



**TECHNIUM**  
**SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL**

**Vol. 14, 2020**

**A new decade  
for social changes**

[www.techniumscience.com](http://www.techniumscience.com)

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

## Role of the culture for formation of the attitude

**Abdullayeva Shafahat**

The Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan

[anfas.07@mail.ru](mailto:anfas.07@mail.ru)

**Abstract.** There are deep relations between the human mind and the environment. The surroundings of human are filled with influences from past generations. Therefore, humans are shaped by the character of the world. The analysis of psychological literature concludes that children become the object of culture from birth. In the process of socialization, a child learns other scenarios from their culture. The state of mind interiorized all of these cultural scenarios. This process impacts a person's perception of the external world. Such influences impact the formation of conscious perception and the emotional system. Mentalities, emotions of the human mind were studied in this article as an internal factor which affects human attitude. It is demonstrated that it is impossible to think about the formation of a child's perception of the world without, considering all of these factors. The internal factors are formed by knowledge of the world, modes of behaviour and scenarios which were learned during childhood. The sources of this knowledge, modes of behaviours and scenarios are culture driven. The basis of psychology is connected to a specific culture. Culture affects the perception of the mind's formulation; the "cultural frame" of perception. The objects of the external world have mental meaning, which pass through the cultural frame of perception. The ways of cultural formation and the perception of it affect the formation of human attitude. The culture learned by an individual are related to the 'thoughtless' or 'thoughtful' attitude which are manifested by certain actions. The investigation showed that culture is the framework for attitude and a person reflects specific cultural attitudes.

**Keywords.** Attitude, Culture, Intentional World, The Conventional World, Cultural Frame of Perception

### Introduction

The biological existence of humans coupled with their social existence is a fact accepted by main stream science. The social existence of humans is reflected by living amongst other persons with shared communications. Should an Infant be removed from human care, in some conditions; a child may have biological existence, but their social existence will accrue in the form of an outcast, one condemned in existence to death. Defined events described in the psychological literature of infants living among animals have proven this hypothesis. Given, the continuation of their biological existence, these infants remain defined as abnormal; proper character formations do not take place.

The processes have been studied as per, the process of social experiences of previous generations involving infants. Children from childhood learn images, modes, schemes, samples of behaviours and scenarios from parents. Also, the child learns the elements of culture as per

its impact. Children learn the differences between ‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘can or cannot’. The elements of culture transfer from parents to the child are in essence learned patterns of behaviour. It is also information transferred from generation to generation. It is available from the minds of individuals as a cultural constant of elements of nations, people, society, and generations; inclusive of family, either in cognitive or emotional forms. In spite of the differences of these constants within different cultures, at the same time they are included in the experiences of mankind. We assess these experiences learned by mankind; even in spite of the differences between cultures. In my opinion, all have common elements: stealing, lying, false witness, execution and fornication.

\*\*\*

Analysis of the psychological literature (Uznadze, 1961/1977/, Shichirev, 1971/1979, Yaroshevskiy, 1971/1985, Allport, Chain, 1948) show that, the problem was in fact since the beginning of the past century. Attitudes are learned from different aspects and the role of culture in its formation were also examined.

Investigations show that an infant from birth who is surrounded with elder people, as it was mentioned by the psychologists says, the child is affected by culture from birth. Culture affects the formation of the state of mind together with biological and social factors. Such roles of culture were found over long periods. It has been agreed only in latter times as S. Lurie writes: “Important impact of the culture to the formation of the state of mind is not a generally accepted hypothesis. But, the psychological anthropology every time more strongly justified that, the culture attempts to the infant psychology since the birth moment. For example, blue nappy is used for the boys, but for the girls pink one” (Lurie, 2005).

