

Lifestyle and Social Structure Processes of Individualization in Eastern European countries

RUDOLF RICHTER
Institute for Sociology
University of Vienna
E-mail: rudolf.richter@univie.ac.at

UDK: 316.728(4)
316.42(4)
316.728:316.42](4)
Pregledni rad
Priljeno: 3. 10. 2002.

In this article I will deal with lifestyles in Eastern European countries. The data come from representative studies in Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Russia and Romania. The life style approach combines structural and cultural variables, indicators of behaviour as well as values. Out of these indicators social clusters are constructed. Thus a different picture of the composition of society can be drawn. After introducing the advantages of the lifestyle approach I go on in describing the lifestyles in the different countries. Finally I construct a thesis about the different stages of democratisation and modernisation the countries under research show.

Key words: LIFESTYLE, SOCIAL STRUCTURE, EASTERN EUROPE, INDIVIDUALISATION, MODERNISATION, DEMOCRATISATION

Introduction

In the second half of the twentieth century social structure analyses in sociology dealt mainly with inequalities in income, education and social position. Very sophisticated models have been constructed [from classical Geiger (1972) to Erikson (1992)]. In the last decades the discussion has been expanded by introducing a cultural dimension to the analysis, giving the work of Bourdieu (1987) central importance. This discussion influenced and went parallel with empirical studies about life styles. A large of studies were carried out, one of the most important ones being the Sinus-studies (see Hradil, 1987:131) in Germany and ongoing studies of European Life Style from the GfK corporation, a commercial enterprise. Besides that, in Germany it was Schulze's "Erlebnisgesellschaft" (Schulze, 1992) that attracted most attention.

It was very clear that the life style approach for analysing the social structure is limited to the countries which are highly developed on the path of modernisation. Explicit or implicit the model of Maslow (1987) stood in the background: first, existential needs had to be satisfied, than social and cultural needs can play a role. Applied to social structure analysis it meant that only in relatively rich countries where the material needs are more or less satisfied differences in the social structure will emerge reflecting cultural dimensions as believes or values. In this way the development of lifestyles is understood as a result of the process of modernisation.

First the studies concentrated on the West and soon afterwards it was also Eastern European Countries on their way to democratisation that were studied under from this viewpoint. Although material needs have not been satisfactorily met these countries got nevertheless richer – at least some. To apply the life style approach to these countries might also say something about the usefulness of this approach.

From class analyses to lifestyles. An empirical argument for the lifestyle approach

Traditional analyses of social structure relied mainly on class differences. These were usually measured by education, income and profession. It is very clear that this approach fo-

cuses on working life and participation in the labour market. This is adequate for an industrial society preoccupied with production. But it has disadvantages in societies which are more concentrated on consumption than on production. In other words, consumption is the driving force behind the markets. This is crucial for the economy. If the trust of consumers in the market vanishes and they spend less money the markets break down and the financial markets suffer a severe loss, a process very obvious today. Insomuch consumption is essential.

In such a differentiated society it is worthwhile to think of new indicators.

Hradil (1987) listed different disadvantages of measuring social differentiation only in the traditional way. First, it is mainly household that is taken as the unit of research, while households are categorised by social class as per the profession of the head of the household, mostly the man. This means that unemployed women, children and old people are either totally excluded from the categorisation or a marginal group.

Students and old age pensioners do not really fit in the system. Thus nearly two thirds of the population are not accounted for or they are incorporated into the class of the male breadwinner. In sociology the theory of transferred status reflects this. Household members are assigned to the status of the person in the household with the highest education or income. To concentrate only on employment and participation in the labour market seems to fall far too short.

Secondly, Hradil was looking at data in Germany and found that since the mid seventies nothing has changed very much in the distribution. The class structure was very stable though we could face a number of differences in society as regards, for instance, use of free time, cultural behaviour, participation in society.

Especially the assessment of different life situations distinguishes people from the same class. This is probably true not only of Germany but of most societies.

Furthermore, in special studies it was shown that traditional relations between behaviour and belonging to a class have broken down. One of the most obvious indications was voting behaviour. It did not hold any more that employees or entrepreneurs voted conservative parties while the workers the socialist ones. First, voting by class declined in the Scandinavian countries and later on in all over Europe. So it is not astonishing that one of the first lifestyle studies was carried out by the Sinus Institute (www.sinus.milieus.de) in order of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, a body close to the CSU. Today it is very clear that the traditional poles of left and right are at least weak.

