "democratic hatreds" in his chapter, and shows that even democracies create their own "hateful enemies". By presenting democracy as our salvation from violence we are thus obliged to oppose all forms of violence and, simply put, to "hate the haters".

Finally, if hate is irrational it can't be eradicated by repressive measures. If it is rational and relies on certain moral choice, punishment again is hardly the most effective way to deal with. Perhaps, a broader view that ascribes some positive value to hate, as in N. Yanay's chapter, who argues that "love and hate are not simply opposites but also nested in each other" (p. 6), or the other means of dealing with hate crimes such as restorative rather than punitive measures, as proposed by M. A. Walters, could help us approach the dangers of hate in society more reasonably.

BOOK REVIEW

Kelly, Mark G. E. (2018). For Foucault: Against Normative Political Theory. Albany: SUNY Press.

Daniil I. Kokin
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

The most recent book written by Mark G. E. Kelly, Associate Professor at Western Sydney University in Australia, has already received two distinct reviews (see Choat, 2018; Vogelmann, 2018). To justify this new review, I would like to make as comprehensive vision of the book as possible by considering the points made in the previous reviews and enriching them with my comments where necessary. However, according to the rules of the genre, I am obliged to reiterate some elements and considerations that were already mentioned in these reviews. Thus, I will start with the book's outline and its purpose, then I will move to the interpretation of the problem the author raises, his overall thesis and arguments defending his position. Further, I will explore the content of the book taking in consideration other reviewers' comments. After that, I will summarize points of praise and critique, which Kelly's book faced. Finally, I will give my own analysis and evaluation of the work.

In the very beginning, Kelly tells his readers that the book "is for and not about Foucault" and "against and not about normative political theory" (Kelly, 2018, p. 1). It means that the author's focus is neither Foucault's thought itself (there are previous Kelly's books primarily devoted to it), nor normative political theory, but a defence of the view interpreting Foucault as a non-normative thinker, which actually is the main purpose of the book. Thus, Kelly raises two questions: why it is necessary to oppose normativity and how it is possible. He gives three arguments to the first question (see Kelly, 2018, pp. 7–8). We need to oppose normativity because, first, it limits the field of influence to those who adhere to these norms. The second argument is that normativity has unintended consequences. Finally, normativity is inherently dangerous. To answer the second question and to prove his thesis, Kelly interprets selected authors through the lens of his approach. He tries to show that Foucault, even late,

was an anti-normative thinker, and that his critique is superior to other approaches opposing normativity. He rejects the wider notion of normativity claiming that it has nothing in particular to do with norms (which is arguable), and chooses the stricter definition used in ethics, that is "ought".

Kelly interprets Foucault's alternative to normative political theory as threefold, for normative, "political, and theoretic aspects are closely interconnected" (Kelly, 2018, p. 11). First, it is anti-normative in the way that it does not have a normative ground in opposing and criticizing things. Second, it is a-theoretical because it eschews systematization and does not try to "produce a totalizing explanation of everything" (Kelly, 2018, p. 11). Third, it is non-political in the sense of "party politics" (Kelly, 2018, p. 11) or, in other words, not being a part of politics as such. Shortly, Foucault's method is a critique aimed to undermine things through its analysis. The book comprises Introduction, where Kelly determines the purpose of his work and sets up the methodological and conceptual framework: seven chapters each devoted to a single thinker one way or another related to Foucault – these are Marx, Lenin, Althusser, Deleuze, Rorty, Honneth, and Geuss, – the last chapter dedicated to Foucault's scholarship, and Conclusion. On the whole, the book is indeed "something of an anthology" (Kelly, 2018, p. 13), therefore, the order of reading the book can be arbitrary.

In the first chapter devoted to Marx, Kelly tries to show from Foucauldian perspective that Marx was almost anti-normative thinker and in some sense precursor to Foucault. He calls Marx a "pivotal figure" (Kelly, 2018, p. 17) in the history of political thought. Kelly criticizes attempts made in 1970–80s Anglophone philosophy to rehabilitate Marx as a normative political philosopher, for his attitude towards capitalism was rather an analysis of how it works as a system rather than a moral condemnation. He analyzes Marx's method and his core concepts, such as alienation, exploitation, slavery, and theft to prove that they are purely descriptive rather than normative. However, the author holds that Marx failed to promote a non-normative alternative because he puts forward a political theory of communism, which according to Kelly inevitably relies on normative premises and becomes political utopian. Moreover, although Marx reached antinormativity, he was held back by Hegelianism.

