



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Iuliia Papushina

**POST-SOVIET MASS
CELEBRATION AND
KUL'TURNOST': THE SURVEY
OF URBAN ART FESTIVAL
“WHITE NIGHTS IN PERM - 2012”**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES
WP BRP 58/HUM/2014

*Iuliia Papushina*¹

**POST-SOVIET MASS CELEBRATION AND *KUL'TURNOST*:
THE SURVEY OF URBAN ART FESTIVAL “WHITE NIGHTS IN
PERM - 2012”²**

This paper employs the category “*kul'turnost*” for the analysis of post-Soviet urban mass celebrations. Based on empirical data gathered during White Nights in Perm Festival – 2012, the paper delves into how Soviet ideological clichés and stereotypes are manifested in the language of contemporary Russian urban inhabitants. The research setting is the industrial city of Perm with approximately one million citizens. The research is based on a survey, conducted with 429 festival visitors. The results demonstrate that visitors have a complex structure of their opinions including the clichés rooted in Soviet discursive heritage. Applying Bourdieu’s idea of “the objectivisation of the objectifier”, the paper reflects on the influence of survey on the usage of Soviet discursive heritage. The results suggest the necessity to regard Soviet discursive heritage as an influential source of signifiers for articulating opinions in post-Soviet Russia. The paper also questions the usage of Western originated scales as the main tool for festival impact evaluation.

JEL Classification: Z110

Keywords: mass celebrations, *kul'turnost*, post-Soviet studies, urban festival

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics. General Management Department. Senior Lecturer. Candidate in Sociology; E-mail: yupapushina@hse.ru

² The author is grateful to the Ministry of Culture of Perm Region for providing the data.

Introduction

Soviet mass celebrations have been widely investigated in a wide range of papers in different theoretical frameworks. The research on Soviet mass celebrations [Kelly & Sirotina, 2008; Petrone, 2000; von Geldern, 1998] focuses only on the Soviet political regime. They examine mainly the celebration lexicon and its dynamics at different stages of the regime, but few studies have examined post-Soviet mass celebrations [Rolf, 2009]. Simultaneously, post-Soviet forms of celebrations in particular urban art festivals have already become a significant part of urban culture in cities and towns. In order to fulfil this gap this paper clarifies the co-existence of Soviet and post-Soviet elements in the celebrative lexicon of post-Soviet Russia. The paper also explains the interdependence between a survey situation, a research setting, and the celebrative lexicon of post-Soviet urban inhabitants.

There are at least two reasons to investigate these issues both connected with the measurement of festival effects and impacts. The first rationale is concerned with the disregard of cultural and historical context when of using Western originated scales [for example, Crompton & Love, 1995]. Measurement ignoring cultural and historical context might miss important features of situations. The second reason is concerned with the language of communication between respondents and researchers. A lack of common language or misuse of language decreases the quality of communication. It may influence, for example, the results of a sociological survey. Together these drawbacks can cause significant bias in understanding a festival's impacts and effects.

Perm is a 290-year-old city with approximately one million citizens. It lies along the Kama River. While the Soviet regime existed, many industrial enterprises were situated in the city; Perm is still an industrial city with military, engineering, oil extraction, and chemical enterprises. Before 1990, Perm was closed to foreign visitors. It has developed an educational infrastructure with seven state owned higher education institutions. High culture is well represented in the city by Perm State Opera and Ballet Theatre, drama theatres, the State Fine Art Gallery, and the Local History Museum.

The White Nights Festival is a part of the Perm city branding strategy. Launched in 2011 the festival had no Soviet history or any roots in the Soviet past. The author defines White Nights in Perm Festival as a highly organized urban mass celebration aimed at changing citizens' attitudes to mass urban celebrations. A highly organized celebration has explicit rules regulating the procedures of the celebration (Lotman, 1995, p. 90). Other than different forms of arts, this festival also provided sport activities, craft classes, and a friendly environment for walking and

talking in a specially built festival space. The festival space was fenced with guards patrolling it, opened from 11.00 a.m. to 10.00 p.m. The majority of events were free for visitors. This research investigates participant reactions to the mass celebration, which was vastly different from the Soviet standards of *kul'turnost'* or organized leisure. It takes place in the city where many citizens still celebrate the traditional forms of high culture.