Hradil proposed analysis by different steps. First he made a proposition to broaden the analysis to the term social situations later to milieus and lifestyles. Social situations are composed of a number of criteria. General living conditions count additionally to income, education or profession. Access to leisure facilities, the embedding in social security programs, the possibility to get access to the advantages of the welfare state are criteria in social differentiation. Further on gender matters as well as ethnical status, age or religion. Thus you can compose a complex model of rather individualised social situations.

This measurement consists of objective indicators. But the situation is also assessed. For one person the income might be appropriate, for the other one in the same situation it is too low and a third one might even be able to save money. An example of a typical middle class position shows that. Let us take a family of a teacher consisting of him, his wife and two children. Let us compare in thought a teacher of German language and a teacher of mechanics in a vocational school. They both will earn at about the same. The German language teacher will besides the daily necessities perhaps spend his money on literature, on books. The mechanics teacher might spend his money on machines, motorcycles and will have mechanical equipment privately at home. The mechanic will need much more money for his interests

and his income will perhaps be insufficient, while the German language teacher might find his income sufficient.

We take a look at similar professions in the social stratum e.g. university professors. They usually earn slightly more money than teachers in high schools. We will find, that perhaps the mechanic teacher has in his consumer behaviour much more in common with the professor of mechanics in the university than with his colleague, the German teacher from the same social class. So people of different class affiliation might show more similar behaviour than people of the same class. The differences within the class might be bigger than those between classes. This is due to the values through which people are perceiving their social situation. When we look at the groupings which are built from objective data and additionally from the assessment of the situation we are coming to the concept of lifestyles. The lifestyle approach combines structural and cultural, subjective and objective indicators in constructing social clusters. When we focus more on the cultural background we are speaking of milieus, when we include everyday behaviour and are looking on expressive indicators we are speaking of lifestyles. Thus we understand milieus as the way people perceive everyday society, react to it, use it according to shared values and attitudes. Lifestyles are in contrast a pattern of typical everyday behaviour which leads to distinction in everyday life.

A macrosociological argument for the lifestyle approach

In developed industrial societies we face different processes leading to a pluralistic society. Mainly we can distinguish four processes: De-institutionalisation, disembedding, individualisation and urbanisation.

In a sociological and anthropological view institutions give hold to human beings. They create predictability, certitude and trust. They provide human beings with a commonly accepted perspective of reality. It is clear that a major institution in traditional societies was religion, in modern societies also economy and politics could be called institutionalised. But all are now in a process of deinstitutionalisation (Berger, Luckmann, 1998). The economy is becoming globalised and is confronted with declining confidence. For a long time politics has failed to deliver a concise and generally accepted vision of society. The church has lost its moral position in western societies. So the traditional big institutions are in themselves plural, their values not commonly shared.

In personal life de-institutionalisation might be felt in the life course. In the sixties in western societies the life course seemed institutionalised, what meant you could expect to run through different stages of life with clear tasks, responsibilities and possibilities. One of the central features was the chronology of the life course. The different phases followed each other in a clear and predictable way separated from each other by rites of passage [van Gennep (1994, orig. 1909)]. Childhood was succeeded by adolescence separated by the confirmation in catholic countries, followed by getting a degree, the beginning of working life and founding a family. The transition to adulthood was separated by marriage. Men could expect to stay in job until their sixties when they would retire, woman would stay at home with their children and perhaps afterwards again participate in working life. Finally you could enjoy old age pension.

This chronology is breaking down. This is most obviously seen at the borders of working life. [see also Kohli (1986)]. Education lasts longer and in the twenties there is a rather ambivalent situation of education, working or joblessness. In the fifties early retirement and again joblessness prevails. Neither the entry into the labour market nor the exit is a clear cut mark in the life course. And within one's working life one can not expect any more to stay in one job only. So chronology in the way it was or at least was intended to be is not taken for granted and not expected any more.

Also the assignation of life phases changed. There are less and less clear cut phases of childhood, youth and adulthood. A forty year old divorced single might have similar habits as a 23 year old young man, though he might be a father. People are ascribed to different generations. The most obvious change in the assignation is the emerging of a new phase the so called post adolescence in between 18 and 28, a decade where people might be still in educational institutions, part time working, part time living alone, part time in the parental household with or without a partner. In Germany it turned out that only about two years are really defined as Youth from the young interviewees [Fischer et al. (2000); Silbereisen et al. (1996)]. The self-perception as a typical young person is narrowing.