The second chapter is devoted to Lenin. Kelly holds that through the comparative analysis of Russian Revolution and Lenin's work "State and Revolution" it becomes clear that Lenin failed to realize his theory in practice, that is, incorporate it in real politics, and thus had to substitute it. As the result, there was the time of terror and totalitarianism. As regards to Foucault, Kelly holds that although Lenin invoked to "smash politics, and dispense with morality" (Kelly, 2018, p. 58), he was committed to Marx's philosophical ideals.

In chapter three, Kelly criticizes Althusser for being not close enough to Foucault's position because of being detached by his commitments to Marxism and Leninism. Moreover, Althusser's adherence to French Communist Party and state-oriented politics makes him politically engaged thinker. He also uses some kind of theoretical tools in his thought. In Kelly's words, "Althusser commits

to a kind of normativity, which resides in his being theoretical and political" (Kelly, 2018, p. 72).

Chapter four is meant to show fundamental differences between Foucault's and Gilles Deleuze's philosophies: "The former aims to demolish existing strategies of power through critical analysis of their operation, whereas the latter aims to build up a new positive account of reality in order to free constrained creative forces" (Kelly, 2018, p. 76). For this, Kelly mostly deals with Deleuze's work "Postscript on Control Societies". He criticizes Deleuze for so-called "normative theoreticism" and his attempt to include Foucault's approach in his thought. In other words, Kelly claims that Deleuze's thought is incompatible with Foucault's genuine critical analysis. As Kelly puts it, "Deleuze's political philosophy is based in the assertion of a metaphysics, in which forces try to free themselves from evil reconfigurations of them" (Kelly, 2018, p. 91).

In the fifth chapter, Kelly criticizes the way Richard Rorty reads Foucault: although Rorty was sympathetic to him, he adhered to normativity by looking for a "realistic utopia" (Kelly, 2018, p. 101). Kelly claims that Foucault's ideas rather challenge Rorty's pragmatic liberalism than support it. The same thing happens with Rorty's idea of ethnocentric relativism, which "elevates his normative preferences to the status of inarguable political truths" (Kelly, 2018, p. 107).

The sixth chapter is devoted to contemporary critical thinker Axel Honneth. Kelly holds that Honneth, as well as Rorty, fails to understand Foucault's position properly. Kelly labels Honneth's thought as normative critical theory, and states that Foucault is a challenge for him rather than support. However, the main point of criticism is that Honneth considers Foucault in line with Frankfurt School theorists, thus blurring the differences between the thinkers and failing to combine Foucault and Habermas in his work.

In chapter seven, Kelly deals with recent works of Raymond Geuss. He criticizes the movement of political realism Geuss belongs to for the view that it is necessary to produce values (political, not moral) and engage in public policy, although the author is sympathetic to the realist critique of the "ethic-first" approach. Kelly concludes that normativity, politics, and theory need to be stamped out on the basis of their failure to account for social complexity.

In his final chapter, Kelly directly aims to defend Foucault from normativity by referring to works of Paul Patton in several steps: he analyzes Patton's original interpretation of Foucault as an anti-normative thinker. Then Kelly answers to the criticism holding that political thought is inevitably based on normative ground, which means that Foucault either incoherent or eventually normative. Then he examines Patton's defence of Foucault against Charles Taylor's criticism. Finally, Kelly criticizes Patton's later work on Foucault, human rights and neoliberalism and his claim that late Foucault became a normative thinker claiming that referring to the problem of rights is merely "a call for rights only qua limitations on power" (Kelly, 2018, p. 156).

In conclusion, Kelly explains that he sees his work as an attempt of "catching up with Foucault" (Kelly, 2018, p. 169) because he is considered as the last thinker

of anti-normative thought. Kelly contends that even other French thinkers, such as Rancierre, Badiou and Balibar, were sub-Foucauldian because different kinds of commitments to normativity, politics, and/or theory can be found in their ideas. As for Badiou, Kelly argues about political character of his thought. Rancierre, in his turn, is the closest to Foucault's position, as Kelly claims, however, his theoretization makes him in some sense normative thinker. And Balibar falls for politics more than other two in terms of attempts to "positively determine the goals of politics" (Kelly, 2018, p. 171). Kelly comes to conclusion that we need to admit the urgency of our "ability to think, act, and live differently" (Kelly, 2018, p. 172). Kelly admits that we are probably "still caught in the old Enlightenment problematic" (Kelly, 2018, p. 172). As its outcome, Kelly shows Trump's triumph as an example and normative political theory's inability to resist it. For Kelly, this demonstrates that Foucault's anti-normative critique is highly relevant also because today "action urgently needs a new strategic analysis of power relations to inform it" (Kelly, 2018, p. 173).