Typically, research on discourse or language is conducted by in-depth interviews, or qualitative analysis of archival data, images or texts from media. The empirical base of the present research are the answers of 429 festival visitors during festival. The usage of survey data represents the answers generated in a particular situation namely a survey. It makes visible the functioning of Soviet elements of post-Soviet language in a highly formalized situation.

The paper discusses several methodological considerations concerning the researcher's point of view and the role of the method for data collection. In order to identify the influence of a survey situation on the respondents the author follows Bourdieu's reflection on the objectivisation of social science practices [Bourdieu, 2003, p. 282]. This analysis clarifies the peculiarities of the data and defines the borders of interpretation.

Based on Rolf [2009] the paper contributes in the current literature by analysing post-Soviet celebrative culture as a hybrid culture in two ways. Firstly, it represents the way in which categories developed to study Soviet celebrative culture might be applied to the analysis of post-Soviet celebrative culture. Secondly, it enriches the corpus of the knowledge about the usage of Soviet ideologemes in contemporary conversational speech. The results may be particularly relevant for cultural sociologists; and for the development of a framework for the measurement of urban art festival visitor opinions and attitudes.

The paper is organized as follows; section one has a review of the literature on Soviet mass celebrations, its lexicon and the Soviet heritage in post-Soviet language. Section two describes the methodology, with a reflection on a researcher's position, and the principles of the interpretation of respondent answers. Section three describes the results and the interpretation. Section four concludes and discusses the theoretical contribution and practical implications of results and the issues to investigate further.

Literature Review

The culture and the language of a society in transition attracts special attention as an indicator of social changes. This trend is particularly true for post-Soviet studies with its variety of research perspectives and frameworks. The literature review presents ideas from three areas:

research on Soviet mass celebrations, research on Soviet heritage in post-Soviet language, and research on everyday Soviet life.

Research on Soviet celebrations, particularly on the language of Soviet celebrations, has already produced an extensive body of literature. It identifies a significant shift in values promoted by celebrations within different stages of the regime. In the first years of Soviet power the goal of mass celebrations was to legitimise the Bolshevik leadership and recreate the party identity [von Gelder, 1998]. Simultaneously, a new visual language and rhetoric was forming in order to clarify the Bolshevik agenda. The ideological disputes among the organizers of mass celebrations resulted in the formation of the core of Soviet cultural policy. The proletarian audience was perceived as a homogeneous mass with similar tastes [von Gelder, 1998].

Then, in the thirties the values of the ideological struggle waned. This was manifested, for example, in the launch of the tradition of fir trees and New Year balls. The values of pleasure and festivity were considered the key features of these holidays. Although the general framework of the Soviet celebratory lexicon changed it was still poor for the expression of “ideas about leisure, relaxation and merry-making” [Petroni, 2000, p. 103]. As a result the chance to renew the Soviet celebration discourse was not used.

Later Kelly and Sirotnina compared the opinions about the Soviet celebrations in the sixties with the ones in the thirties. They note the shift from mainly ideological to mainly entertaining elements in the perception of the celebrations in sixties and later [Kelly & Sirotnina, 2008, p.260]. It seems that many of the children who later accounted for the population of post-Soviet Russia frequently perceived Soviet celebrations as a time of leisure and festivity, but not as ideologically significant events. Therefore, the ideological meanings of mass celebrations lost their significance through the different stages of Soviet regime. They were replaced by the values of leisure and festivity, but not in the official discourse.

The current stage of Russian celebratory culture might be defined as a hybrid culture [Rolf, 2009, p. 353], with the co-existence of Soviet celebratory traditions and post-Soviet celebrations. The influence of Soviet celebratory tradition is strong also in unofficial celebrations [Rolf, 2009, p. 353]. Rolf explains this fact by the inner sovietisation with the interiorisation of generally valid linguistic standards, behaviour and communicational patterns [2009, p. 259].

In Soviet celebrations the concept of culture played a dual role. Firstly, culture in the narrow sense was functional and connotative. The functional role manifested itself into usage of cultural institutions as venues for celebration and in the involvement of employees of these institutions in the production of the celebrative discourse. Connecting Soviet celebrations with

images of high culture, the connotative function, Soviet cultural cadres legitimised the celebrations. In this way, they also connected celebrations with the pre-revolutionary elite and high culture [Petrone, 2000, p. 12].

