This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document, This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge Press in Soviet and Post-Soviet Lithuania – Generational Experiences on 31 December 2021, available online: https://www.routledge.com/Soviet-and-Post-Soviet-Lithuania-Generational-Experiences/Zilinskiene-Ilic/p/book/9780367902025?gclid=CjwKCAiA-9uNBhBTEiwAN3IlNEM-SZTnr-nmVGFW5vjOxCr-HIXlSkeXF6M005xB1oitzCf8iKhY_xoCEb4QAvD_BwE and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

Žilinskienė, Laima (Ed) and Ilic, Melanie J (Ed) ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2219-9693 (2021) Introduction: Social Time and Generations. In: Soviet and Post-Soviet Lithuania – Generational Experiences. Routledge Studies in the History of Russia and Eastern Europe . Routledge, pp. 1-23. ISBN 9780367902025

Official URL: https://www.routledge.com/Soviet-and-Post-Soviet-Lithuania-Generational-Experiences/Zilinskiene-Ilic/p/book/9780367902025?gclid=CjwKCAiA-9uNBhBTEiwAN3IlNEM-SZTnr-nmVGFW5vjOxCr-HIXlSkeXF6M005xB1oitzCf8iKhY_xoCEb4QAvD_BwE

EPrint URI: https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/10461

Chapter 1

Introduction: Social Time and Generations

Laima Žilinskienė and Melanie Ilic

This collection of essays focuses on people born from 1970 to 1980 in order to identify this age cohort as a specific generation and to define this generation in the historical context of Soviet Lithuania. The studies included here provide not only an overview of the life course trajectories of a specific age cohort that reached adulthood in Lithuania immediately before the final collapse of the Soviet regime in 1991, but also that generation's unique demographic characteristics, the adaptability potential of its members and some of the particular shifts in their cultural and attitudinal outlook. These shifts include both critical re-evaluations of the Soviet past and necessary reconstructions of possible future life scenarios.

The identification of historical generations as a structure of social identity emerged as part of the modernisation process. The importance of generations in modern societies has grown partly in response to the increasing uncertainties linked to other collective identities (classical, national, religious) and as an outcome of rapid social change (Corsten 1999, Eisenstadt 1988, Misztal 2003, Edmunds and Turner 2005). Although the definitions of various 'global generations' (X, Y, Z, etc.) have recently dominated the discourse, a number of studies have also shown that generational formation and the chronological boundaries between generations differ in specific historical contexts. The theoretical discussions about the concept of 'generations' include the empirical evaluation of the influence of relevant macrosocial processes, such as modernisation and the change of political social systems, on the formation of generations. The study of generational formation is particularly important

in examples of periods of change between two different modes of modernity. In the case study underpinning the chapters in this book, the transition from the Soviet regime to a Westernised system of governance forms the basis of the study. Periods of social turbulence and upheaval, according to White (2013: 5), provide a specific focus for public debates on the idea of generations. For example, the events of 1968 particularly as they took place in Eastern Europe gave rise to discussions of 'the sixties generation', and likewise the events of 1989 gave rise to talk of a 'post-communist generation'.

The transformations that took place in Eastern Europe during the 1990s gave further impetus to the study of generations, resulting in those people born between 1960 and 1980 being identified as belonging to generations with unique demographic characteristics and adaptation strategies. In a series of geographically specific case studies, this collection of essays focuses particularly on those born in Lithuania in the 1970s with the aim of identifying this age cohort as a 'generation'. The chapters explore the objective criteria that distinguish this generation, and how this age cohort perceives and names itself as a generation. The chapters delineate the boundaries of this generation and stake a claim for this age cohort to be named 'the last Soviet generation'.

