

УДК 316.347(470.62)

DOI 10.18522/2658-5820.2021.2.3

**International Communication in the City Space of Dagestan: Condition and Trends****Madina M. Shakhbanova****Olga B. Khalidova***The Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography  
of Dagestan Federal Research Center of Russian Academy of Sciences  
Makhachkala, Russia*

**Abstract.** There is the problem of interethnic interaction. It is particular importance in a multi-ethnic society due to a number of very different factors. In addition, interethnic communication is an indicator of measuring the state in the interethnic sphere, because stability and the positive development of modern multinational society depend on it. Empirical data show that there is a positive attitude towards interethnic interaction, an orientation toward maintaining ethnic contacts in the mass consciousness of the urban population of Dagestan although at the same time it clearly outlines the social spheres within which they are ready to engage in interethnic dialogue.

**Key words:** urban space; urban population; interethnic communication; interethnic sphere; inter-ethnic relations; interethnic tolerance; social distance.

**For citation:** Shakhbanova M. M., Khalidova O. B. International Communication in the City Space of Dagestan: Condition and Trends // Caucasian Science Bridge. 2021 Vol. 4 № 2. P. 32 – 41.

**Межнациональная коммуникация в городском пространстве Дагестана:  
состояние и тенденции****М.М. Шахбанова****О. Б. Халидова***Институт истории, археологии и этнографии,  
Дагестанский федеральный исследовательский центр  
г. Махачкала, Россия*

**Аннотация.** Проблема межнационального взаимодействия приобретает особую значимость в полиэтническом социуме в силу ряда самых различных факторов. Кроме того, межнациональная коммуникация является индикатором измерения состояния в межэтнической сфере, ибо от нее зависит стабильность и позитивное развитие современного полинационального социума. Эмпирические данные показывают наличие в массовом сознании городского населения Дагестана позитивного отношения к межнациональному взаимодействию, ориентацию на поддержание этноконтактов, хотя при этом четко очерчивает социальные сферы, в рамках которых они готовы вступать межнациональный диалог.

**Ключевые слова:** городское пространство; городское население; межнациональная коммуникация; межэтническая сфера; межнациональные взаимоотношения; межнациональная толерантность; социальная дистанция.

**Для цитирования:** Шахбанова М.М., Халидова О. Б. Межнациональная коммуникация в городском пространстве Дагестана: состояние и тенденции // Caucasian Science Bridge. 2021. №2. С. 32 – 41.

**Introduction**

Used methodology and used methods are important when studying any social phenomenon which the researcher relies on. If we turn to the methodology of the study of inter-ethnic relations then the theory of contact and communication were the key in its framework. Moreover, the process of development of society, its needs, a formation of interethnic and inter-religious tolerance, interethnic harmony and stability in a multinational society required the search for a mechanism for resolving ethnic conflicts and confrontation between ethnic groups.

If we turn to scientific concepts that the development of the theory of contact was carried out by Allport in study "Nature of prejudice". Subsequently, both Allport and his students established the significance of the frequency and duration of contacts, as well as the number

of people who maintain contact. Also Allport and his followers have merit for the designation of such an indicator as the status of a social group in a social hierarchy in the formation of a specific type of relationship. If western researchers studied the concept of contact, its specificity, role in the social sphere, then great attention was paid to the theoretical probability of interethnic contacts at the regional level in Russian ethno sociology (*Arutyunyan, Bromley, 1986*). In native sociology in the 1970<sup>th</sup> – 1980<sup>th</sup> special attention was paid to the status of interacting groups. Therefore, the social composition and mobility of the contacting groups in the republics was revealed using data from statistics and sociological studies. We can to analyze the growth rates of qualified groups in the past that lagged behind in the economic development of peoples by such studies, their developing social and political demands, which it was clearly manifested during the period of perestroika. There was an understanding of status differences in their broad context as a new in the study of interethnic relations in the 1990<sup>th</sup> and especially in the 2000<sup>th</sup> including participation in power, the prestige of professions and position in society by M. Weber (*Drobizheva, 2018, p. 125*).

We can to establish an individual constructing a sociocultural space by study of the subjective boundaries of interethnic communication. We can see this process in an urban environment clearly and vividly that it is most often multiethnic and respectively, it filled with rules and stereotypes of interethnic contact that have developed over a long period of time. In addition, «the subjective reality of urban space is formed and ordered by the subject through natural attitudes, which are relatively stable social products» (*Fedosova, 2015*).

Before proceeding to the analysis of interethnic interaction and communication in the urban space of Dagestan, the frequency and nature of ethnic contacts, we have to state the concepts of interpersonal contact in the city in the scientific literature. So, to Z. Bauman's opinion, «cities have been sites of continuous and rapid changes throughout their history; and it were born changes that could turn the rest of society these changes arose unexpectedly and made people by surprise» (*Bauman, 2008, p. 24*). At the same time, the boundary «friend or foe» is clearly seen during interpersonal interaction. Therefore «we call cities a place where strangers meet, where they stay close to each other and where they interact with each other for a long time, without ceasing to remain strangers» (*Bauman, 2008, p. 26*), moreover, they are places of the «mass industry of strangers».