Secondly, culture was considered an opposition to nature in terms of manners and behaving [Petrone, 2000, p. 12]. Studies of Soviet everyday life also include a concept of culture modified in this way as the key concept for understanding routine (*kul'turnost'*). For example, Volkov, and Kozlova define this concept of culture as the set of practices employed for controlling and disciplining former peasants. These practices were a fantastic and fragmented mixture of uncouth upbringing and high culture [Volkov, 1996, p. 203; Kozlova, 2005, p. 212]. *Kul'turnost'* includes components of satisfaction, seduction, and the inaccessibility for the masses [Kozlova, 2005, p. 213]. There was the evolution in the history of *kul'turnost'* from fashion, hygiene, prestige to language, reading, and general knowledge, which often were the goals and results of self-cultivation [Volkov, 1996, p. 216]. As a celebration is naturally connected with routine being its opposition and benchmark, it seems helpful to borrow the concept of culture in its second meaning to examine the celebratory lexicon of Perm citizens.

Soviet language preserves the role of an important cultural element and a part of the everyday environment [Litovskaya, 2010]. This was caused by the coincidence of three factors. First, the Soviet era is an important part of the personal history for a considerable part of the Russian population. Second, the cult of the past seems to be inevitable for every modern society [Litovskaya, 2010]. Third, native speakers cannot evaluate each used cliché or phrase in order to check what the phrase has signified during the last hundred years [Guseinov, 2003, p. 10].

Although there are number of the papers investigating the connections between Soviet and post-Soviet discourses from the perspective of sociological [Sovetskay, 2008; Sovetskie, 2009, a,b; Rivkin-Fish, 2009], anthropological [Khakhordin, 2002], linguistic, and political sciences [Budaev & Chudinov, 2008], only few of them [Guseinov, 2003; Oushakin, 2000] develop the analytical tools to explain the existence of Soviet heritage in post-Soviet language. Guseinov even suggests using the perfective prefix (*po-sovetskoe*) instead of the widely used term post-Soviet. Guseinov's framework relies on the concept of ideologeme. This concept means the least significant unity of speech or writing communicating the meaning of proper thinking and behaviour models according to a certain ideology [Guseinov, 2003, p. 27].

Oushakin also highlights the viability of Soviet discursive heritage. He concludes that there is a lack of sign-oriented resources for producing a post-Soviet subject and defining his/her place in post-Soviet reality. He claims, for example: "The new symbolic/discursive regime is

strongly defined by the vocabulary of the previous cultural epoch without, however, being merged with it” [Oushakin, 2000, p.998-999].

In contrast to the idea of the totality of Soviet ideological language the latest papers demonstrate its transformation in the process of everyday usage [Petrone, 2000, p. 8; Guseinov, 2003, p. 29]. Petrone claims individuals have an active role in communication using the dominating discourse [2000, p. 8]. It means there was the resistance to state control and the practices to controlling behaviour and language approved to achieve personally desirable goals. Ideological language was invested with new meanings. New meanings for Soviet clichés often could be understood by only a narrow circle of insiders. An outsider had little chance to understand the meanings of such communication [Guseinov, 2003, pp.13-14]. In post-Soviet discourse the usage of ideologeme in spoken language also may lead to non-transparent communication.

There is a significant difference between the mass celebrations experience of the 30s, the 60s and the post-Soviet period. During Soviet era celebrations, language played an ambivalent role connecting ordinary people and the state. Although in terms of ideology, politics and practices the Soviet experience has lost a considerable part of its influence, the previous literature establishes a considerable role for words and terminology originating from the Soviet Union in contemporary Russian language. The meanings provided by Soviet period of history have been lost, but the language is still alive and to be used.

Methodology

The section develops the analytical framework relevant to the research question. It also discusses the main methodological considerations. First, there is a reflection on the researcher’s position in the field based on Bourdieu’s idea of “the objectivisation of the objectifier” [2003, p. 282]. Second, the trends of the current mass celebrations in Russia are analysed. Third, the author explains why some answers will be interpreted as being inherited from Soviet ideology. Fourth, the research procedures will be described .