Life is also not organised merely about the working life. Leisure time is important, but also continuous education, and phases of unemployment give a de-institutionalised picture of the life course.

Disembedding might be a second process. As Beck (1986) showed in the process of modernity people were detached from their rural bindings. The well known and familiar setting of the village as a rather closed system broke open letting in the diffused and unclear value structure of an urban new world. A loss of a value consensus was the consequence. The church does not stay central any more. Also other institutions like the community itself lost its importance in an urbanised world. With the loss of community comes a loss in social control. This was seen as an advantage of modern society. But with the loss of microsocial control macrosocial control rose. The digitalisation of a large number of tasks, working on a PC as well as paying with credit cards allows controlling private movements. Surveillance cameras in open spaces, which are not free spaces any more, show the rise of macrosocial control [see also Ritzer (1995)].

One of the central processes in modernisation is individualisation. This was already perceived by Simmel (1977, orig. 1900) about hundred years ago. But it proceeded with the development of the welfare state. The welfare system provided many advantages and security models for different situations. As an example, funding and tax reduction got very individualised and resulted in an individual composition of income. The school system was another way for individualisation. The possibilities of branches with different specification, be it natural science be it humanities and languages nearly exploded. While a schoolboy in the fifties and sixties could stay in a class at least in the gymnasium for eight years with his school mates, now the different branches, the different possibilities bring different social networks, new faces and less continuity. In continental Europe this system spreads to the university. Bachelor degrees formerly unknown to the system in most European countries are introduced and Masters can be done in different ways, disciplinary and interdisciplinary. In addition no common value system exists. We see the emergence of that what some scholars call patchwork religion (Zulehner, Hager, Polak, 2001). Religion in general has not lost so much of its importance but the individual puts together his own religion borrowing from Christianity as well as from Buddhism or native believes.

Finally, to round up, we might mention the process of urbanisation. Most people live in urbanised areas now. Eastern European countries are following the Western European ones. In the Countries of the European Union now 70% of the population live in urbanised areas. In the Eastern European Countries on the average it is still only about 50% but rising. Though modern technology makes oneself geographically independent and you might conclude that decentralization is on its way, there is no sign that the process of urbanisation has stopped. On the contrary. The most important knots in the communications networks are found in agglomerated areas [Castells (1996)]. Instead of turning back to villages we face a process in the development of megacities like Los Angeles, Tokio or New York. In megacities people do not share common values or behaviour. They are a pool of very different ways of living, of very different life styles.

The world has left the structures of the traditional industrial society of the nineteenth century. It is not so essential if we speak of a post-industrial society, advanced modern society, of post-modern society or reflexive modernism. All these labels describe the change in social structure. While differences in the classic dimensions still exist and should not be neglected, we might get a better view of the problems of society when we include in our analysis cultural indicators as well. This is done in lifestyle studies which we will introduce in the next paragraph.

Tradition of Life Style studies

Life style studies had a very practical origin. Consumer research showed that target groups could not be defined anymore through traditional social classes. One of the first studies in this area was that of Mitchell (1983). He described nine American life styles, much in the tradition of Riesman's (1954) distinction of inner and outer directed people. The study had a commercial orientation. It was used to define new consumer groups for products. The same shift in social structure was realised in politics. Voting behaviour was not organized along class lines any more. Workers began to vote conservative parties while employees did social democratic parties [see Kaase, Klingemann (1983)]. Obviously the political parties had to do with a new composition of the voters. This led e.g. in Germany to the analyses of the Sinus institute (Sinus, 2001) and the development of life styles. This empirical research when introduced to sociology was very much discussed in the line of a new composition of social inequality within the social structure.

Another path came from cultural sociology, especially from the work of Pierre Bourdieu. In his book "Distinctions" (1987) he broadened the analyses of social inequality in adding the cultural perspective. His work was more suitable for a theoretically oriented science than the commercial studies were. Bourdieu with his description of cultural and further on social capital influenced a broad theoretical discussion within sociology about life styles [e.g. Müller (1992)]. In the following a lot of life style studies were performed.