Such a question was prompted by an earlier sociological study (Zilinskiene, 2014) about 'the first Soviet generation' (born between 1945 and 1960) in Lithuania. The genealogical significance of this age cohort allowed researchers to build a picture of the adaptation strategies of the first Soviet generation in relation to their family experiences and the influence of Soviet ideology. The essential uniqueness of members of the first Soviet generation, when compared to their parents and grandparents, is their primary socialisation in the period of the early Soviet period. The collective wartime experiences of the earlier

'transitional' generation of the age cohort born during the Soviet and Nazi occupations of Lithuania (1940-1941-1944) are not directly recalled by the first Soviet generation born after 1945. The first generation of the Soviet era, in the terms of R. Miller (2000), is the 'later' generation because their adaptation as 'participants' in primary or secondary socialisation took different forms from those born earlier. Members of the first Soviet generation had to externalise their existence in the new Soviet social world alongside simultaneously internalising this world as objective reality (Berger and Luckmann 1999: 163). For the parents and grandparents of this generation, however, this 'objective' reality was not the only reality they experienced during their life course.

Another important aspect that distinguishes the first Soviet generation from older generations is the format of the education system they experienced. Members of the first Soviet generation studied in an education system that from 1945 was centrally operated from Moscow. Some educational employees of the pre-Soviet system were 're-educated' after then end of the Second World War. The first Soviet generation experienced an education system that had been reoriented 'from West to East'. Another strong 'player' in the education system that contributed to the formation of the first Soviet generation was almost universally mandatory participation in Soviet ideologically oriented organisations for children and young adults.

As Berger and Luckmann point out (1999: 169), however, people live with the parents assigned to them by fate. In Soviet Lithuania, living with their parents presented children with a family reality that included long-established family membership practices, intergenerational memory formation and parental attitudes that did not necessarily align with Soviet ideology. When the Soviet ideological system began to enter children's lives, another

'world' emerged alongside their parents' 'world', and it brought with it its own practices, attitudes and values. When two 'worlds' collide in such a way, they may complement each other, ignore each other or conflict with each other. In Riesman's (1989) terms, 'internal' family directives are confronted with 'external' ideological directives and this, accordingly, results in different understandings of the given situation. In such a scenario, the question of trust plays a role in different strategies deployed in adapting to the new reality.

A certain degree of analogy can be traced between the first Soviet generation and those born in the 1970s because the early socialisation of the last Soviet generation also took place during a period of system change. In this case, however, the transition that now took place was from the Soviet regime to a Western model. This later transformation away from the Soviet system also required the input of older generations. Therefore, an intriguing aspect of this analysis is the identification of models of adaptation to the radical structural transformation in the post-Soviet period with which different generations were faced. Did different components of the transformation process determine different generational experiences of change and how were these experiences reflected in different generations? The contributors to this collection test and extend ideas relating to changing life scenarios and practices with a focus on age and intergenerational issues in the late Soviet and post-Soviet context.

Those born in the 1970s in Estonia have already been the specific focus of study. Raili Nugin's study (2010) identifies this generation as one that overcame the challenges of transition. She identifies it as a strategic generation that had and still has better opportunities for self-realisation than other generations. Nugin also points to a problem in identifying the 1970s generation: on the one hand, it understands and defines itself as a distinctive

(peculiar) generation, but, on the other hand, it contains signs of a split, of being between two systems.

In a 2018 study, Ene Kõresaar identifies the Baltic States not only as geographical region but also a mnemonic entity. According to Kõresaar, the mental maps of the various peoples living in this region are shaped by the memories of Soviet socialism. Each of the Baltic States, however, also has its own unique experiences relating to the transformation period. The demographic peculiarity of Lithuania in comparison with other Baltic countries is its homogeneity in that the majority of the population are of local origin: 80% Lithuanian. Other nationalities living in Lithuania reside not only in the capital, Vilnius, but also in other regions of the country. In Latvia's capital, Riga, in contrast, 40% of the population are ethnic Russians, and Russian speakers constitute over half of the urban population.

Politics is another crucial factor. In 1989, the Lithuanian Communist Party (LCP) split from the CPSU and in 1990 changed its name to the Lithuanian Democratic Labour Party. After the 1992 Seimas (parliamentary) and 1993 Presidential elections, the governments formed by the Lithuanian Democratic Labour Party took charge of economic policy. The 'old guard of policy makers', with their experience of active participation in Soviet economic policy making, also oversaw the implementation of these new policy directives. The Lithuanian Democratic Labour Party governed the newly independent state for almost 18 years. In Lithuania, the de-Sovietisation process proved to be much more difficult than it was in Estonia. Although the Law on De-Sovietisation had been discussed in Lithuania after the restoration of independence in 1990, it was never fully adopted. Estonia, on the other hand, witnessed a transformation of its political parties and the new political elite of independent Estonia were not former communists. It was thus easier in Estonia to implement reforms.