The researcher’s position needs to be discussed here because the analysis will focus on the researcher’s own culture. Moreover, it concerns Soviet heritage, which is a sensitive issue in social sciences and the public sphere [Litovskaya, 2010]. According to Bourdieu, the reflection should cover several areas of a researcher’s activities: the researcher’s position in a scientific field, a deconstruction of the researcher’s point of view, an examination of the methods used for

data collection, and the social conditions which shaped the development of tools [2003, pp. 284-285].

The research is based on data from the survey conducted at the commission of the Ministry of Culture of Perm Region by the Centre of Applied Economics of National Research University-Higher School of Economics. The author's position in the field might be described as distant. The author did not participate in the development of the tools used in the survey or in the administration of the survey. She has no commitment to the organizers of the festival. Hopefully, this liberates the analysis from possible bias provoked by the desire to please a customer.

The sample of 1000 festival visitors (the initial sample) was interviewed during the festival. As a method of data collection a survey includes several possible features to be objectified [Bourdieu, 2003, p. 285]. There are the social constraints pressing on the development of the inquirer. Initially the festival was positioned as an economically profitable project, therefore the customer of the survey emphasised the festival's financial impact ignoring its social effects. As a result the survey experienced a lack of theoretical base, but it was overwhelmed by detailed questions on the visitor expenses during the festival.

The author was a visitor to the festival and consumed the festival's environment and events. The author's experience as a visitor provides the additional resource to interpret the visitor experience. The reference to the author's personal experience here is beneficial in order to highlight the difference between a visitor, a respondent and an analytic. There is significant variety between these three roles in terms of awareness, the mode of understanding someone's activity, and a response to it [Bourdieu, 2003, p. 288]. This assumption leads to the discussion about the survey as a form of communication.

The mutual perception of an interviewer and a respondent may be seen as linguistic differences and professional attitude to a social world. Linguistic differences in this case mean the divergence between researcher's and respondent's languages. It leads to the rejection of the answers offered in the inquirer. So far, although the list of the answers was provided, 429 of 1000 respondents preferred giving their own answers for the question "What do you think about the festival?" These 429 participants accounted the final sample which was the focus of the analysis. The question "What do you think about the festival?" assumes that a respondent thinks something about the festival. That might not be true for considerable part of the sample.

The mutual perception of respondents and interviewers is also influenced by the level of trust in a society. Russian society has low level of trust to majority of social institution and social groups except the nearest circle: family and friends [Doverie, 2013]. Population also don't trust

representatives of research institutions or organizations . Putting this another way: people who probably think nothing about the festival were asked to say what they think; many of them cannot see a lot of sense in the survey and also do not trust interviewers with their pens and questions. The method and the prerequisite of the question to be asked determined the fact that results are not as straightforward as might be expected.

There are a few typical interrelated trends for mass celebrations in Russia. Generally, the interest in almost any mass celebrations has declined in the post-Soviet era [Dubin, 2003, p. 58]. While urban celebrations are highly attractive for newcomers, migrants and marginal groups [Dubin, 2003, p. 53], the feeling of safety during urban mass celebration has reduced. These trends prevented wealthy and educated citizens from visiting urban mass celebrations. In Perm's case, the trend has been overcome: there were more than million visitors through the festival's main entrance [Malcev, Shafranskay et. al., 2012, p. 2]. The festival provided a safe venue for organized and affordable leisure.

Another issue of this section is the arguments in the support of labelling some answers as Soviet and non-Soviet based on the concept of *kul'turnost'*. To identify *kul'turnost'* in the answers of the survey participants the author uses Gusienov's definition of an ideologem. Following it two questions were formulated in term of desirable and undesirable patterns of behaviour: To what desirable patterns of behaviour do the answers refer? To what non-desirable patterns of behaviour do the answers contradict? Below several citations that were labelled as Soviet are provided to illustrate this statement.

Cultural level of the city is going better (male, 50-65) («Культурный уровень города улучшается»); It raises cultural level of the city (female, 18-21) («Поднимает культурный уровень города»); There are something cultural one; that is better than alcohol abuse ((female, 22-35)) («Хоть культурное что-то есть, чем бухают лучше так»); Spiritual and cultural enrichment (female, 18-21) («Духовное и культурное обогащение»); Ordinary people can become familiar with arts and culture (female, 22-35) («Простые люди могут приобщиться к искусству и культуре»); It is possible to extend somebody's notion about contemporary art (female, 50-65) («Можно расширить представления о современном искусстве»); "Educational, development" (female, 14-17) («Познавательльно, развитие»).