Until recently it was controversial whether these studies contributed to the analysis of social structure or were more or less specific issues in the field of cultural sociology. Both opinions prevail. In this article we prefer the position that lifestyles show a fundamental change within the social structure of society. This change goes hand in hand with the movement to an advanced, reflexive modernity or postmodernity, whatever it is called. It is the expression, that the label of traditional industrial society which was composed around classes does not work for our society nowadays.

One of the most famous in Germany was "Erlebnisgesellschaft" from Schulze (1992). But Schulze himself placed his study in the field of cultural sociology and did not see it as a contribution to the study of social inequality. Perhaps this helped his success in sociology as he did not have to argue the question about the relevance of social classes.

Life style studies were established more in applied research. Only a few scientific systematic approaches were carried out, one of the most prominent being that of Spelleberg (1996). She was using questions from the German Welfare study (www.gesis.org) and thus had the advantage of using representative quantitative data from a very broad study in Germany. But besides that it was more a commercial enterprise. In Europe the programme of Eurostyles was established through the GfK company. In Austria FESSEL-GfK was responsible for accomplishing these polls (www.gfk.at).

Though those styles were strictly focussed on westernised states, in the nineties the Austrian branch of FESSEL-GfK extended it to Eastern European countries and adopted questionnaire, considering the lower economic situation.

So questions about e.g. household equipment or the importance of car or technical equipment, all things which call for quite a substantial amount of money could not be asked. Therefore the questionnaire was adapted.

The Eastern European Lifestyles

The study was carried out in seven Eastern European countries, namely in Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania and Russia. It is a representative study with 1000 people per country (2000 in Russia) with a random sample from people above the age of 15. They were asked to fill out a written questionnaire on many indicators. Those indicators were on the dimensions of priority in life, on leisure activities, national self image, saving abilities, satisfaction with income, salary improvement, opinions about health, religious attitudes and much more. These indicators were computed in a cluster analyses which produced following types in the description of the research institute. (FESSEL-GfK: www.gfk.at)

Table 1. Mentalities 1997

	Hungary	Poland	Czech Rep.	Slovakia	Bulgaria	Russia	Romania	Total
Newcomers	32	34	11	12	24	6	27	21
Establishment	17	8	41	34	13	1	6	19
Traditionalist	28	28	28	31	35	5	25	26
Winners	7	9	8	7	11	30	22	13
Re-Rootings	5	21	12	15	17	57	21	21

Quelle: Mentality / Socio Styles, FESSEL-GfK, 1997

Re-Rootings Mentality

Persons belonging to Re-Rooting Mentality are mainly characterized by being 50 and over, living with large families. Generally they belong to the blue-collar work force or are retired. As a consequence they have to manage their lives on low incomes.

To these mentalities belong individuals from rural as well as urban areas. Their existence is rather deprived of economic and social privileges.

The part of the population belonging to the Re-rooting Mentality feels overall threatened by anything that is new. Religiously inclined, which does not stop them from feeling an urgency of making the best of their lives here and now. An ambiguous attitude within their ranks is also very much present: this is made up by passivity, self-absorbance and fear of risk-taking. They are also known as being highly materialistic. Money has a crucial role in their lives, viewing it as only means to forget life's dreary problems. Their longing for stable traditional social rules is very strong and they are highly concerned with the disappearance of traditional values. They have no or little faith in their present institutions and tend to embrace nationalistic or minority type movements. They claim no longer to expect the solution of their problems from the west.

Newcomers Mentality

Newcomers consists mainly of the younger population such as students, junior executives and professionals living in urban areas. They are rather well off financially at the moment. Highly dynamic, enjoy risk-taking, striving to succeed in the making of a best life possible. They long to be original and recognized for their merits, curious of the world, very much for change and progress. The environment is high on their list of concerns. Strongly involved in personal care and keeping up their good health.

Ambitious in creating a new morality opposed to the previous communistic ideas that were forced upon them. Some of them still have faith in authority. They wish to obtain a valid national identity but also tend towards broad mindedness and agree with the founding of a western-style economy. Interested in active participation in politics.

Establishment Mentality

Establishment-Mentality consists of the young to middle aged part of the population. They live on a high income as of now and belong to the white collar and even executive work force. They live mainly in the big city areas.