Meanwhile, in Lithuania, members of the former Soviet nomenclature successfully adapted to the new post-Soviet conditions, and easily turned their political capital into economic benefit (Antanaitis, 2008). Unlike in Latvia, members of the Lithuanian nomenclature, having lost their assured route to economic prosperity, now found ways to turn their established positions in state power into sources of personal enrichment.

Economically, Latvia lagged behind Lithuania and Estonia, and was one of the worst-hit countries of the 2009 global economic downturn. According to Sommers (2014), the most successful years for the Baltic States have been from 2014 to the present. By the time Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia had regained their independence in 1990, neoliberal economic ideas had already taken root in the West. These neoliberal ideas were not critically accepted by the leaders of the Baltic States, and this had an impact on the development of these countries.

Time, as a social construct, gives a sense of linear progress from the past to the present and from the present to the future. However, time as a condition of social existence can be divided into different stages which differ in the forms of human experience. Koselleck (1985) perceives time as a panoramic horizontal line on which different historical time is only ever temporary. Each time segment as a temporality faces the problem of synchronising past and present experiences. According to Kosellek (1985), every present is an imaginary future in the past. European society in the twentieth century and at the beginning of the twenty-first century was characterised by a multitude of events, especially in the case of Eastern Europe: war, post-war recovery, repression, Sovietisation and the fundamental transformations of systems that resulted from the collapse of the Soviet regime. All of these events required a high degree of individual and personal adaptability. In this respect, time

does not function in the same way for everyone. On the one hand, adaptability is dependent on individual participation in the events of any one specific time period and, on the other hand, the age at which the individual experiences the various processes of socialisation at any given time. Time can be characterised through both social and personal prisms. The social prism of time encompasses various stages of social development, while the personal prism of time demonstrates at which stages of personal development personal life experiences are formed. Time is a collection of lives, identities and feelings. Time can be described as a living memory, an attempt to preserve identities and behaviours.

Sztompka (2004) has described the collapse of the Soviet empire (European communism) as a moment of traumatic change, and one which came quickly and unexpectedly. The changes that took place in the political, economic and cultural spheres also brought about fundamental changes to everyday life. This radical change of system inevitably had a major impact on individual life trajectories. These important events in twentieth-century history changed the European political map. The year 1989 brought about significant changes in Central and Eastern Europe, after which everything on the map of the former Soviet empire changed. The general atmosphere of change created interrelated processes, and other previously unimaginable geopolitical processes took place throughout Central and Eastern Europe.

As Svedas (2019) has pointed out, however, even such events as the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 cannot yet be considered to be complete because we still talk about borders in our thinking and borders between people. The fall of the Berlin Wall is still relevant today because the changes subsequent to it inevitably affected people's lives, values, behaviours, relationships, outlooks and attitudes. After 1989, individuals had to adapt to different rules

and life scenarios because their new life experiences were now in conflict with their past expectations. Thus, the changes that have taken place since the decentralisation and de-institutionalisation of the former Soviet space have required new processes of adaptation. As Winch (1999) argues, habits are formed not only through receiving instructions, but by living with people who normally behave in a certain way. In forming new habits, generational positionality is significant both in social space and in the family.

In a particular time segment (social time), some interpret that specific time period through the prism of their own life experiences accumulated since birth, whilst others assess the situation through the stories they are told about it. Representatives of any given time period are agents of memory, and actively shape the ways of understanding, remembering or forgetting the past. In this sense, different 'generations' can be seen as 'mediators' between individual and collective memory.

During a period of political transformation, according to Wulf and Groenholm (2010), time is mentioned more often; it is used not only in political rhetoric but also in day-to-day discourse. Wydra (2018) draws attention to the historicity of generational backgrounds and their key role for the emergence of memories. Generations are not ruptures with the past, but their impact on memory requires further elaboration because of the varying experiences of different generations. Generations form their own meanings of the past and create new meanings for the future, as historical experience, according to Koselleck (2004), is the experience of specific generations. These experiences are based on the events that make up the individual's unique biography and temporality.