To conclude, I would like to summarize both merits and shortcoming noted by other reviewers. Simon Choat acknowledges the book's style that makes the argument clear and consistent, although it relates to the Continental tradition characterized by "the pretension and needless obscurity" (Choat, 2018, p. 1). However, he considers some of Kelly's arguments against normative political theory unconvincing, and doubts on the demarcation line between theory and critique. He claims that "overzealous" (Choat, 2018, p. 4) defence and interpretation of Foucault's approach as flawless weakens the book. Choat finishes his review with a statement, which is absolutely out of place, that it is not acceptable in 2018 "to write eight chapters on political thinkers and to fail to include any women or non-white thinkers" (Choat, 2018, p. 4). Moreover, almost nothing is mentioned about the book's content.

In his turn, Frieder Vogelmann assesses the book as threefold: (1) original for Kelly's "overall thesis that political thinking should follow Foucault's model of non-normative critique" (Vogelmann, 2018); (2) provoking for combination of author's thesis and criticism against both analytic and continental normative political thinking; and most importantly (3), infuriating for Kelly's deliberate refutation for his far-reaching claims. Vogelmann is dissatisfied with insufficient outline of Foucault's conceptual apparatus claiming that "it weakens the book's persuasive power" (Vogelmann, 2018). He analyses each chapter in detail and also challenges Kelly's approach and its three core elements: normativity, theory, and politics. However, Vogelmann does not give proper attention to the final chapter and conclusion, which I think are no less important parts of the book.

Throughout the book's outline and other reviewers' assessment, it has become clear that it is not perfect and has some shortcomings. Nevertheless, it does not belittle the book's importance. I would recommend this book to those, first, who are interested in Foucault's scholarship, particularly in his political thought. Second, this book can be useful for scholars concerned with normative political theory and its alternatives, for the view of continental tradition presented here challenges the analytic paradigm

dominating within the field. Finally, this book might be useful for scholars who are interested at least in one of the thinkers presented in chapters, for it can give a great opportunity to look at them from the other side.

References

Kelly, M. G. E. (2018). *For Foucault: Against Normative Political Theory*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Choat, S. (2018). M.G.E.Kelly, For Foucault: Against Normative Political Theory. Albany: SUNY Press, 2018. In *Contemporary Political Theory,* September 2018, (pp. 1–4). DOI: 10.1057/s41296-018-0266-8

Vogelmann, F. (2018). *For Foucault: Against normative political theory* [Notre-Damme Philosophy Review]. Retrieved from: https://ndpr.nd.edu/news/for-foucault-against-normative-political-theory

ETHICAL CODE

FOR JOURNAL EDITORS

We ask all journal editors to make every reasonable effort to adhere to the following ethical code for *Changing Societies & Personalities* journal articles that are worthy of peer review:

- Journal editors should be accountable for everything published in their journals meaning that they should strive to meet the needs of readers and authors; strive to constantly improve their journal; have processes in place to assure the quality of the material they publish; champion freedom of expression; maintain the integrity of the academic record; preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards; always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

- Journal editors should give unbiased consideration to each manuscript submitted for consideration for publication, and should judge each on its merits, without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).

- Journal editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's validity and its relevance to the remit of the journal. Editors should not reverse decisions to accept submissions unless serious problems are identified with the submission.

- Journal editors must ensure that all published reports and reviews of research have been reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers (including statistical review where appropriate), and ensure that non-peer-reviewed sections of their journal are clearly identified.

- Journal editors must keep the peer-review process confidential. The editor and any editorial staff of the journal must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

- If a journal editor receives a claim that a submitted article is under consideration elsewhere or has already been published, then he or she has a duty to investigate the matter with CS&P Editorial Board.

- An editor should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper. Such measures will generally include contacting the author of the manuscript or paper and giving due consideration of the respective complaint or claims made.

- Journal editors may reject a submitted manuscript without resort to formal peer review if they consider the manuscript to be inappropriate for the journal and outside its scope.

- Journal editors should make all reasonable effort to process submitted manuscripts in an efficient and timely manner.

- Journal editors should arrange for responsibility of the peer review of any original research article authored by themselves to be delegated to a member of the CS&P Editorial Board as appropriate.

- If a journal editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of an article published in the journal are erroneous, then, in consultation with CS&P Editorial Board, the journal editor should facilitate publication of an appropriate corrigendum or erratum.

- Editor should refrain herself (himself) (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts, in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers.

- Any data or analysis presented in a submitted manuscript should not be used in a journal editor's own research except with the consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

- Editors should be alert to intellectual property issues and work with their publisher to handle potential breaches of intellectual property laws and conventions.

- Journal editors should make decisions on which articles to publish based on quality and suitability for the journal and without interference from the journal owner/publisher.