They have been found to be mainly idealistic, striving for security, balance and harmony on their life. They have a high sense of duty and are not excessively materialistic. Curious of the world, pleasure-seeking, health conscious, embracing originality and creativity without ostentation. They are equally dynamic, but conformist and passive, too. They have a desire for finding a common aim, oppose any restriction to free enterprise. Highly environmentally oriented. A large part of them are looking for new life styles while others tend to cling to their conservative values.

Traditionalists Mentality

Traditionalists are mainly individuals 50 and over, working class, farmers or retired. Forced to get by on a low income during most of their lives. Equally found in rural as well as urban areas.

Their main characteristics consist of longing for a quiet life but also passively accepting whatever comes their way. A matter of high concern is their health. They live as puritans, not at all ostentatious and have a high sense of duty and solidarity towards their fellow men. They are opposed to materialistic values, refuse to take risks and cling to their traditional values. They have high confidence in authority, struggle to preserve their national identity but claim to be for the usage of dialogue instead of force or violence.

Winners Mentality

To Winners belong the younger than 40 segment of the population, represented by a variety of social status such as singles, couples, students to middle-management. Consequently they get by an average income and live in families of small to average size in urban areas.

They have declared leading a casual life without excessively worrying of their future. They prefer to enjoy their lives here and now, therefore they are willing to take risks, are fighting for their professional success and they are proud of being called the "movers and shakers" of the society. An equal number of them is sceptic and materialistic as well as idealistic. Embrace willingly anything that is new and cosmopolitan in their opinion. They are torn between desire to live according to traditional values and the attraction, the "unknown" represents for them. They claim counting only on themselves when solving problems. Their social values tend to be rather ambivalent: they are those, who have declared themselves as followers of puritanism and traditionalism, while others are very much for pleasure-seeking and embrace novelties with enthusiasm. However, they all have a strong desire for physical and spiritual freedom.

From this description we see different qualities of the life styles. That what is called "Establishment" can be seen as a new emerging middle class, very similar to western middle classes, urban and well educated. Newcomers are very career oriented. They might be best described as the new economically oriented business people much in favour of change from a communist society to a more liberal one.

The mentality of the newcomer is contrasted by winner mentality. They are oriented on quick and easy money, much less stable and less oriented to the future than the Newcomers. More or less they might be described as players, torn between traditional values and new possibilities to get money.

The traditionalist mentality is, as the name indicates, more concentrated on the past.

Very typical for the new democracies are the Re-Rootings. These are people who feel that they lost their roots. They are disoriented, poor and deprived. They are in danger of being marginalized, excluded from society. It is a mentality which is not really on the path of society and destabilizes society as they are themselves destabilized.

These Mentalities are different in the Eastern European Countries under research:

Looking at the table you see clear differences between the countries. Our interpretation is guided by the opinion, that a profound middle class with its attitudes is necessary for a modern democracy. Therefore in our study a high proportion of the Establishment is judged as positive. Generally the orientation to innovation is also judged as a positive factor as long as this looks rather future oriented. This characterizes the Newcomers. So countries with a high proportion of those two life styles are seen as advanced on the way to modern democracy. The Traditionalists and Winners who focus rather on quick money than on lasting innovation as well as Re-Rootings as people in the danger of deprivation are judged as negative for democracy. Thus we can interpret the results as follows.

Russia has the highest rates of the Re-Rootings with 57% of the population belonging to this group. 30% are Winners. These two groups are very unstable and partially at risk of deprivation. Russia in this way gives the image of a very unstable, rather collapsing society rather than of a developing society. You can hardly speak of Russia as a stable modern democracy, it looks rather chaotic.

Romania has also a very high proportion of Winners (22%) and Re-Rootings (21%), seeing also this society in danger and not yet stabilized. There is also a high proportion of Traditionalists, but it is not higher than in other countries. With this mixture of the Re-Rootings and Winners we can speak of a society which is still far away from modernity. Romania with its 27% has a high number of Newcomers, but rather few middle class people.

Bulgaria might be a step further to modernity. The destabilizing mentalities account for a total of 28%, still a large proportion but with a 13% of the middle class it is beginning to establish itself and a quarter of the population belong to the Newcomers. Bulgaria has a relatively high proportion of Traditionalists (35%).

Very similar to Bulgaria is Poland. The proportion of Re-Rootings, people who are tentatively deprived is with 21% relatively high and the middle class with 8% relatively small. Poland has with 34% a high proportion of Newcomers which might be bringing society to a more modern level. But from the composition of the sociostyles Poland is not very far on the path to a modern stable democratic society.