The human environment is abundant with cultural information elements from previous generations. One of the lead postulates of anthropologic psychology is that, there is a connection between people and this information which makes for possible multiple impacts. As it was notified by S. Lurie, “The seared relations between the special existing human surroundings and fundamental categories of his/her mind: The human environment is full with the material and ideal ways of the behaviours, left from the past generation.” (Lurie, 2005, p7) (To be notified that, by this reason, humans get a structured image of the world). S. Lurie writes: “children are become the object of culture from birth. In the next process of socialization, he/she learns other scenarios of his/her culture. His/her state of mind interiorizes of all these cultural scenarios. The process impacts the perception of the external world by children. Even, it does not only impact, at the same time, it is strongly affects to the formation of the perception, mentality and the emotional system” (Lurie, 2005, p.9).

Fifty years ago, the formation of the state of mind, only the external factors we considered and used for analysis of the psychology. “There were considerations writes Lurie, it was enough to know the explicit characters of humans...Indeed, the main motivations of the behaviours like what do they think, what kind of emotional conditions does one live, what they tell and why, what they were thinking when, they say this or other opinions, what did they understand but did not considered.”

As it was presented in this sample, it is not possible to say any idea is the formation of the child, without considering ideas, the emotional conditions, hidden or unhidden words, said or unsaid words, which were learned or not learned, so we mean the internal factors. The reason is they always act upon the main motivations of behaviours. All these mentioned factors form the attitude of the person. Then, there is a question generated; which factors influence the formation of human internal world? The human internal world is formed by the world’s collective knowledge which is learned from childhood, modes of behaviours, schemes and scenarios and emotional conditions. Then, there is a logical question; what is the source of such

images, models, schemes, conditions and scenarios? The answer is clear: it is in culture. Transference of all these factors from generation to generation is possible due to the culture. So, we conclude that, the state of mind of everybody is formed by the effect of the cultural information transfer from previous generations.

There are multiple types of cultures. The question is where must we search for their sources? For investigation of this problem, psychologists use the terms “intentional” and “conventional worlds”. When we say intentional world, it is considered the world created by the human and when we say conventional world, it is considered the world that is important for human. S. Lurie writes: “Each culture represents the “intentional” world, so “the created and build world”. Then he writes: “The infinity numbers of different intentional worlds could not be justified with conventional world (so, social strengthened world of importance)” (Lurie, 2005, p.6). So, the culture created by humans is the important world for humans. The infinite numbers of cultures have social importance. This means, the external world (the conventional world) cannot be source of the intentional world. Then, it means, the social world (the world of importance) cannot be the sources for a culture-intentional world. It is accepted in the psychology, the variety and abundances of cultures suitable with the physical worlds. There is a conclusion that the sources have to be searched in other places.

In opinions of psychologists and anthropologists, such sources can only be “intentional person”. They show also, there are cultural systems in the basis of the psychology of intentional person. At the same time, the cultural system is depended on intentional person, and therefore it is depended on the psychology affected by culture. Consequently, referring to the intentional person, we consider the person formed by the impact of culture. The source of culture is not a world; it is the human having specific cultural systems and consequently it is the intentional person. There is a specific culture in the basis of the state of mind of the intentional person. The culture generates intentional persons. Apparently, it is the process of having mutual impacts: humans make culture, at the same time, culture forms humans and their internal worlds. S. Lurie writes: “The intentional world is factually and realistically will be existed while the people have the knowledge redirecting their trust, wishes, targets and mental images” (Lurie, 2005, p.7).

R. Shweder is also approving it: “The intentional events and things will exist only in the intentional worlds. Anything out of our reaction and interest will not exist. The intentional things are active because, we have their images, they do not exist in any “naturel” reality out of the human’s mind and activities, (Shweder, 1991, p.88). Shweder writes that, the intentional world does not exist outside the intentional conditions (trust, emotion, desire, wishes). The intentional world impacts the intentional conditions and it is under impacts of condition, it will be impacted by the people living in this world” (Shweder).

According to the above mentioned hypothesis, culture is the aggregate of the intentional world and intentional person. For L. , stated from this position, the culture is arranging the biological calls, adopts this or other methods to the members of the society and defines for them senses. R. Shweder more deeply explains the seissues. He writes: “The psychological intension reflects the person but the culture reflects the intentional world. The intentional world and intentional person is mutually connected. They are the results of the intentional activity and dialectically define each other by the intentional activity” (Shweder, p.102).