FOR AUTHORS

We expect all authors submitting to *Changing Societies & Personalities* journal to adhere to the following ethical code:

- All authors must warrant that their article is their own original work, which does not infringe the intellectual property rights of any other person or entity, and cannot be construed as plagiarizing any other published work, including their own previously published work. Plagiarism takes many forms, from 'passing off' another's paper as the author's own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

- All authors named on the paper are equally held accountable for the content of a submitted manuscript or published paper. All persons who have made significant scientific or literary contributions to the work reported should be named as co-authors. The corresponding author must ensure all named co-authors consent to publication and to being named as a co-author. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors.

- Authors must not submit a manuscript to more than one journal simultaneously. An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal of primary publication. Authors should not submit previously published work, nor work, which is based in substance on previously published work, either in part or whole.

- Authors must appropriately cite all relevant publications. The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used.

- the work and/or words of others, this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work unless fully cited, and with the permission of that third party.

- If required, authors must facilitate access to data sets described in the article. a paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work.

- Authors must declare any potential conflict of interest – be it professional or financial – which could be held to arise with respect to the article. All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict

of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript.

- Authors must avoid making defamatory statements in submitted articles, which could be construed as impugning any person's reputation.

FOR PEER REVIEWERS

We ask all peer reviewers to make every reasonable effort to adhere to the following ethical code for *Changing Societies & Personalities* journal articles they have agreed to review:

- Reviewers must give unbiased consideration to each manuscript submitted for consideration for publication, and should judge each on its merits, without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).

- Reviewers should declare any potential conflict of interest interests (which may, for example, be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious) prior to agreeing to review a manuscript including any relationship with the author that may potentially bias their review.

- Reviewers must keep the peer review process confidential; information or correspondence about a manuscript should not be shared with anyone outside of the peer review process.

- Reviewers should provide a constructive, comprehensive, evidenced, and appropriately substantial peer review report, and provide feedback that will help the authors to improve their manuscript. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments and make clear, which suggested additional investigations are essential to support claims made in the manuscript under consideration, and which will just strengthen or extend the work. Reviewers must ensure that their comments and recommendations for the editor are consistent with their report for the authors.

- Reviewers must be objective in their reviews, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory. Reviewers must avoid making statements in their report, which might be construed as impugning any person's reputation. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.

- Reviewers must be aware of the sensitivities surrounding language issues that are due to the authors writing in a language that is not their own, and phrase the feedback appropriately and with due respect.

- Reviewer must not suggest that authors include citations to the reviewer's (or their associates') work merely to increase the reviewer's (or their associates') citation count or to enhance the visibility of their or their

associates' work; suggestions must be based on valid academic or technological reasons.

- Any selected reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

- Reviewers should make all reasonable effort to submit their report and recommendation in a timely manner, informing the editor if this is not possible.

- Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Reviewers should call to the journal editor's attention any significant similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or submitted manuscripts, of which they are aware.

- Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

INSTRUCTION FOR AUTHORS

Thank you for choosing to submit your paper to us. These instructions will ensure we have everything required so your paper can move through peer review, production and publication smoothly. Please take the time to read and follow them as closely as possible, as doing so will ensure your paper matches the journal's requirements.

Use these instructions if you are preparing a manuscript to submit to *Changing Societies & Personalities*. To explore our journal portfolio, visit https://changing-sp.com

Changing Societies & Personalities considers all manuscripts on the strict condition that:

1. the manuscript is your own original work, and does not duplicate any other previously published work, including your own previously published work;

2. the manuscript has been submitted only to *Changing Societies & Personalities*; it is not under consideration or peer review or accepted for publication or in press or published elsewhere;

3. the manuscript contains nothing that is abusive, defamatory, libelous, obscene, fraudulent, or illegal.

By submitting your manuscript to *Changing Societies & Personalities* you are agreeing to any necessary originality checks your manuscript may have to undergo during the peer-review and production processes.

Manuscript preparation

1. General guidelines

Description of the journal's reference style

All authors must submit articles written in good English or Russian using correct grammar, punctuation and vocabulary. If authors are non-native English speakers or writers, may, if possible to have their submissions proofread by a native English speaker before submitting their article for consideration.

Please use double quotation marks, except where "a quotation is 'within' a quotation". Long quotations of words or more should be indented with quotation marks.

A typical manuscript is from 6000 to 8000 words including tables, references, captions, footnotes and endnotes. Review articles will not exceed

4000 words, and book reviews – 1500 words. Manuscripts that greatly exceed this will be critically reviewed with respect to length.

Manuscripts should be compiled in the following order: title page (including Acknowledgements as well as Funding and grant-awarding bodies); abstract; keywords; main text; acknowledgements; references; appendices (as appropriate); table(s) with caption(s) (on individual pages); figure caption(s) (as a list).