The socio-demographic profile of the initial sample (1000 respondents) is represented in Table 1. It shows that young adults in age between 22 and 35 accounted for the biggest segment of the survey participants. It is as much as twice than the group aged 36-49 is. All together people aged 22-49 account for more than half of the initial sample whereas only 10% of

respondents were older than 50 years and only 2,2% was older than 65. This age imbalance makes questionable the interpretation of the results for participant age.

Tab. 1. The initial's sample demographic profile

(N=1000) (in percentage points)

Sex	
Male	45%
Female	55%
Age	
14 – 17 years	6%
18 – 21 years	16%
22 – 35 years	44%
36 – 49 years	22%
50 – 65 years	10%
Older than 65 years	2,2%

[Malcev, Shafranskay and al., 2012, p. 27]

The analytical procedure applied here includes three steps. It begins with coding which divides the data into groups. The second step was categorization, establishing logical connections between the groups in order to generalize them. Finally, we interpreted the data from the perspective of the Soviet celebration lexicon and *kul'turnost'*.

Results and Interpretation

The data demonstrates that festivity (“joyful”, “interesting”, “great”) is still an important feature of mass celebration. It shows that festivity as a salient aspect of mass celebration still exists. The elements, which constitute the atmosphere of festivity, are excess, abundance, “contrast”, “demonstration”, and “action”. The ideas of excess and abundance (“variety”, “massive”) refer to wider choice of the possibilities for both the festival’s participants and audience compared with their routine. They oppose the lack of choice out of the festival period with the variety of the festival program. “Contrast” is represented by visual metaphors: the

colour of the festival versus the grey routine, the unfamiliar festival events versus the familiar routine. “Demonstration” refers to the opportunity to see and to be seen. The festival contrasts the passivity and cultural lag as the perceived norm of the everyday life in Perm.

The code “action” (*dvizhuha*) also describes the dichotomy “the festival – the routine”. “Action” being the term from the respondent vocabulary, refers to the value of dynamics, feeling alive and excited which the festival provides (“it excites Perm, the city looks alive” (female, 36-49), “Action is better than quietude” (male, 36-49), “there is something interesting in Perm, finally” (male, 36-49), “It is better than nothing” (male, 22-35). This value used to be claimed as the rationale of the Perm city branding strategy [Kuznetcova, 2011]. In terms of the desirable behavioural patterns the data represents the dichotomy “activity versus passivity” and “poor choice versus variety of opportunities”.

The next category brightly marking welcomed patterns of behaviour is the category of “leisure”. The desirable leisure should be organized, interesting, entertaining, and cool: “enjoyable leisure”, “leisure for children” (female, 22-35), “leisure for youth” (female, 50-65), “a new kind of leisure appears” (female, 22-35), “remarkable leisure” (female, 50-65), “to make leisure more diversified” (male, 50-65), “cultural leisure”. The ideas of organized and targeted leisure are the result of urbanisation and the Soviet Enlightenment. These answers mark the second and the third generations of Perm inhabitants.

The historical shift from *kul'turnost'* as mainly bodily and consumer practices to mainly enlightenment and intelligence is manifested by the data as well. *Kul'turnost'* as enlightenment used to mean the familiarity with certain facts, ideas, and the corpus of literature. This form of *kul'turnost'* was achieved as the result of self-cultivation that includes education. The educational value of the festival is widely experienced among respondent of different ages: “Spiritual and cultural enrichment” (female, 18-21), “The notion about contemporary art might be extended” (female, 50-65), “Educational, development” (female, 14-17), “There is a holiday for the urban inhabitants, a lot of educational information is available” (female, 36-49), “it extends the horizon, contributes into intercourse” (male, 36-49). The festival is valued as the source of the knowledge about art, contemporary art, and culture: “Ordinary people might become in touch to art and culture” (female, 22-35). In terms of desirable and undesirable behavioural patterns there is the opposition “eagerness to learn versus indifference to learning”.