When a substantive transformation of the social system takes place, as was the case in Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the twentieth century for example, long-term changes in experience are also in evidence. In such conditions where a range of possible memories may be formed, generations associate the past with the future and vice versa. Such long-term processes of system transformation transcend the experiences specific to any one generation because different generations cannot discard historical time or forget the past (Wydra, 2018). 'Generational consciousness', according to Pickering and Keightley (2013: 126), is formed in relation to the past. In genealogical relationships, a connection takes place in a vertical projection between generations. Gurevitch (1964) describes this as various 'social times' existing contemporaneously in a society. 'Social times' dynamically interact, forming alliances and antagonisms and causing frictions and communication. These social times, according to Jureit and Wildt (2005), come to generations of those having similar social backgrounds, born in the same region and characterised by certain shared formative experiences during their adolescence, which construct their generational identity. Thus, each generation is connected by the historical experiences taking place at that time. Generations seek unique answers to the social and political issues that are relevant to them and which provide them with a corresponding emotional character. New generations respond to previous generations by rejecting or accepting them, depending on their political perspective. Each generation has its own 'truths' about society and seeks to redefine and understand its past, present and future.

As a consequence, whilst the generational component forms a large part of an individual's personal identity, time is also important in an intergenerational perspective. Nugin et al. (2016: 17) argue that the construction of generations depends in part on the perception of past generations. Social change constructs the various social characters of different birth

cohorts as generations. Generational constructs, according to Edmunds and Turner (2005), are dynamic and flexible in time as the events or social processes going on around them are re-evaluated. Similar social conditions, however, do not necessarily result in similar generational constructs, just as in the same way as common generational descriptions can have different content. Generational constructs are influenced by the socialising experiences that have an impact at any one particular social time. Chauvel (2006) argues that the processes of socialisation experienced during periods of economic growth seek to secure a position in society, and socialisation in times of economic crisis weakens those aspirations. Those age groups experiencing key socialisation during economic crises tend to remain weaker in aspiration even as the economy later improves. Thus, system transformations and economic crises become obstacles to positive self-identification (Hoikkala et al., 2002).

Turner (2002) identifies strategic generations as those with high levels of social mobility, secure employment prospects and economic prosperity. However, members of the same generational group can differ in such aspects as social status, educational achievement and place of residence, which may lead to different life trajectories and relationship scenarios, and therefore different critical assessments of the situation around them. According to Inglehart (1997), system transformation brings about the emergence of new generational groups, whose values are influenced by the socio-economic conditions of their childhood and adolescence. Importantly, these value orientations remain relatively stable throughout one's lifetime. Thus, different social groups and different people may recall shared and similar life experiences in completely different ways. In different periods of history and under different political systems, the same society's interpretations of the past can vary quite considerably. Furthermore, through the various social groups formed on the basis of generational, gender and other features, individuals are involved in a process in which

models for a suitable recollection of the past are created, with the aim of making the public conceptualisation of the past acceptable to or at least usable for each individual in that society.

In stable societies, cultural knowledge and values are passed down from generation to generation (Nugin, 2016). In contrast, in periods of significant social change, previously accumulated cultural knowledge and values are not necessarily applied to the new social conditions. Rapid and fundamental change can lead to tension or conflict between generations. New generations may choose to ignore the past because they believe that the knowledge and experiences accumulated by their parents and grandparents are no longer of use in trying to understand the present. These generations develop their own distinct models of socialisation. The delineation of subjective boundaries between generations becomes problematic because these depend not only on a specific time period but also on the ages and current life stages of those included in the generation. When processes of important social change coincide with a cohort's coming of age, their transition from youth to adulthood, their experiences can become crucial in forming a specific generational consciousness. Divisions between generations, however, do not necessarily represent ruptures with the past, but instead can be understood also to constitute threshold experiences. Generativity is the concern for establishing and guiding the next generation and thereby perpetuating life (Wydra, 2018). The transformative events of the twentieth century further served to adjust the concept of 'generation'. The particular changes in Central and Eastern Europe affected a huge number of people, their life experiences and expectations, demonstrating that generational belonging is an experiential phenomenon.