Abstracts of 150–200 words are required for all manuscripts submitted.

Each manuscript should have 5 to 10 keywords.

Section headings should be concise.

All authors of a manuscript should include their full names, affiliations, postal addresses, telephone numbers and email addresses on the cover page of the manuscript. One author should be identified as the corresponding author. Please give the affiliation where the research was conducted. If any of the named co-authors moves affiliation during the peer review process, the new affiliation can be given as a footnote. Please note that no changes to affiliation can be made after the manuscript is accepted. Please note that the email address of the corresponding author will normally be displayed in the published article and the online version.

All persons who have a reasonable claim to authorship must be named in the manuscript as co-authors; the corresponding author must be authorized by all co-authors to act as an agent on their behalf in all matters pertaining to publication of the manuscript, and the order of names should be agreed by all authors.

Please supply a short biographical note for each author.

Please supply all details required by any funding and grant-awarding bodies as an Acknowledgement on the title page of the manuscript, in a separate paragraph, as follows:

For single agency grants: "This work was supported by the [Funding Agency] under Grant [number xxxx]."

For multiple agency grants: "This work was supported by the [Funding Agency 1] under Grant [number xxxx]; [Funding Agency 2] under Grant [number xxxx]; and [Funding Agency 3] under Grant [number xxxx]."

For all manuscripts non-discriminatory language is mandatory. Sexist or racist terms must not be used.

2. Style guidelines

Font:	Helvetica, "Helvetica Neue" or Calibri, Sans-Serif, 12 point. Use margins of at least 2.5 cm (1 inch).
Title:	Use bold for your article title, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.
Authors' names:	Give the names of all contributing authors on the title page exactly as you wish them to appear in the published article.

Affiliations:	List the affiliation of each author (department, university, city, country).
Correspondence details:	Please provide an institutional email address for the corresponding author. Full postal details are also needed by the publisher, but will not necessarily be published.
Anonymity for peer review:	Ensure your identity and that of your co-authors is not revealed in the text of your article or in your manuscript files when submitting the manuscript for review.
Abstract:	Indicate the abstract paragraph with a heading or by reducing the font size.
Keywords:	Please provide five to ten keywords to help readers find your article.
Headings:	Please indicate the level of the section headings in your article:

- First-level headings (e.g. Introduction, Conclusion) should be in bold, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.
- Second-level headings should be in bold italics, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.
- Third-level headings should be in italics, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.
- Fourth-level headings should also be in italics, at the beginning of a paragraph. The text follows immediately after a full stop (full point) or other punctuation mark.

Tables and figures:	Indicate in the text where the tables and figures should appear, or example by inserting [Table 1 near here]. The actual tables and figures should be supplied either at the end of the text or in a separate file as requested by the Editor.

If your article is accepted for publication, it will be copy-edited and typeset in the correct style for the journal.

Foreign words and all titles of books or plays appearing within the text should be italicized. Non-Anglophone or transliterated words should also appear with translations provided in square brackets the first time they appear (e. g. weltanschauung [world-view]).

If acronyms are employed (e. g. the BUF), the full name should also be given the first time they appear.

If you have any queries, please contact us at https://changing-sp.com/ojs/index.php/csp/about/contact

CHANGING SOCIETIES & PERSONALITIES
STANDARD REFERENCE STYLE: **APA**

APA (*American Psychological Association*) references are widely used in the social sciences, education, engineering and business. For detailed information, please see the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 6th edition, http://www.apastyle.org/ and http://blog.apastyle.org/

In the text:	
Placement	References are cited in the text by the author's surname, the publication date of the work cited, and a page number if necessary. Full details are given in the reference list. Place them at the appropriate point in the text. If they appear within parenthetical material, put the year within commas: (see Table 3 of National Institute of Mental Health, 2012, for more details)
Within the same Parentheses	Order alphabetically and then by year for repeated authors, with in-press citations last. Separate references by different authors with a semi-colon.
Repeat mentions in the same paragraph	If name and year are in parentheses, include the year in subsequent citations.
With a quotation	This is the text, and Smith (2012) says "quoted text" (p. 1), which supports my argument. This is the text, and this is supported by "quoted text" (Smith, 2012, p. 1). This is a displayed quotation. (Smith, 2012, p. 1)
Page number	(Smith, 2012, p. 6)
One author	Smith (2012) or (Smith, 2012)
Two authors	Smith and Jones (2012) or (Smith & Jones, 2012)
Three to five authors	At first mention: Smith, Jones, Khan, Patel, and Chen (2012) or (Smith, Jones, Khan, Patel, & Chen, 2012) At subsequent mentions: Smith et al. (2012) or (Smith et al., 2012) In cases where two or more references would shorten to the same form, retain all three names.
Six or more authors	Smith et al. (2012) (Smith et al., 2012)
Authors with same surname	G. Smith (2012) and F. Smith (2008) G. Smith (2012) and F. Smith (2012)