The impact of the culture on humans for it to be understood as it impacts the human perception. In the psychological literature, it calls “cultural frame of perception”. The anthropologic psychologists give high value to perception and they say that, the objects of the external world passing through perception take their mental meanings. The psychological anthropologists review perception as the process forming the base structure of the culture (Lurie, 2005).

So, it is concluded that, the humans perceive the elements of the external world from the cultural frame of perception. The ways of forming of the perception is by the impact of culture which identifies the forms of attitude. The attitude is the preparation status of humans for respondent reaction. Attitude and perception are very closely connected to each other and they have mutual impacts. It is talked about it in details in paragraph three.

It is notified in psychological literature that, learning different scenarios by the child is realized his/her perception and activity process. In this process, he/she is also learning certain perception methods. The paradigm of perception defines the character of such activity. The paradigms of perception are defined by the components of the culture which create structure.

In order to perceive the social cultural environment by humans they should have to be important. In order to be important of the components of the external world, they have to be processed in the human mind and then, they will be interiorized. How do the objects of the external world become internal? In the opinions of the psychologists, parts of these are taking places automatically they are not translating. The child perceives the cultural scheme and modes-scenarios, when he/she is communicating to others, whatever perception is in this inter-psychical process it is inter psychical for him/her (Shweder).

As the results of investigations, it was found that, the paradigms formed structure and context of the culture is not perceivable, otherwise, it would not be culture, it would be just the norms accepted by the small groups of people. S.Lurie writes: "It is possible to understand these paradigms as the general culture scenarios perceived and interiorized. Such scenario can identify the character of perception and activity." (Lurie, 2005, p.12)The learned scenarios are realized in the mutual impact process and become significant for human. As it is defined in the psychological literature, we do not live in real world we live in the world of importance. (Lurie, 2005; Shweder, 1991)

The world of significances is also related to attitude itself. The culture learned by a person is a thoughtless attitude against the certain actions. In addition, the cultural scenario itself is defining by the components of attitude like, cognitive, emotional, and conative elements. Summarizing the above mentioned, we can see that the scenarios are:

- 1) Realizing in the mutual impact process.
- 2) Related to the attitudes.
- 3) Significance.
- 4) Scenarios itself defining by the impact of attitude.

"This process, being the production of cultural activities of a human being, as well as controlling and regulating-socio-cultural activities of human being, is of a specific psychological nature considered as the unconscious elements of human psychology conditioned with the culture." – said S. Lurie (2005). So, perception of information by humans:

- 1) Products of the human's cultural activities.
- 2) Regulating the human's socio-cultural activities.
- 3) It is specific thoughtless process conditioned with culture.

Such specific psycho processes make for the different images. The interesting and important things are not these images, these are their dispositions, conditions for activity, their mutual relations and mutual impact methods, and they are called "thoughtless area" in the psychological literature. (Lurie, 2005; Shweder, 1991). S. Lurie notified that, dispositions are still not intentional world; these are the frame of this. The attitude is the frame of intentional world, saying, it is the frame of culture. The structured image of the whole world is vitalizing in the human mind. S. Lurie had written: "... Human gets such image of surrounding that, here are structured all the elements of the world and it is keeping harmony by human" (2005, p.14).

Explaining the person structure, A. Kardiner differentiated the role of initial institutional and re institutionalization for its formation. In his opinion, main structures of a person are forming by initial public institutional. He includes life guarantee, family organization, child care experiences, their education and socialization to the initial public institutional. A. Kardiner and R. Lipton call all such things the way of perception of the skills and knowledge and quality of the society where he/she lives (Kardiner & Lipton, 1995).

Indeed, initial public institutional make the basis of experiences which will be used in whole of his/her life. So, considering these facts, S. Lurie assessed the initial public institutional as a phenomenon defining their degree of excitation, character of neurosis, the ways of psychological defences. In opinion of A. Kardiner, re-institutional is establishing by the folklore, mythology and religious. A. Kardiner gives explanation to all of them as “a projection of main structure of the person.”