Although the educational value of the festival is spread widely among the respondents, the bodily experience is also represented. It is manifested as the sensitivity to certain objects of the festival space: a beach, a swimming pool, and sand sculptures. The bodily experience is also

constructed as the set of the opinions claiming aesthetical value of the festival: “nice sand sculptures, foreigners, orchestra, original” (female, 22-35), “White Nights is a beautiful event” (female, 50-65), “beautiful, creative, original” (female, 22-35), “it is well decorated”. Here aesthetical value is inseparable from enjoyment: “it is pleasure to see what people do, to see contemporary art” (male, 22-35), “eye appeal” (female, 22-35). These opinions support the idea of satisfaction, seduction, and enjoyment belonging free time and art consumption [Kruglova, 2013]. It might be also considered an echo of the environment-as-a tool-of-bringing up idea that was a popular idea of the newspaper discourse in the middle of the thirties [Volkov, 1996, p. 211].

If *kul'turnost'* is the set of norms and practices for solving mainly ideological tasks, then who is the object of the application of these practices? In the Perm case the object of cultivation is *Narod*, “people”, or “ordinary people”. The citizens describe themselves as a mass that needs to be organized, educated, socializing, entertained and controlled: “Cleanly, without hard consequences for people, all is civilized” (female, 36-49), “Interesting leisure has appeared” (female, 22-35), “Perm inhabitants are entertained” (female, 22-35). In terms of non-desirable behavioural patterns the festival leisure is opposed to wasting time and drinking in public places: “People socialize more and drink less” (male, 22-35), “People do not drink beer, do not waste time” (male, 22-35), “People do not drink, but walk” (female, 22-35).

The term *Narod* also is used by respondents in order to explain the recipients of the festival goods: “there should be place where people could have a rest” (female, 22-35), “People are busy” (male, 18 – 21), “People are involved in a collective activity” (female, elder 65), “it influences wholesomely the cultural life of the city inhabitants” (female, 18-21), “it is the pleasure to see something that is organized for people” (male, 22-35), “Culture - in masses” (female, 36-49), “(It) makes people cultured” (female, 22-35). These answers implicitly mark negatively connoted forms of behaviour that are doing nothing and “cultureless” activity. Taking together these answers with the category “leisure” it might be concluded that the festival is perceived as a social project providing dignified leisure for the citizens.

The perception of the mass celebration as a public good might be explained from Hiddens's idea of feelings of ontological security [Shevchenko, 2009, p. 67]. Ontological security is the feeling based on the complex of state sponsored institutions providing essential services for the population. The destruction of the Soviet regime broke these feelings. Nostalgic feelings of ontological security determine the significance of Soviet ideologeme in the post-Soviet environment. Although, the festival was sponsored by the regional and the city budgets, the respondents disregard the role of the authorities in the development of the festival, the authorities

were not mentioned in the answers. That may be because respondents tend to distance themselves and their families from the state managed project [Shevchenko, 2009, p. 144].

When a situation makes people interpret and reflect on a complicated question, they employ the discourse and language tools of the Soviet ideological heritage for thinking and articulating their opinions [Oushakin, 2000, p. 995]. They extract and apply well known clichés from their childhood and youth. Even young people, who seem to be less familiar with these forms of thinking and speaking, use these ideological phrases.

In order to demonstrate more clearly the particularities of the Soviet discursive heritage in the respondent answers it is helpful to examine briefly non-Soviet ideologemes in the answers. These answers operate in terms connected to management, city branding and openness. The managerial measurement includes the description of visitors in an “active voice” as active participants or creators representing their arts and capacities. Compared with the code “*Narod*” the representation seems to be less paternalistic.

Other categories constituting the post-Soviet sector of the answers are city image and tourism. City image is perceived as the value of the positive internal and external city image that the festival is creating. The answers vary from the comparison of Perm with itself to the comparison Perm with other cities around the world, for example, Munich. Although few of the answers focused on the city promotion function executing by the festival, the general trend of these answers witnesses about positive attitudes of respondents to the city image issue.

The value of openness is also represented into two aspects: tourist and foreigners. The answers from the code “tourism” refer to the festival as an attractor for tourists and the following economics profits. The answers from the code “foreigners” emphasize the intercultural exchange and the possibility to meet another culture with its specific arts and traditions. The former answers were probably provoked by wide range of the foreign festival participants and the extant program provided by Mexican performers. Besides, as the majority of the Russian population do not go abroad [Skol’ko, 2014], probably, the wide representation of foreign culture compensates for this disadvantage. In any case, these answers suggest some festival visitors value the benefits from the economics and cultural openness of the city.