No author	Cite first few words of title (in quotation marks or italics depending on journal style for that type of work), plus the year: ("Study Finds", 2007) If anonymous, put (Anonymous, 2012).
Groups of authors that would shorten to the same form	Cite the surnames of the first author and as many others as necessary to distinguish the two references, followed by comma and et al.
Organization as author	The name of an organization can be spelled out each time it appears in the text or you can spell it out only the first time and abbreviate it after that. The guiding rule is that the reader should be able to find it in the reference list easily. National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH, 2012) or (National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], 2012) University of Oxford (2012) or (University of Oxford, 2012)
Author with two works in the same year	Put a, b, c after the year (Chen, 2011a, 2011b, in press-a)
Secondary source	When it is not possible to see an original document, cite the source of your information on it; do not cite the original assuming that the secondary source is correct. Smith's diary (as cited in Khan, 2012)
Classical work	References to classical works such as the Bible and the Qur'an are cited only in the text. Reference list entry is not required. Cite year of translation (Aristotle, trans. 1931) or the version you read: Bible (King James Version).
Personal communication	References to personal communications are cited only in the text: A. Colleague (personal communication, April 12, 2011)
Unknown date	(Author, n.d.)
Two dates	(Author, 1959–1963) Author (1890/1983)
Notes	Endnotes should be kept to a minimum. Any references cited in notes should be included in the reference list.
Tables and figures	Put reference in the footnote or legend

Reference list	
Order	Your reference list should appear at the end of your paper. It provides the information necessary for a reader to locate and retrieve any source you cite in the body of the paper. Each source you cite in the paper must appear in your reference list; likewise, each entry in the reference list must be cited in your text. Alphabetical letter by letter, by surname of first author followed by initials. References by the same single author are ordered by date, from oldest to most recent. References by more than one author with the same first author are ordered after all references by the first author alone, by surname of second author, or if they are the same, the third author, and so on. References by the same author with the same date are arranged alphabetically by title excluding 'A' or 'The', unless they are parts of a series, in which case order them by part number. Put a lower-case letter after the year: Smith, J. (2012a). Smith, J. (2012b). For organizations or groups, alphabetize by the first significant word of their name. If there is no author, put the title in the author position and alphabetize by the first significant word.
Form of author name	Use the authors' surnames and initials unless you have two authors with the same surname and initial, in which case the full name can be given: Smith, J. [Jane]. (2012). Smith, J. [Joel]. (2012). If a first name includes a hyphen, add a full stop (period) after each letter: Jones, J.-P.
Book	
One author	Author, A. A. (2012). *This is a Book Title: and Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge.
Two authors	Author, A. A., & Author, B. B. (2012). *This is a Book Title: and Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge
Three authors	Author, A. A., Author, B. B., & Author, C. C. (2012). *This is a Book Title: and Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge.

More authors	Include all names up to seven. If there are more than seven authors, list the first six with an ellipsis before the last. Author, M., Author, B., Author, E., Author, G., Author, D., Author, R., … Author, P. (2001).
Organization as author	American Psychological Association. (2003). *Book Title: and Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge.
No author	*Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (10th ed.). (1993). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
Chapter	Author, A. A. (2012). This is a chapter. In J. J. Editor (Ed.), *Book Title: And Subtitle* (pp. 300–316). Abingdon: Routledge. Author, A. A. (2012). This is a chapter. In J. J. Editor & B. B. Editor (Eds.), *Book Title: and Subtitle* (pp. 300–316). Abingdon: Routledge. Author, A. A. (2012). This is a chapter. In J. J. Editor, P. P. Editor, & B. B. Editor (Eds.), *Book Title: And Subtitle* (pp. 300–316). Abingdon: Routledge.
Edited	Editor, J. J. (Ed.). (2012). *Book Title: And Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge. Editor, J. J., Editor, A. A., & Editor, P. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Book Title: And Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge. Editor, J. J., & Editor, P. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Edited Online Book: And Subtitle.* Retrieved from https://www.w3.org
Edition	Author, A. A. (2012). *Book Title: And Subtitle* (4th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.
Translated	Author, J. J. (2012). *Book Title: And Subtitle*. (L. Khan, Trans.). Abingdon: Routledge.
Not in English	Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1951). *La Genèse de L'idée de Hasard Chez L'enfant* [The origin of the idea of chance in the child]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. For transliteration of Cyrillic letters please use the links: ALA-LC Romanization Tables at the web-site of The Library of Congress http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/roman.html
Online	Author, A. A. (2012). *Title of Work: Subtitle* [Adobe Digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://www.w3.org