A. Kardiner shows the five hierarchic system of the main structure of a person:

- 1). The projective system based on thoughtless experience. Here are included the individual super-ego system and psychological defence system.
- 2). Studied norms belonging to the modes appeared as impulses.
- 3). Studied models of activities.
- 4). Taboo system, learned as a part of the real world.
- 5). The reality learned by empiric methods (Kardiner, 1939)

As it was notified by the author himself, the first level is the thoughtless area and they could be presented only by transferring the thoughtless complexes to real objects. They are transformed little; their changes, the institutes created them to be transformed. The last level is the fully mindful and cognized level. Other levels state in the middle of them (Kardiner, 1939).

To be notified that, A. Kardiner uses the term of projection in different meaning than it was used by Freud. Despite Z. Freud uses of projection as a psychological defence facility. A. Kardiner explains it as a general symbolic process and he presents that, there is a relation between the projective sub-system and re-public institutional. He had written: “... projection transforms general psycho symbolic material the area of mind. It makes possible for the relations between sub system and re-public institutional” (Kardiner, 1939, p.357).

According to the concepts of A. Kardiner, the human experience forms his/her perception and emotionally directing his/her intension, summarizes them and is presented as an objective reality during formation of projective system. Certainly, this reality organizing the human’s field of motivation affects to his/her behaviour.

In his investigations, A. Kardiner concluded that, humans at the same time live in both, in objective and projective reality. The neurotic condition of the society appears, when there is strong confrontation between them. All societies have the institutional models based on the projective and rational systems: There is not such culture, one of these is dominant, and the issue is that, how they are not suitable to each other, the problem is how they devastate concept of the psychological reality“ (Kardiner, 1939, p.119).

American psychologist Klod Kluckhohn states it in different form: “Everybody inside itself has the system of value as his/her adjusted personal part...” and “the values of culture are not identic with the value of person” (Kluckhohn, 1951, p.395). K. Kluckhohn and F. Strodbeck concluded that:” Member of any culture is never going next to the dominant of culture consciously” (Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, 196, p.396).

The American psychologists J. Whiting and I. Child approve also above mentioned hypothesis in their investigations. “...Person locates in between two systems: Experience of childhood education, magic, religious trust and practices” (Whiting and Child, p.227). J. Whiting and I. Child using the stimuli and reaction paradigms, they use “black box” notion:

“Behaviours of elders is respond to childhood education. Person is the black box which is remained between them, and directly evaluation is impossible” (Whiting and Child, p.190). In my opinion, the black box is the internal world of human, his/her attitude - dispositions and plenty of dispositions. S. Lurie is also justifying that, there are a lot of black boxes.

Indeed, the numbers of attitudes are infinitely more. It is not possible to explain the forms of attitude only using stimuli and reaction formula. Despite perception the world starts from the external world, in order to be important by individuals, the objects of the external world need to be passed through certain processes, in order to cognized in human minds; to be emotionally strengthened and to be connected with the value system of the human condition. This is the process of personal attitude.

“The person, in narrow meaning of the word, reflects disposition” said Robert Le Vine. Then he continuous: “The person reflects the dispositions of psychological organizations for adapting to the external world, which are not observed by themselves, but they are interiorized by person. These dispositions exist like potential behaviours which are not realized in behaviour. We can observe the constant dispositions which affect the human behaviour adaptation. Such manifestations are clear and expectable (Le Vine, 1974, p.12).

Then, arguing the mutual impacts between the individual behaviour and dispositions, R. Le Vine writes: “Such observed aspects of behaviour are not the basis of the person, it reflects the person, to tell the truth, and it reflects the dispositions which affect to his/her behaviour. Dispositions affect behaviours of the person, as well as cultural norms, but it is from inside. The psychologist, studying the person, does not stay in the level of behaviour, rather he looks at his/her unobserved side and in his suppositions, this side is psychologically organized: “We have to recognize that, the disposition is organized, the organization has the functional importance” (Le Vine, 1974, p.90).