Hungary, Czech Republic and Slovakia can be called the most advanced societies, Slovakia and the Czech republic being very similar in the composition of styles, Hungary quite different.

Czech Republic and Slovakia have the highest proportion of the established mentality (34% Slovakia and 41% Czech Republic). They have also about 30% traditionalist and with little above 10% a relatively low proportion of Newcomers. About a fifth of the population have these lifestyles which we see as rather destabilizing and counterproductive to modernity.

Hungary is different insofar as it has a comparatively low proportion of the Establishment but a rather high – nearly a third of Newcomers. In Hungary the lifestyles of Re-Rootings and Winners are rather low. This gives the image of a rather liberal society in

the economical sense. From these mentalities the economy should be better of in Hungary than in the other countries.

Czech Republic and Slovakia can be seen far on the path of modernity with a relatively stable and large middle class. But they might be described as rather conservative compared to Hungary.

Comparison with general indicators

We will now also analyse central macrosocial indicators on the advancement of society if life styles are a good reflection of the situation.

The life-style study was done in 1997. We compare the life styles with the political and economic situation at that time.

We would expect Russia and Romania rather chaotic, Bulgaria and Poland both very ambivalent, Bulgaria more on the traditionalist side. In Czech Republic and Slovakia as well as in Hungary we would expect a rather stable regime, a rather stable democracy. From the economical point of view we would expect Hungary as the comparatively best developed country. A rather weak economy is expected in Poland and Bulgaria, unstable in Romania and worst in Russia.

We cannot prove entirely our expectations here but we can introduce some measures: In Table 2 we give an overview of central criteria for the advancement of societies. We take the GNP per capita, infant mortality, as a measure of stability we take the number of people in prison [Tanzi; Schuknecht (2000:114)] and the corruption index. Finally we use two general indices, the Freedom Index as presented by freedom house and the Human development index, (Human development Report UNDP, www.undp.org/hdr2002). For political correlation we first wanted to look at the party in power but a short glimpse showed that on the level of votes there is no connection with the development of society and right, conservative or left wing governments or parliaments. So we do not use this as an indicator. Obviously with minor differences politics hardly influences the general development or political parties in power operate in a similar way so that on the broad scale it does not make for a significant difference. To compare it more easily, we take also the life styles to the table in a condensed form. We put together the modern "middle class" lifestyles which are Newcomers and Establishment and the Winners and Re-Rooting as rather destabilizing life styles on the other hand. In this question it is very difficult to say to which side a traditional life style belongs, so we do not include it here. Than we show the relation of modern lifestyles with the rather destabilizing and the relation of modern plus traditional with the rather destabilizing life styles.

Table 2. Lifestyles and macroindicators in comparison

Country	Macroindicators					Lifestyles		
	GNP/per Cap.	HDI	Prisoners	CPI	childdeath	Freedom Index	Nwe+Est	Win+Re-root
Bulgaria	1170	0,79	138	3,3	23,5	2,5	37	28
Czech Republic	10510	0,88	209	4,6	7,6	1,5	52	18
Hungary	7200	0,86	141	5,2	11,8	1,5	49	12
Poland	4010	0,85	148	4,2	11,9	1,5	40	30
Romania	4310	0,77	196	3,3	26,4	2	33	43
Russia	4370	0,77	686	2,4	25	3,4	7	87
Slovakia	7910	0,88	142	3,7	10	2,9	46	22

Let us look at some indicators as shown in the table.

Infant mortality is a good indicator as it leads to distinction. It is high in Romania, Russia and also Bulgaria significantly lower in Hungary, Slovakia and Poland and lowest in Czech Republic. Take this as an indicator of the health of the nation you will find that Romania, Russia and Bulgaria are far away from a modern state.

The GNP per capita gives an impression of the wealth of nations. Definitely as we said, a certain amount of wealth is the basis for the development of westernised lifestyles. Thus the Czech Republic had in 1997 the highest GNP per capita, but it was still less than half of Austria's (22070 \$) or half that of Italy (20290 \$) by way of comparison. Slovakia and Hungary were lower. Now all rank higher, but we take the rates of 1997 as this was the time of the lifestyle study and we want to show connections between lifestyles and general political and economical indicators. Poland, Romania and Russia were rather poor, Bulgaria ranked lowest.