Place of publication	Always list the city, and include the two-letter state abbreviation for US publishers. There is no need to include the country name: New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Washington, DC: Author Newbury Park, CA: Sage Pretoria: Unisa Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press Abingdon: Routledge If the publisher is a university and the name of the state is included in the name of the university, do not repeat the state in the publisher location: Santa Cruz: University of California Press Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press
Publisher	Give the name in as brief a form as possible. Omit terms such as 'Publishers', 'Co.', 'Inc.', but retain the words 'Books' and 'Press'. If two or more publishers are given, give the location listed first or the location of the publisher's home office. When the author and publisher are identical, use the word Author as the name of the publisher.
Multivolume works	
Multiple volumes from a multivolume work	Levison, D., & Ember, M. (Eds). (1996). *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology* (Vols. 1–4). New York, NY: Henry Holt. Use Vol. for a single volume and Vols. for multiple volumes. In text, use (Levison & Ember, 1996).
A single volume from a multivolume work	Nash, M. (1993). Malay. In P. Hockings (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of World Cultures* (Vol. 5, pp. 174–176). New York, NY: G.K. Hall. In text, use (Nash, 1993).
Journal	
One author	Author, A. A. (2011). Title of Article. *Title of Journal*, 22, 123–231. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx Provide the issue number ONLY if each issue of the journal begins on page 1. In such cases it goes in parentheses: Journal, 8(1), pp–pp. Page numbers should always be provided.

	If there is no DOI and the reference was retrieved from an online database, give the database name and accession number or the database URL (no retrieval date is needed): Author, A. A. (2011). Title of Article. *Title of Journal*, 22, 123–231. Retrieved from https://www.w3.org If there is no DOI and the reference was retrieved from a journal homepage, give the full URL or site's homepage URL: Author, A. A. (2011). Title of Article. *Title of Journal*, 22, 123–231. Retrieved from https://www.w3.org
Two authors	Author, A. A., & Author, B. B. (2004). Title of Article. *Title of Journal*, 22, 123–231. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx
Three authors	Author, A. A., Author, B. B., & Author, C. C. (1987). Title of Article. *Title of Journal*, 22, 123–231. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx
More authors	Include all names up to seven. If there are more than seven authors, list the first six with an ellipsis before the last. Author, M., Author, B., Author, E., Author, G., Author, D., Author, R., …, Author, P. (2001).
Organization as author	American Psychological Association. (2003). Title of Article: and subtitle. *Title of Journal*, 2, 12–23. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx
No author	Editorial: Title of editorial. [Editorial]. (2012). *Journal Title*, 14, 1–2.
Not in English	If the original version is used as the source, cite the original version. Use diacritical marks and capital letters for the original language if needed. If the English translation is used as the source, cite the English translation. Give the English title without brackets. Titles not in English must be translated into English and put in square brackets. Author, M. (2000). Title in German: Subtitle of Article [Title in English: Subtitle of Article]. *Journal in German*, 21, 208–217. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx Author, P. (2000). Title in French [Title in English: Subtitle of Article]. *Journal in French*, 21, 208–217. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx For transliteration of Cyrillic letters please use the links: ALA-LC Romanization Tables at the web-site of The Library of Congress http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/roman.html

Peer-reviewed article published online ahead of the issue	Author, A. A., & Author, B. B. (2012). Article title. *Title of Journal*. Advance online publication. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxx If you can update the reference before publication, do so.
Supplemental material	If you are citing supplemental material, which is only available online, include a description of the contents in brackets following the title. [Audio podcast] [Letter to the editor]
Other article types	Editorial: Title of editorial. [Editorial]. (2012). *Title of Journal*, 14, 1–2. Author, A. A. (2010). Title of review. [Review of the book Title of book, by B. Book Author]. *Title of Journal*, 22, 123–231. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx
Article in journal supplement	Author, A. A. (2004). Article title. *Title of Journal*, 42(Suppl. 2), xx–xx. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxxx
Conference	
Proceedings	To cite published proceedings from a book, use book format or chapter format. To cite regularly published proceedings, use journal format.
Paper	Presenter, A. A. (2012, February). Title of paper. *Paper Presented at the Meeting of Organization Name*, Location.
Poster	Presenter, A. A. (2012, February). Title of poster. *Poster Session Presented at the Meeting of Organization Name*, Location
Thesis	Author, A. A. (2012). *Title of Thesis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation or master's thesis). Name of Institution, Location.
Unpublished work	
Manuscript	Author, A. A., Author, B. B., & Author, C. C. (2008). *Title of Manuscript*. Unpublished manuscript. Author, A. A., Author, B. B., & Author, C. C. (2012). *Title of Manuscript*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
Forthcoming article	Author, A. A., Author, B. B., & Author, C. C. (in press). Title of article. *Title of Journal*. doi:xx.xxxxxxxxx
Forthcoming book	Author, A. A. (in press). *Book Title: Subtitle*.
Internet	
Website	When citing an entire website, it is sufficient just to give the address of the site in the text. *The BBC* (https://www.bbc.co.uk).
Web page	If the format is out of the ordinary (e.g. lecture notes), add a description in brackets. Author, A. (2011). Title of document [Format description]. Retrieved from http://URL