Although the festivity is still the most significant element of the celebration, there are some specific meanings in the celebrative lexicon connected with Soviet discursive heritage and the research setting. Firstly, the festivity has additional meaning “action” (*dvizhukha*). Secondly, the main desirable and non-desirable patterns of behaviour were identified. These patterns might be represented in the form of dichotomies: activity versus passivity, routine cultural lag and festival

variety, and eagerness to learn versus indifference to learning. The attitudes to the state and the representation of the citizens play an important role in constructing the opinions about the festival.

The importance of the Soviet heritage in this particular case raises the question about the poor post-Soviet celebration lexicon. The results also show that the celebration lexicon inherited from the Soviet era is in active use whereas the answers that were labelled as post-Soviet have very little in common with celebration, enjoyment and merry-making. This fact encourages developing the discussion on the hybrid nature of post-Soviet celebration culture.

Conclusion

This paper investigated language as an indicator and the consequence of the hybrid nature of post-Soviet celebrative culture. Returning to the question posed at the beginning of the study it is now possible to say that Soviet ideologemes are an influential source of language tools for the post-Soviet celebrative lexicon, particularly in the situation of a survey.

One of the most significant theoretical findings is that the categories developed for the analysis of the Soviet era might also be applied for the analysis of post-Soviet mass celebrations. The second major finding is that the usage of Soviet ideological clichés in speech is not determined by respondents' age. This result supports the hypothesis that Soviet originated forms of thinking and speaking have been transmitted into the post-Soviet society [Oushakin, 2000]. The third major finding is that language tools employ different forms of *kul'turnost'*. Basically, these forms represent different historical stages of the development of *kul'turnost'*. Also, this study enhances our understanding of hybrid nature of contemporary Russian celebrative culture. It also has gone some way toward enriching our understanding about the implication Soviet ideological language in post-Soviet convenient speech.

The results of the study indicate that sociologists should take into account Soviet discursive heritage while they are investigating the attitudes and opinions concerned with cultural consumption in the post-Soviet period. Besides, the representatives of place marketing and creative industries studies might benefit from these results, using them as scales for estimating attitudes to urban mass celebrations. It would bring into the process of the development of a scale, the wide historical context and language particularities that might improve the validity of measurements.

The research has a narrow focus limited by the opinions of the visitors. It could be extended in order to identify the multidimensional picture covering other group discourses

(creative practitioners, politicians, officials) connected with the festival. Another possible dimension of the whole picture includes the discourse diffused via different media or the internet. The topic of Soviet ideologemes in current Russian language is much broader than the Perm case. This issue could be studied in terms of different areas and social issues, for example, education and management. The research was also unable to analyse the interdependence between the respondent education and occupation and the usage of the Soviet originated ideologemes. The fulfillment of these gaps are goals for further work.

References

“Dannye Oprosov Ispol’zuiutsy Fatal’no, Katastroficheski Nepravil’no”. Interv’yu s Vedustchim Analiticom Fonda “Obschestvennoe Mnenie” Grigoriem Kertmanom. 17 Oktyabray 2013. <http://fom.ru/TSennosti/11132>

Alexander A. Malcev, Irina N. Shafranskaya et al. (2012) Report on the Research Conducted for Regional State Autonomy Agency “Center on Cultural and Youth Policy Projects”: Estimation of Economic, Social and Place Marketing Impact of the Festival “White Nights in Perm”. Perm

Anna Kruglova (2013) Sensory Utopia in the Times of “Cultural Revolution”: on Art, Public Space and Moral Ontology of Class. // *Laboratorium* – Vol – 5. № - 1. P. 25 – 51.

Boris Dubin. (2003) Budni i Prazdniki. // *Vestnik Obshchestvennogo Mneniya: Dannye, Analis, Discussii*. P. 52 – 62

Doverie v Obshchestve. 19 Decabray 2013. <http://fom.ru/TSennosti/11253>

Eduard V. Budaev and Anatolii P. Chudinov (2008). *Lingvisticheskay Postsovietologiya*. // *Politicheskay Lingvistika* – Vol. – 2. № - 25. S. 10 – 19.

Gasan Ch. Guseinov (2003) *Sovietskie Ideologemy v Rossiyskom Discourse 1990-h*. Moskva: Tri kvadrata.