Mannheim (1928) has distinguished experiences of passive and active belonging to generations. Passive belonging to a generation has a biological basis. Active belonging to a generation depends on specific events in any given historical time. Living in the same social time leads to identification with other participants in that situation of the same generation. The experiences of different generations in the same social time can be very different and those differences also have an impact on intergenerational relationships. In more stable conditions, young people tend to adapt more readily to the ideas of their elders. In the context of significant social change, however, intergenerational relationships and dialogue may require considerable adjustment. In such cases, either shared dialogue / cooperation or conflict / tension between generations can occur. In such situations, cooperation is especially facilitated in those cases where the younger generation has to rely on parental support, and new connections are formed between the generations.

Generational belonging structures the perception of temporalities. Individuals experience social time according to their own position in the generational sequence. The meanings given to specific events reveal how formative experiences coincide with historical event time, and thus can produce generational time. Generational divisions thus work as thresholds and intervals, as the dimension of the in-between. New expectations may emerge because the younger generation's space of experience inevitably differs from that of the older generation. An emerging generation may choose not to accept the systems of interpretation developed by previous generations (Wydra, 2018).

'Barriers' between generations are made meaningful by autobiographical memories and stories told to them by older family members. There are also reflections on specific events of that time told in these narratives. The family plays an important role in the communication

of memory to younger generations (Erll, 2011). Family memory is understood here as conversation that involves efforts to reconstruct past experiences. This is not only a fact of behaviour but also of emotions. It is also a dialogue between the narrator and the listener and it creates opportunities to learn from the past and, as such, it is a conversation with the past. The conversation must be based on the premise that the past has something to say, that it tells the truth, and that it is valuable to listen to it. It is not simply a reconstruction of the behaviour of family members in their belief that such a view of the past provides information but does not affect the present. Conversation is a fusion of horizons that affects the understanding of the present.

According to Assman (2008), communicative memory in the family is important because talking about past experiences is often based on an assessment of that social system. Family memory shapes attitudes towards the context of different social time (temporality) and the reasons for choosing various behavioural scenarios. Family memory, according to Hodgkin (2003), is understood as the 'container' or possessor of memory. The family story conceptualises the family's relationship with their social environment. This means that the family story encapsulates not only experiences in the social environment, but also a reflection of those experiences. In other words, experiences are narrated in a certain context with a certain emotion. However, memory is also dynamic because the construction of the meaning of the past takes place in a changing space of time. Mistzal (2003) calls this the 'memory dynamic'. Memory construction or reconstruction is the process by which interpretations of existing and alternative to previous experiences may be similar or different. In memory dynamic there is a significant dimension of time and of social change.

Olick (2007: 12) refers to 'memory of memory' because it brings the past into the present. This 'second' memory helps individuals to understand the past, and to choose patterns of behaviour in the context of social change. That memory, however, does not guarantee a similar distribution of meaning. According to Schwartz (1996), social change constructs new social and symbolic spaces, making use of previous structures. People give meaning to their experiences on the basis of the same cultural narrative or interpretation template (Wertsch, 2002). The constructed memory archive stores events that occurred at different times. Those events that were significant to people at any one social time may be ignored by generations belonging to a different social time. Alternatively, certain specific events may be interpreted differently by those same groups.

Each generation forms a unique impression arising from the social and political events experienced during their childhood and youth. This is how the generation shapes its social identity. Social change affects both life scenarios and life course. Various adaptation scenarios are available to individuals in the face of significant social transformation: some may not be able to adapt, others may face unstable careers, and others may need to work independently, for example. Variations are evident amongst people in similar structural situations. Their attitudes towards experiences in that particular social time may differ due to their different life trajectories.