If we turn to R. Sennet' concept, then he focuses on the fact that «otherness» is a provocateur, a source of anxiety in analyzing social contact, that you do not know what the other will do and how he can behave. If any of us are in the crowd that we experienced such a feeling of awkwardness, discomfort (*Sennet, 2008, p. 96*).

Native researchers note the initial characteristic of social contacts of tolerance, although the lack of social connections contributes to the formation of social loneliness and social passivity, which is manifested through a decrease in social responsibility and activity of the local community. If we turn to Z. Bauman' theory then «the presence of strangers within sight and reach only increases the deep uncertainty of all life aspirations of citizens. This presence is an inexhaustible source of anxiety but sometimes still breaking out aggression which can be avoided only briefly. The eternal, albeit unconscious, fear of the unknown is desperately seeking an outlet. Accumulated fears are usually discharged on the chosen category of «strangers», which begin to be as the personification of the whole «stranger» (*Bauman, 2008, p. 43*).

By G.V. Lysenko's opinion the condominiums are one of the means of international communication and social contacts in cities that contribute to the formation of public relations of urban residents located at the same level of social space while it having a fairly similar system of values and needs. In addition, there is a formation of security and security in such a space. Social contact has the quality of solidarity than tolerance. At the same time, «condominiums with their fenced territory divide the space of the city into «internal» and «external».

Condominiums divide the urban space into segments. There is a solid nature in some social interactions and they are built tolerant or conflicting relations with the actors of other segments. Thus, urban space is not open and equally accessible for social interactions» (*Lysenko, 2011, p. 49*).

By researchers, the city and urban space where, firstly, with a constant increase in the population, and secondly, the integration of representatives of various ethnic communities, religions, professions and activities, migrants from rural areas to the local community is the basis for the existence of a social, spiritual, religious, etc. diversity due to the mutual influence, sometimes the combination of opposing ideas and cultures. Therefore, urban space with high heterogeneity is considered as a place, « people of different origin can easily join in it..., showing a high degree of openness» by R. Florida's opinion (*Mirishnikova, Shekin, Reva, 2011, p. 29*). E. Shevki and D. Bell (*Mirishnikova, Shekin, Reva, 2011*) analyzed the social environment. They have a thesis that the city is a reflection of the complexity of modern society. Three main factors were identified by them that shape social transformations within the urban environment. There is social status or economic status, urbanization, or marital status. R. Murdy (*Mirishnikova, Shekin, Reva, 2011*) described urban mosaics based on the intersection of three factors in the analysis of the social environment. For example, the socio-economic situation represents a sectoral structure, family status is concentric zones, and ethnic concentrations resemble multiple nodes. The imposition of these zones results in urban mosaics. We can build a methodology of tolerance in the social space of the city based on this model.

D. Rothschild proposed for the first time to consider ethnic groups and the state as subjects of an ethno-political conflict in his theory of ethnic stratification. He was paying serious attention to the analysis of both the resource potential of the parties and the possibilities of political mobilization of the group. By D. Rothschild's opinion, the successes and activity of ethno-political movements depend on the economic, political and ideological resources that the group can operate. In addition, it is necessary to take into account the composition of the group, its social and cultural characteristics (*Baranov, 2018*).

### **Data and methods**

A sociological survey on the study of ethnic identity of the urban population of Dagestan was conducted by method of random sampling in Derbent city, Kaspiysk city, Makhachkala city, Khasavyurt city in 2019. N - 520.

### **Discussion**

Only the multinational environment does not allow objective and subjective reasons to dominate the national factor in modern Dagestan society, because there are forces that can weaken the manifestation of ethno-nationalism, the desire to prevail in a particular social sphere. In addition, a positive interethnic dialogue helps maintain stability in a multi-ethnic society. Moreover, it is important to characterize the interethnic sphere from within by respondents, who are familiar with the ethnic processes taking place on the territory of their residence despite the subjectivity of the judgments (Table 1).

There is a positive position for the interethnic sphere in the territory of its residence in the mass consciousness of the urban population of the republic by results of the study. This opinion is shared by more than half of the respondents in Dargin, Lezghin and Chechen subgroups. Their share is smaller in the other (one second part), with the exception of Kumyks (every third respondent). If you look at the results of the study at the place of residence of the respondents, the answers were distributed as follows. Ethnic relations were rated positively by 57,4% of respondents in Derbent city, 50,7% of Khasavyurt city, 49,7% of Makhachkala city and 49,2% of Kaspiysk city. The second ranking place with a significant margin is

occupied by the judgment «positively, interethnic clashes do not occur in my city» (one third of the entire array). One fourth of Khasavyurt population, one in three of the subgroup of Derbents and Makhachkala residents, and one in two of Kaspians surveyed holds this position. 11,1% of respondents in Derbent city, 16,4% in Khasavyurt city, 18,6% in Kaspiysk city and 20,6% in Makhachkala city share the answer «there are ethnic collisions, but we quickly manage them in my city» for one fifth of the entire array of respondents. It is judgment negatively for «there are no open interethnic conflicts, but relations between representatives of different nations are bad in my city» are closer than 15,8% of Kumyks and 21,4% of Russians. If you look at the cities, then 11,6% of Lezgins, 21,2% of Kumyks and 31,6% of Russians living in Makhachkala city, 27,3% of Avars, 16,7% of Dargins, 20,0% of Kumyks and Laks living in Kaspiysk city characterize a state of the interethnic sphere in these settlements negatively. A statistically small proportion of respondents consider the interethnic sphere as tense for the entire array of respondents. There are Chechens (one fifth) and Laks (every ninth respondent) by nationality in it.