James Von Geldern (1998) Putting the Mass in Mass Culture: Bolshevik Festivals, 1918 – 1920. // *The Journal of Popular Culture*. Vol. – 31. P. 123 – 144.

Jenny Lee and Gerard T. Kyle (2012). Recollection Consistency of Festival Consumption Emotions. // *Journal of Travel Research* – Vol. 5. № - 2. P. 178 – 190.

John L. Crompton and Lisa L. Love (1995). The Predictive Validity of Alternative Approaches to Evaluating Quality of a Festival. // *Journal of Travel Research* – Vol. – 34. № - 11. P. 11 – 24

Karen Petrone (2000) *Life Has Become More Joyous, Comrades: Celebrations in the Time of Stalin*. Indiana University Press

- Kariona Kelly and Svetlana Sirotina (2008) "Bylo neponaytno i smesho": Prazdniki Poslednih Desyatiletii Sovietskoy Vlasti i Vospriaytie ih Det'mi. // *Antropologicheskiiy Forum* - № 8. P. 258 – 299
- Maria Litovskay (2010) Funktcii Sovietskogo v Post-Sovietskom Diskurse. Doklad dlya ICCEES, VIII World Congress 2010, Stockholm, 26 – 31 July, 2010.
- Marina Kuznetcova (2011) Olge Chirkunov: Kogda u Goroda est' Mechta on Mozhet Stat' Luchshim Mestom na Zemle. Interv'yu. 11 Noaybray. <http://perm.kp.ru/daily/25785/2768982/>
- Matle Rofl (2009). *Sovitskie Massovye Prazdniki*. Moskva: ROSSPAN
- Michael Rifkin-Fish (2009) Tracing Landscapes of the Past in Class Subjectivity. // *American Ethnologist* - Vol – 36. № - 1. P. 79 – 95
- Natalia N. Kozlova (2005) *Sovietskiye Luide. Steiny iz Istorii*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Evropa.
- Nilokay V. Gladkih and Elene V. Zelentcova et al. (2011) *Permskiy Proekt. Koncepciia Kulturnoy Politiky dlya Permskogo Kraiy*. Perm
- Oleg Khakhordin (2002) *Oblichat' i Litcemerit': Genealogiay Rossiiskoy Lichnosty*. Sankt Peterburg: Letniy Sad, EU.
- Olga Shevchenko (2009) *Crisis and the Everyday in Postsocialist Moscow*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press
- Pierre Bourdieu (2003). Participant Objectivation. // *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* – Vol. – 9. № - 2. P. 281–294.
- Sergey A. Oushakin (2000) In the State of post-Soviet Aphasia: Symbolic Development in Contemporary Russia // *Europe-Asia Studies* – Vol – 52. № - 6. P. 991 – 1016.
- Skol'ko Rossian Byvaly za Granitcey. 22 Aprelay 2014 <http://fom.ru/Obraz-zhizni/11470>
<http://fom.ru/Obraz-zhizni/11470>
- Sovietskay Sotcial'nay Politika: Sceny I Deystvuyuschie Litca. 1940 – 1985*. (2008). Moskva: OOO "Variant", CSPGI.
- Sovietskoe Proshloe I Kul'tura Nastoaystchego*. (2009). Monografay v Dvuh Tomah. Eketerinburg. Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Tom 1
- Sovietskoe Proshloe I Kul'tura Nastoaystchego*. (2009). Monografay v Dvuh Tomah. Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Tom 2
- Vadim V. Volokov, (1996). Concept Kul'turnosty 1935-38: Sovietskay Civilizaciya y Povsednevnaiy Zhizn' v Stalinskiuy Eru. // *Sociologicheskiiy Journal*, №1/2, 203 – 221.
- Yuriy M. Lotman (1995) *Besedy o Russkoy Kul'ture. Byt i Tradicii Russkogo Dvoraynstva (XVII – nachalo XIX veka)*. Sankt-Peterburg: Iskusstvo-SPb.

Iuliia O. Papushina
National Research University Higher School of Economics (Perm, Russia). General
Management Department. Senior Lecturer;
E-mail: yupapushina@hse.ru, Tel. +7 (342) 205-52-28

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily
reflect the views of HSE.**

© Papushina, 2014