Newspaper or magazine	Author, A. (2012, January 12). Title of Article. *The Sunday Times*, p. 1. Author, A. (2012, January 12). Title of Article. *The Sunday Times*. Retrieved from http://www.sundaytimes.com Title of Article. (2012, January 12). *The Sunday Times*. Retrieved from http://www.sundaytimes.com/xxxx.html
Reports	
May or may not be peer-reviewed; may or may not be published. Format as a book reference.	Author, A. A. (2012). *Title of work* (Report No. 123). Location: Publisher. Author, A. A. (2012). Title of work (Report No. 123). Retrieved from *Name website*: https://www.w3.org
Working paper	Author, A. A. (2012). *Title of work* (Working Paper No. 123). Location: Publisher. Author, A. A. (2012). Title of work (Working Paper No. 123). Retrieved from *Name website*: https://www.w3.org
Discussion paper	Author, A. A. (2012). *Title of work* (Discussion Paper No. 123). Location: Publisher. Author, A. A. (2012). Title of work (Discussion Paper No. 123). Retrieved from *Name website*: https://www.w3.org
Personal communication	Personal communication includes letters, emails, memos, messages from discussion groups and electronic bulletin boards, personal interviews. Cite these only in the text. Include references for archived material only.
Other reference types	
Patent	Cho, S. T. (2005). U.S. Patent No. 6,980,855. Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
Map	London Mapping Co. (Cartographer). (1960). Street map. [Map]. Retrieved from http://www.londonmapping.co.uk/maps/xxxxx.pdf
Act	*Mental Health Systems Act*, 41 U.S.C. § 9403 (1988).
Audio and visual media	Taupin, B. (1975). Someone saved my life tonight [Recorded by Elton John]. On Captain fantastic and the brown dirt cowboy [CD]. London: Big Pig Music Limited. Author, A. (Producer). (2009, December 2). *Title of Podcast* [Audio podcast]. Retrieved from *Name website*: https://www.w3.org Producer, P. P. (Producer), & Director, D. D. (Director). (Date of publication). *Title of Motion Picture* [Motion picture]. Country of origin: Studio or distributor. Smith, A. (Writer), & Miller, R. (Director). (1989). Title of episode [Television series episode]. In A. Green (Executive Producer), Series. New York, NY: WNET.

	Miller, R. (Producer). (1989). The mind [Television series]. New York, NY: WNET.
Database	Author, A. A., Author, B. B., & Author, A. A. (2002). A study of enjoyment of peas. *Journal Title*, 8(3). Retrieved February 20, 2003, from the PsycARTICLES database.
Dataset	Author. (2011). *National Statistics Office Monthly Means and other Derived Variables* [Data set]. Retrieved March 6, 2011, from *Name website*: https://www.w3.org If the dataset is updated regularly, use the year of retrieval in the reference, and using the retrieval date is also recommended.
Computer program	Rightsholder, A. A. (2010). *Title of Program* (Version number) [Description of form]. Location: Name of producer. Name of software (Version Number) [Computer software]. Location: Publisher. If the program can be downloaded or ordered from a website, give this information in place of the publication information.

3. Figures

Please provide the highest quality figure format possible. Please be sure that all imported scanned material is scanned at the appropriate resolution: 1200 dpi for line art, 600 dpi for grayscale and 300 dpi for color.

Figures must be saved separate to text. Please do not embed figures in the manuscript file.

Files should be saved as one of the following formats: TIFF (tagged image file format), PNG (portable network graphics) or JPEG (also JPG).

Each file should be no larger than 1 megabyte, the total size of all files attached to one article should not be more than 20 megabytes.

All figures must be numbered in the order, in which they appear in the manuscript (e.g. Figure 1, Figure 2). In multi-part figures, each part should be labelled (e.g. Figure 1(a), Figure 1(b)).

Figure captions must be saved separately, as part of the file containing the complete text of the manuscript, and numbered correspondingly.

The filename for a graphic should be descriptive of the graphic, e.g. Figure 1, Figure 2a.