Compared to the lifestyles the GNP does not reflect the situation very good as Bulgaria which is in lifestyles much more advanced has a very low GNP.

Next let us have a look at the corruption index. This might be a good indicator for political stability not necessarily for democracy. Here Czech, Hungary and Poland are the best. It is interesting to see this in comparison with countries in the European Union. Austria e.g. has with 7.6 ranks rather high what means low corruption, but Italy has with 4.7 the lowest rank in the European Union. Corruption is high in Russia and that might effect the political stability very much. World wide Russia gets rather low figures from the countries in Europe only Albania is a little bit lower (2.7), Bulgaria and Rumania a little higher, Slovakia not very much higher than these two.

The persons in prison indicator shows again the exceptional role of Russia with more than three times as much as in the other countries. Unexpectedly is the relatively low rate in Bulgaria. In contrast to the opinion of Tanzi and Schuknecht (2000:114f), persons in prison might not always be a sensible indicator for stability.

The freedom Index shows the advancement in democracy. Hungary, Czech Republic and Poland have the highest and Russia the lowest. In 1997 it was also very low in Slovakia.

Finally let us take a look at the Human Development Index. It is a combination of different indicators such as Life expectancy, Adult literacy rate, combined first-second and third level gross enrolment ratio, GDP per capita. As an index we do not expect very high differences. Within the world though the HDI fluctuates between .9 for highly ranked countries and .4 for very low ranked countries mainly in the third world.

Countries higher than .8 are high, higher than .3 middle. From that we see that Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland are in the higher class and Bulgaria, Russia and Romania in the lower. Romania and Russia rank lowest, Bulgaria a little bit higher. In 1995 (that is the time of the HDI we are reporting) Czech and Slovakia were higher than Hungary and Poland.

Again we can distinguish two bigger groups in these countries: Romania, Russia and Bulgaria on the one side and Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic and Slovakia on the other.

Comparing with the lifestyles we see that modern lifestyles and middle class lifestyles go together with a higher rate in Human development. Form the table we can say definitely that among the nations under study Hungary, Czech Republic and Slovakia are the most advanced, Slovakia lacking still democratic freedom. These countries are followed by Poland, Bulgaria is very low on the process of advancement and Russia is the least.

Conclusions

What do these data mean? First we can see that very common economical and political indicators go hand in hand with the life styles. Both result into a same classification of coun-

tries. We can distinguish very clearly two groups: Rumania, Bulgaria and Russia on the one side and Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland on the other side. In the first group there are no candidates for the European Union. Each group in itself is diverse. This can be shown by life styles as well as the objective indicators. Russia is farthest away from a modern society. It is not clear if Bulgaria or Romania are more advanced. Bulgaria is definitely poorer at 1997 but has a higher HDI. Looking at the life styles it is more the question to which side the Traditionalists are shifting when the country gets richer.

The other four countries are similar and different at the same time. The furthest advanced in 1997 was obviously the Czech Republic, even more than Hungary. This might reflect the relatively stable middle class life style in Czech Republic. In this group money at first makes the difference. Poland is significantly poorer than the other countries. But on a second level also democratic freedom makes a difference, where Slovakia is ranking lower. So from these data in Poland economic development is the biggest issue while in Slovakia political freedom is much more important.

This situation is also reflected in the lifestyles. The most stable lifestyles, put together Establishment and Newcomers are found in Czech Republic and Hungary.