At various stages of history, generations have coded their existential community and thus symbolically conveyed the idea of their founding (Wydra, 2018). Memory plays a crucial role in remembering comprehensive political and social changes in society. People belonging to different age groups and different generational times, according to Wydra (Ibid), always overlap in historical time, generational belongings are incommensurable, and

meanings are always fragmented. If several social and political upheavals occur during the lifetime of overlapping generations, meanings are fragmented according to their generational time. A conflict arises from the chronological discrepancy between social and political time. Therefore, different meanings are emphasised in communication memory, depending on the position of those communicators in the intergenerational chain.

Communicative memory forms connections with the past. According to Wydra (2018), one needs to ascertain how memories are collected over time and space. Memory is not made by events, generational units, or outstanding individuals, but relies upon networks of connectivity. Collective memory is an aggregate of individual memories where the plurality of individual experiences across temporal and spatial distance shapes memory. Meaning is not limited to one aspect of experience - an event, generational unit, or founding generation. It pervades the whole. Meaning is not a relationship of causation but is the centre that attracts connections from different backgrounds of generational belonging. The phrase 'to recollect oneself' suggests that recollection is the basis of remembering. However, according to Aarelaid-Tart (2016), sometimes great differences occur between what was considered to be true in the past and what is regarded as the truth at present. These truths can be multiple both in the past and in the present.

This becomes especially relevant when a system transformation takes place, when the success of adaptation in a changed social time depends not only on the social context, but also on past experiences and practices. The question arises about the inheritance of intergenerational relationships and patterns of behaviour, the need to revise generations as a model of the 'teacher-student' relationship, determined by (re)adaptive abilities. In order to understand how generations in Lithuania have succeeded in re-adapting in the post-Soviet

social time, this collection of essays pays attention to both the historical aspects of the Soviet era and the problems of generations.

A variety of research methods were used in the intergenerational research conducted in the preparation of these chapters, and these formed the basis of the critical analysis of changes in behavioural patterns, value systems and life course trajectories in Lithuania. The use of qualitative research methodologies, including in-depth analysis of extensive biographical interviews, focus group discussions and survey data, has further made it possible to study the self-perception of this particular age cohort and the specific consciousness of the 'last Soviet generation' in Lithuania.

Following the Introduction, the book is divided into two parts. The first part presents three historical contextual case studies of the Soviet era, allowing a better understanding to emerge of the behavioural scenarios and practices of the generations in late Soviet and post-Soviet social space.

In Chapter 2, Neringa Klumbytė examines the everyday dystopian experiences of modern materialities expressed in letters of complaint written by those living in late Soviet Lithuania. To do this, Klumbytė makes a close analysis of the content of a widely read contemporary satirical magazine. The chapter argues that these letters expressed significant disenchantment with the Soviet utopian project and stood in stark contrast to the regime's progressive discourse.

In Chapter 3, Monika Kareniauskaitė explores understandings of concepts linked to criminality and deviance to examine the differing values of various Soviet Lithuanian

generations with the aim of identifying the distinctive belief systems and social normativity of 'the last Soviet generation'. Members of this generation are found to be distinctive in their 'risk' concerns about security and personal safety in a way that was not formerly an issue for their more Sovietised parents. They are also far less likely to be engaged in acts of petty criminality that underpinned their parents' informal everyday practices in Soviet Lithuania, and they take a moral stance against such behaviour.

Chapter 4 explores the experiences of the last Soviet generation of engineers in Lithuania. Unlike the cultural elite examined in chapter 8, Saulius Grybkauskas argues that this specific group of higher education graduates had already suffered a downturn in their fortunes before the collapse of the Soviet regime, by which time their wages had fallen below those of shop floor workers. By the end of the Soviet period, engineering expertise as an example of higher professional training was no longer perceived to be of value. As the Soviet regime collapsed, many decided to abandon their studies in favour of earning a living.

The book's second part focuses on the sociological investigation of generations in Lithuania, especially those born from 1970 to 1980:

Chapter 5 examines some of the demographic characteristics of the generation that passed into adulthood towards the end of the Soviet era. Sigita Kraniauskienė addresses the question of whether naming this 'the last Soviet generation' is really appropriate. The chapter highlights the divisions in this age cohort, who chose the standard scenario of Soviet life, and who chose the opportunities presented by the post-Soviet path. It argues that 'the last Soviet generation' is defined in part by values, attitudes and practices seen in both previous and subsequent age cohorts, but its demographic specificities, particularly features

of the delayed transition to independent adulthood, clearly delineate it. A description is given of the specific features of the demographic characteristics inherent in the transition from childhood to maturity that delineate the last Soviet generation in Lithuania.

