

Patriotism has an important role in the life of a community, increasing cooperation between its members (Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tajfel, 1974; Terry, Hogg, & White, 1999) and triggering prosocial behaviour (Bar-Tal, 1993; Raagmaa, 2002; Rothstein, 2003). Not surprisingly, state authorities and public institutions often try to exploit the concept of patriotism as a promotional tool. However, attempts to manipulate patriotism should be done with caution as the result strongly depends on the presented material and, if chosen inappropriately, may lead to destructive nationalism. (Gangl et al., 2016). Previous studies suggested that, in contrast to national flag and other official symbols, landscapes and national achievements are relatively safe and efficient for evoking patriotism. (Gangl et al., 2016; Mummendey, Klink, & Brown, 2001). However, all to our knowledge previous studies evaluating national pride-promoting material had one strong limitation: they all were based on cross-sectional data when initial sample was split into control and experimental groups. This may pose problems with conclusions about material effects if by chance the two groups, although balanced on other socio-demographic characteristics, had different initial levels of national pride. Furthermore, with cross-sectional design it is not possible to evaluate manipulation effects on the individual level.

Considering this, we present here the first panel study trying to evaluate the effectiveness of evoking patriotic feelings in young Russians by exposing them to the scenes of national landscapes and achievements. We conducted two surveys answered by the same respondents. The first survey was used to investigate the structure of the national pride in the absence of any manipulations and to measure its initial levels. The second survey contained the same questions and was used to explore the effects of viewing national achievements and landscapes on national pride level compared to its initial level and in comparison with a control group.

Using the first survey and exploratory factor analysis we revealed the 3 factors of the national identity which strongly resembled the 3 factors reported earlier by Grigoryan (2013) who called them “nationalism”, “cultural patriotism” and “political patriotism”. For the 2nd survey we split the respondents into “control” and “experimental” groups balancing the level of the 3 national

identity factors. Before the 2nd survey the experimental group viewed 14 images showing national achievements, landscapes, historical monuments and Russian people.

As expected, viewing national achievements and landscapes did not increase the level of nationalism and thus, such material can be indeed considered as “safe from nationalism”, at least in our sample.

The level of “cultural patriotism” significantly increased between the first and the second survey in both control and experimental groups ($p < 0.001$). However, there was no significant difference between the two groups neither before nor after manipulation suggesting that the observed changes in the “cultural patriotism” should be explained by some external events, and the effects of priming, if any, were too weak to be revealed in comparison with some external stimulation.

Surprisingly, there was an effect of priming on “political patriotism”: while control group showed only a non-significant increase ($p = 0.24$), the experimental group demonstrated a significant decrease ($p < 0.03$). Among the “political patriotism” items significant changes were found for item “Proud of Russian fair and equal treatment of all groups in society” (decrease, $p < 0.04$) and item “There are some things about Russia today that make me feel ashamed of Russia” (increase, $p < 0.002$), which was quite striking as viewing national achievements were expected to increase pride and not shame levels.

To summarize, we have shown that the material, initially believed to be pride-promoting, may have some paradoxical effects leading to decrease in national pride measures. Although it is possible that some individual pictures could affect the level of “political patriotism”, the alternative explanation may be a counteraction between “cultural” and “political” patriotism. Previously, Paul Goode (2017) suggested that Russians have two forms of patriotic sense: official and private: the former resembles “political” patriotism, while “cultural patriotism” is likely to contribute to an apolitical “private” patriotism, with these 2 forms being at odds with one another. Thus, reminding respondents about cultural achievements may potential lead to subconscious depreciation of the

economic and political governmental actions. Furthermore, putting together too many positive scenes might also be considered as propaganda leading to decrease in trust in national authorities and the level of “political patriotism”. These findings somehow contradict the previous results from an Austrian sample (Gangl et al., 2016), showing that viewing national achievements and landscapes increases the level of patriotism and the related trust in tax authorities. The differences may stem from the fact that national pride in Austria and Russia has slightly different structure (Grigoryan, 2013) and from the antagonizing interaction of “cultural” and “political” forms of patriotism in Russia. Considering the importance of trust in public institutions for promoting socially-desirable cooperation and the paradoxical effect one may get if not selecting appropriate stimulation material, it is suggested that public institutions should run pretests of their promotional material, and that further investigation of factors influencing different aspects of national pride in different communities should be performed.

References

- Bar-Tal, D. (1993). Patriotism as fundamental beliefs of group members. *Politics and the Individual*, 3, 45–62.
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extrarole behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 445–464.
- Gangl, K., Torgler, B., & Kirchler, E. (2016). Patriotism’s Impact on Cooperation with the State: An Experimental Study on Tax Compliance. *Political Psychology*, 37(6), 867–881.
- Grigoryan, L. K. (2013) Patriotism and Nationalism in Russia: Influence on Economic Independence.” *Kul'turno-Istoricheskaya Psikhologiya [Cultural-Historical Psychology]*, 3: 22–31.
- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., & Brown, R. (2001). Nationalism and patriotism: national identification and out-group rejection. *The British Journal of Social Psychology / the British Psychological Society*, 40(2), 159–172.

Paul Goode, J. (2017). Humming Along: Public and Private Patriotism in Putin's Russia. In *Everyday Nationhood*, pp. 121–146.

Raagmaa, G. (2002). Regional Identity in Regional Development and Planning¹. *European Planning Studies*, 10(1), 55–76.

Rothstein, B. (2003). Social Capital, Economic Growth and Quality of Government: The Causal Mechanism. *New Political Economy*, 8(1), 49–71.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Sciences Information. Information Sur Les Sciences Sociales*, 13(2), 65–93.

Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: Self-identity, social identity and group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(3), 225–244.