We could combine here only a few indicators but they show the limits and possibilities of a life style approach. Economic and political indicators do not say all. Lifestyles as typical for a western democracy obviously need an economic basis. Poorer countries have more instable life styles. On the other hand with the lifestyles you can picture subtler differences in society. They add somehow meaning to the objective indicators. And more you see that the behaviour and the attitudes of people are not independent from the economic and political scenery in their country. Life styles thus reflect on one side very good the status of a society on the other hand they are more precise and nearer to the everyday world, the attitudes and behaviour of people than objective measurements are. They add information to the development of society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck, Ulrich (1986) **Die Risikogesellschaft**. Frankfurt / Main, Suhrkamp.
- Berger, Peter L.; Luckmann, Thomas (1995) **Modernität, Pluralismus und Sinnkrise**. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann-Stiftung.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1987) **Die feinen Unterschiede**. Frankfurt / Main, Suhrkamp.
- Castells, Manuel (1996) **The Rise of the Network Society**. Blackwell, Massachusetts.
- Erikson, Robert; Goldthorpe, John H. (1992) **Constant Flux. A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies**. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- FESSEL-GfK: www.gfk.at
- Fischer, Arthur; Fritzsche, Yvonne; Fuchs-Heinritz, Werner; Münchmeier, Richard (2000) **Jugend 2000. 13. Shell Jugendstudie**. Opladen, Leske & Budrich.
- Geiger, Theodor (1972, orig. 1932) **Die soziale Schichtung des deutschen Volkes**. Stuttgart, Enke.
- German Welfare Survey (2002) www.gesis.org
- Hradil, Stefan (1987) **Sozialstrukturanalyse in einer fortgeschrittenen Gesellschaft**. Opladen, Leske & Budrich.
- Kaase, Max; Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (ed.) (1983) **Wahlen und politisches System**. Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag
- Kohli, Martin (1986) Gesellschaftszeit und Lebenszeit. In: Johannes Berger (ed.) **Die Moderne – Kontinuität und Zäsuren**. Göttingen, Schwartz. P. 183–207.
- Maslow, Abraham (1987) **Motivation and personality**. Third edition. New York, Harper & Row.
- Mitchell, Arnold (1983) **The Nine American Lifestyles**. New York, Warner Books.
- Müller, Hans-Peter (1992) **Sozialstruktur und Lebensstile: der neuere theoretische Diskurs über soziale Ungleichheit**. Frankfurt / Main, Suhrkamp.

- Riesman, David; Glazer, Nathan; Denney, Reuel (1954) **The lonely crowd**. Garden City, New York, Doubleday.
- Ritzer, George (1995) **Expressing America**. Thousand Oaks, Pine Forge Press.
- Schulze, Gerhard (1992) **Die Erlebnisgesellschaft**. Frankfurt am Main, Campus Verlag.
- Silbereisen, Rainer K.; Vaskovics, A. Laszlo; Zinnecker, Jürgen, (ed.) (1996) **Jungsein in Deutschland. Jugendliche und junge Erwachsene 1991 und 1996**. Opladen, Leske & Budrich. P. 150ff.
- Simmel, Georg (1977) **Philosophie des Geldes**. 7. Auflage. Gesammelte Werke. Berlin, Duncker & Humblot.
- Sinus-Studie: www.sinus-milieus.de
- Spellerberg, Anette (1996) **Soziale Differenzierung durch Lebensstile**. Berlin, Edition Sigma.
- Tanzi, Vito; Schuknecht, Ludger (2000) **Public Spending in the 20th Century. A Global Perspective**. New York, Melbourne, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- UNDP, United Nations Development programme, Human development Report: <http://www.undp.org/hdr2002>
- Van Gennep, Arnold (1994, orig. 1909) **Les rites de passage**. Paris, Picard.
- Zulehner, Paul M.; Hager, Isabella; Polak, Regina (2001) **Kehrt die Religion wieder? Religion im Leben der Menschen 1970-2000**. Ostfildern. Schwabenverlag.

ŽIVOTNI STIL I SOCIJALNA STRUKTURA PROCESI INDIVIDUALIZACIJE U ISTOČNOEUROPSKIM ZEMLJAMA

RUDOLF RICHTER

Institut za sociologiju
Sveučilište u Beču

U ovom članku bavim se životnim stilovima u istočno europskim zemljama. Koriste se podaci iz reprezentativnih studija u Mađarskoj, Poljskoj, Češkoj, Slovačkoj, Bugarskoj, Rusiji i Rumunjskoj. Pristup životnih stilova kombinira strukturalne i kulturalne varijable, indikatore ponašanja kao i vrijednosti. Na osnovi indikatora konstruiraju se socijalni klasteri. Na taj način može nastati i drugačija slika kompozicije društva. Nakon predstavljanja prednosti pristupa životnih stilova opisujem životne stilove u raznim zemljama. Na kraju postavljam tezu o različitim fazama demokratizacije i modernizacije istraživanih zemalja.

Ključne riječi: ŽIVOTNI STILOVI, SOCIJALNA STRUKTURA, ISTOČNA EUROPA, INDIVIDUALIZACIJA, MODERNIZACIJA, DEMOKRATIZACIJA