Chapter 6 takes this analysis further in the examination of the 'last Soviet generation' in Lithuania's self-conscious generational identity through an analysis of its formative and discursive construction, including *habitus*, memory and postmemories of the Soviet past. Irena Šutinienė identifies the generation's distinctive features and boundaries, and sets these against the historical time period of their critical formative years. The chapter recognises the mutability of the conceptual construction of generational self-consciousness.

In Chapter 7, Laima Žilinskienė makes use of extensive biographical interview data to explore the adaptation models, including the influence of family members, the education system and place of residence, that were deployed by the 1970s birth cohort as evidenced in their changing life scenarios, behaviour patterns and intergenerational relationships during the process of post-Soviet transformation in the 1990s. The chapter reveals the influences at play in successful adaptation in the post-Soviet social context, and the roles played by the family and the institutional environment.

Chapter 8 takes the study of differentiated Lithuanian society one step further. Monika Kareniauskaitė builds on the research initiated by Vilius Ivanauskas to focus on the impact of post-socialist transition on a particular sub-group of the last Soviet generation in Lithuanian society: the cultural elite. This study allows for the determination of whether a social position of relative privilege, in which various forms of capital had been accumulated under the Soviet regime, was of benefit during the 1990s transition and could endure as

advantageous positioning in the long term. It is argued that those who held higher social status in Soviet Lithuania, the beneficiaries of 'embodied cultural capital', had a vested interest in bringing about change and were better placed to adapt to post-socialist transformation.

Chapter 9 turns attention to a different kind of everyday practice and personal life in Soviet and post-Soviet Lithuania by examining the survival and revival of religious identity and affiliation. Irena Eglė Laumenskaitė identifies the family as a key influence in the transmission of religious identity across generations.

Chapter 10 takes the study of family memory further by examining the communicative role this plays in the synthesising process of forging intergenerational relationships and solidarity. Laima Žilinskienė identifies the roles played by the different channels of communicative memory, and the focus of their content in the context of Soviet collapse and post-Soviet transformation. The chapter contests the contemporary predominantly negative portrayal of Lithuania's Soviet past and calls for a more nuanced evaluation.

Chapter 11 examines the experience of post-Soviet transformation in Lithuania for the women and men of the last Soviet generation in terms of the gendered division of household labour and domestic tasks. Aušra Maslauskaitė concludes that post-socialist transition brought about far greater domestic gender inequalities for members of the last Soviet generation than had been experienced by their parents.

References

Aarelaid-Tart, A. (2016). The Soviet past through the lenses of different memory communities. In (Eds.) K. Kull, V. Lang, M. Tasa. Generations in Estonia: Contemporary Perspectives on Turbulent Times. Approaches to Culture Theory. Volume 5. University of Tartu.

Antanaitis, K. (2008). Nomenklatūros transformacijos Lietuvoje 1988-1992 metais. *Darbai ir dienos*, volume 49, 81-93.

Assmann, J. (2008). Communicative and Cultural Memory. In: A. Erll and A, Nuning (Eds.). *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 109-18.

Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. (1999). Socialinis tikrovės konstravimas. Vilnius; Pradai.

Chauvel, L. (2006). Social generations, life chances and welfare regime sustainability. In: P.D. Culpepper, P.A. Hall and B. Palier (Eds.). *Changing France: the Politics that Markets Make*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 150-75.

Corsten, M. (1999). The time of generations. *Time and society, v*olume 8, issue 2-3, 211–30.

Edmunds, J. and B. Turner (2005). Global generations: social change in the twentieth century. *British Journal of Sociology,* 56(4), 559-77.

Eisenstadt, S. (1988). The Construction of Collective Identities: Some analytical and comparative indications. *European journal of social theory, v*ol. 1, issue 2, 229–54.