R. Le Vine gives high value to dispositions for forming of the person. R. Le Vine defends three levels of person:

- 1). An observed behaviour.
- 2). Person’s disposition.
- 3). Personal organization, where the disposition is strengthened. He includes motivations, emotional and cognitive complexes in different forms to the disposition of person (Le Vine, 1974).

We have to note that, the psychology organization is the cognitive, affective and is the motivation organization of humans. Information transferred in childhood take place in the structure of a mental and emotional system and in the behaviour mechanism, and it is highly reinforced. In common opinions of the psychologists, the mental and emotional models do not easily disappear even when the person is not in his/her culture. Justifying this hypothesis, Le Vine writes: “The individual cannot accept the new requirements in his/her behaviours, unless his/her mental and sensitive models are destroyed. Specifically, it is difficult to forget inconceivable mental and sensitive components. The reason is that, they were for med in early childhood times” (Le Vine, 1974, p.349). Shweder also justifies this opinion. Although, he does not use the term of attitude in his study, he investigates: “the central activity mechanism” and indeed, he talks about the disposition of person. He writes: “Central activity mechanism of human state of mind is behind the socio-cultural system, the central activity mechanism does not change radically by the impact of the socio-cultural environment included to the structure” (Shweder, 1991, p.2).

R. Shweder notes that: “The principles of intentional world are like, subject and object-human and his/her surrounding is mutually absorbed to each other and they cannot be studied like, one is dependent from other one but the second does not depend on first. Neither this nor

other could be defined considering each other specifications” (Shweder, 1991, p.379). Concussively, the socio-cultural environment cannot exist without depending on human subjectivity and human mental reality cannot exist without depending on socio-environment. R. Shweder shows that, the socio-cultural environment is the intentional world because, it reality is only possible when there is an existence of human communities which are impacted by and directed to trusts, wishes, targets and other mental images” (Shweder, 1991). R. Shweder has defined the six types of relations between culture and cultural human. Initially, he divides the relations in two big groups:

- 1). Positive relations.
- 2). Negative relations.

He shows that, the positive relation is appearing when the world intentionally is increasing or supporting people intentionally. The negative relation is appearing when world intentionally negatively affects to the intentionally of the state of mind. Then, R .Shweder divides these relations in to the groups like active, reactive and passive. He shows that, active relation appears when he/she makes his/her targets with his/her own choices. Reactive relations appear when the target for a person is defined by other people or the intentional world is created for him/her. The goal of the human in passive relations to the world is to be immortal in intentional world (Shweder, 1991). Thus, R. Shweder has demonstrated six types of relations: positive (active, reactive, passive); negative (active, reactive and passive).

The American scientist Scheier and Carver, in their study discuss the dispositional optimism said that, the dispositional optimism is a quality which supports to the people to get their targets. When the human believes that, everything will be good, and then he works with more interest and enthusiasm. In contrary, if he/she does not believe that, everything will have positive end, or let us say, he/she believes that, the bad things will happen only with him/her, then they cannot get their targets (2006).

### **Conclusion**

Thus, summarizing above mentioned, we conclude that, culture strongly affects the formation of the state of mind as well as biological and sociological process. The child becomes the object of the culture from the moment of birth. Received information is interiorized by his/her state of mind. This process is highly affects the child’s perception, mental and emotional system.

In addition, the investigation demonstrated that, every culture is intentional, and therefore it is a created and build world. The source of the intentional world is the intentional person. At the same time, cultural systems are dependent on the intentional person and dependent on the culturally conditioned state of mind. Humans create the culture. The culture is forming the human. Thus, the culture is the unit of intentional world and intentional person having mutual impacts with each other.

It is clear that, impact of the culture on humans has to be understood as impact to the human perception. The way of forming perception by the impact of culture is by defining the formation of the attitude. Attitudes and perceptions are closely contacted and they have impacts upon each other. Culture learned by human is conditioning; it is thoughtful or thoughtless attitudes within certain actions.