Erll, A. (2011). Locating Family in Cultural Memory Studies. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 42(3), 303-18.

Gurevitch, G. (1964). *The Spectrum of Social Time*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Hodgkin, K. and Radstone, S. Eds. (2003). Regimes of Memory (reprinted as Memory Cultures: Memory, Subjectivity, Recognition). London: Routledge.

Hoikkala, T., S. Purhonen and J.P. Roos (2002). The baby boomers, life's turning points, and generational consciousness. In: J. Edmunds and B.S. Turner (Eds.). *Generational Consciousness, Narrative and Politics*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 145-65.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jureit, U. and M. Wildt (2005). *Generationen. Zur Relevanz eines wissenschaftlichen Grundbegriffs*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.

Kõresaar, E. (Ed.). (2018). *Baltic socialism remembered: memory and life story since 1989*. London: Routledge.

Koselleck, R. (1979/1985). *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Koselleck, R. and K. Tribe (2004). *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mannheim, K. (1928). Das Problem der Generationen. *Kölner Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie*, 7, 157–85, 309–30.

Miller, R. I. (2000). *Researching Life Stories and Family Histories*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Misztal, B.A. (2003). *Theories of Social Remembering*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Nugin, R. (2010). Social time as the basis of generational consciousness. *Trames Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*. 146459(4): 342-66.

Nugin, R., A. Kannike and N. Raudsepp (2016). Introduction. Mapping generations in the Estonian context, In: K. Kull, V. Lang and M. Tasa (Eds.). *Generations in Estonia: Contemporary Perspectives on Turbulent Times*. Approaches to Culture Theory. Volume 5. University of Tartu, 13-33.

Nugin, R. (2016). Constructing a transition generation: the 1970s cohort. In: K. Kull, V. Lang and M. Tasa (Eds.). *Generations in Estonia: Contemporary Perspectives on*

Turbulent Times. Approaches to Culture Theory. Volume 5. University of Tartu, 282-317.

Olick, J.K. (2007). *The Politics of Regret. On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*. New York: Routledge.

Pickering, M. and E. Keightley (2013). Communities of Memory and the Problem of Transmission. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 16(1), 115–31.

Riesman, D., N. Glazer and R. Denney (1989). *The lonely crowd: A study of the changing American character*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sztompka, Piotr. (2004). *The Trauma of Social Change: a Case of Postcommunist Societies*. 10.1525/california/9780520235946.003.0005.

Schwartz, B. (1996). Memory as a cultural system: Abraham Lincoln in World War II. *American Sociological Review*, 61(5), 908-27.

Sommers, J. and Ch. Woolfsoon (2014). Introduction: the Baltic and the political economy of austerity. In: J. Sommers and Ch. Woolfsoon (Eds.). *The Contradictions of Austerity: the Socio-economic Costs of the Neoliberal Baltic Model*. London: Routledge.

Svedas, A. (2019). Berlyno siena griuvo prieš 30 metų, bet mąstymo sienos vis dar egzistuoja. *Kultūra*, 08.11.2019.

Turner, B.S. (2002). Strategic generations: historical change, literary expression, and generational politics. In: J. Edmunds and B.S. Turner (Eds.). *Generational Consciousness, Narrative and Politics*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 13–29.

Wertsch, J.V. (2002). *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, J. (2013). Thinking Generations. *British Journal of Sociology*, 64 (2), 216-47.

Winch, P. (1990). *The Idea of a Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy*. Second

    Edition. London: Routledge.

Wulf, M. and P. Groenholm (2010). Generating meaning across generations: the role of

    historians in the codification of history in Soviet and post-Soviet Estonia. *Journal of*

    Baltic Studies, 41(3), 351-82.

Wydra, H. (2018). Generations of memory: elements of a conceptual framework.

    Comparative Studies in Society and History, 60(1), 5-34.

Žilinskienė, L. (2014). (Ne)prisitaikymo sovietmečiu kontekstai gyvenimo istorijose

    (Contexts of Soviet (non) adaptation in life stories). Kn: L. Žilinskienė (Ed.).

    Sovietmecio atmintis gyvenimo istorijose (Memory of Soviet Times in Life

    Stories). Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 127-80.