It was found in the investigation that, dispositions (attitudes) are not yet intentional world; they are the frame for this. It is such framework that makes the basis of the world where people live and act, and the structure of all the reality is built on this frame in the human mind. The attitudes are infinite in number. It is impossible to describe the process which forms attitudes for only by the use of stimuli and reaction can a formula be supposed. Although

understanding the world starts from the external world, in order to measure the elements of the external world, they would have to be cognate in the human's mind, to be reinforced emotionally, and to be connected to the human's value system. This is the process of formation of the human's attitude.

Therefore, we have to note that, information transfer during childhood education takes place in the structure of the mind and emotional systems with behavioural mechanisms of a child and all is strengthened by attitude. The state of mind of all persons is formed by the impacts of bearer culture. Given, an attitude is positively formed; such dispositional optimism supports the individual to obtain their targets.

### **References**

#### **In Russian**

- [1] Lurie S.V. Psychological Anthropology: History, status and prospects. Moscow, Publishing House Academic Project; Alma Mater, 2005, -624 p.
- [2] Psychological Encyclopedia. 2nd edition, publishing house "Piter" under. Ed. R.Korsini and A.Auerbaha, 2006 - 1096 with.
- [3] D.N. Uznadze Experimental foundations of the psychology of set. Tbilisi publishing house "Metsniereba" 1961, - 358s.
- [4] D.N. Uznadze The main provisions of the theory. Proceedings, Volume 6, Tbilisi, publishing house "Metsniereba", 1977, p. 263-326.
- [5] Hell L. Ziegler D. Theories of personality. SPb., Publishing house "Peter", 2000, -608s.
- [6] P.N. Contemporary social psychology the United States. Moscow, Publishing House "Science", 1979, -372 p.
- [7] Shihirov PN Social Studies in the US system. \ Problems of Philosophy, 1971, N5, c. 168-175)
- [8] Schultz D.P., Schultz S.E. The history of modern psychology. 2 nd ed., Trans. with Eng. Govorunov A.V. et al., St. Petersburg., publishing house "Eurasia", 2002, -532 p.
- [9] Yaroshevskii M.G. Psychology in the twentieth century. Theoretical problems of psychological science. Moscow, publishing house "Politizdat" 1971, -368 p.
- [10] Yaroshevskii M.G. History of Psychology. 3 rides. Moscow, publishing house "Thought", 1985, -575 p.

#### **In English**

- [1] Allport G.W. Attitudes. In: C. Murchison (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Worcester, Mass: Clark Univ. Press. 1956, p. 798-884,
- [2] Chein I. Behaviour Theory and the Behaviour of Attitudes. Psychol. Rev., 1948, -188p.
- [3] Kardiner A. Psychological Frontiyer of Society, New York: Columbia University Press, 1939
- [4] Kardiner A., Lipton R. The Individual and His Society, New York. Columbia Universities Press, 1955.
- [5] Kluckhohn C. Valuee Orientation in the Theory of Actions. In Parnsons T. And Shils E. (ed). Toward General Theory of Actions. Cambridge/ Mass. Harvard University Press, 1951, p.395
- [6] Le Vine R.A. Culture, Behavior and Personality. An Intriduction to the Comparative Study of Psychosoyal Adaptation. Chicaqo, Aldine Publishing Company. 1974, p.3-4
- [7] Le Vin R.A. Properties of Culture. An Ethnographic View, 1984
- [8] Shweder R.A. Thinking through CulturesCambridge (Mass). London (England). Harvard University Press, 1991, p.2

- [9] Shweder R.A. Cultural psychology – What is it? NY, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [10] Shweder R.A., Le Vin (eds.) Cultural Theori. Essays on Mind Self and Emotion. Cambridge. L., NY. New Rpchelle. Cambridge University Press, 1984
- [11] Wicker A. Attitudes vs. actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioural responses to attitude objects. 1967.
- [12] Whiting J.W.M., Child I.L., Children Traning and Personality, New York: Wiley, 1953, -286 p.