**Table 1**

*The distribution of answers to the question «How do you assess the interethnic situation in your city?» (in percentage)*

<b>Answer options // Nationalities</b>	<b>Positive, there are favorable relations between representatives of different people in my city</b>	<b>Positive, there are no ethnic clashes in my city</b>	<b>Negatively, there are tense interethnic relations in my city</b>	<b>Negatively, there are no open interethnic conflicts, but the relationship between representatives of different people is bad in my city</b>	<b>There are ethnic clashes in my city, but we quickly can regulate</b>
Avars	48,1	31,9	5,2	8,1	28,9
Dargins	55,1	41,6	2,2	5,6	15,7
Kumyks	29,8	35,1	5,3	15,8	19,3
Lezgins	54,9	34,1	4,4	5,5	12,1
Laks	48,9	27,7	10,6	4,3	14,9
Russians	42,9	39,3	7,1	21,4	14,3
Chechens	54,5	27,3	18,2	0	9,1
Other	64,4	25,4	1,7	10,2	16,9
<b>Total:</b>	<b>50,6</b>	<b>33,5</b>	<b>5,0</b>	<b>8,5</b>	<b>18,8</b>

When studying the phenomenon of interethnic communication, the nature of interethnic communication, the preference of one or another ethnic group in the course of interpersonal interaction, the frequency of ethnic contacts, the contact theory will be used (authors K. Ellison, D. Powers, N. Shelton, T. Pettigrew, L. Tropp), according to which interaction with representatives of a foreign ethnic community contributes to alleviating existing national prejudices, ethnic stereotypes, and therefore, stabilizing the interethnic climate in a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional society, harmonization of interethnic relations (Warszawer, 2015, p. 199).

Representatives of various ethnic communities enter into ethnic contacts with an unequal interaction status, which forced researchers to study conditions that could weaken

ethnic stereotypes, prejudices, and prejudices in real life. According to G. Ollport and his followers, the following are favorable conditions, firstly, cooperation, not group competition, secondly, common goals, thirdly, interaction of society and power institutions, aimed at finding a consolidating factor. T. Pettigrew, G. Hudson and M. Houston identified social and personal contacts as designating as formal or informal depending on the environment of their maintenance and entry in scientific community. It are public places, personal communication, and business.

The content of contact theory lays in the fact that depth and scale of communication, its prevalence in an informal environment is an indicator of relationships (positive or negative). Therefore, the measurement of interethnic attitudes are carried out by Bogardus social scale in ethno sociology because it shows that there are attitudes for a person of a different nationality in different social spheres in the mass consciousness of people. Earlier, study result was presented on this scale, which showed that there are positive attitudes towards representatives of foreign nationality and willingness of respondents to accept them in various social spheres in the mass consciousness of urban population.

Researchers identify unfavorable factors to forging a positive international environment, for example, «it is the existing gap between status expectations and non-realization by a person of his capabilities, regardless of ethnic, racial, religious (upward mobility)» (*Drobizheva, 2018, p. 127*).

We should note M. Rokich among foreign researchers who analyzed attrahere in detail i.e. prejudices emerging on base of differences. Of course, the process of interethnic contact has proceeded easier for ethnocultural and confessional proximity of interacting groups. However, we should be bear in mind that cultural and religious similarities are not yet a condition and basis to develop positive interethnic interaction. Moreover, differences are not always an obstacle to positive interethnic dialogue. Author's sociological surveys conducted this conclusion in different time. Therefore, the interviewed Dagestan peoples give preferences to the Russian people, which are radically different from them in ethnic culture and religion in a question «If you were destined to live away from your people, then what peoples would you prefer to live with besides your own?» In other words, we can say that these data are a clear statement of situation «unity in differences» in ethnosociology. In addition, we should to take into account the concept of «empathy» for researching the interethnic sphere appearing as a positive relationship of a subject with an object with a chosen an object for it as a condition, form, and mode of man and humanity. It supports a compassion for the purpose and inner goal of that reality which is available to a consciousness of a subject. It is empathy with other people, oneself, society, etc.

Specificity of such a movement of consciousness in the sphere of interpersonal and intergroup relations is really the fact that «a subject repeats voluntarily or involuntarily, excites and reproduces the experiences of other people, those with whom he is in direct or indirect contact. Empathy reveals itself as an experience of the experiences of another person in its highest manifestations when not only this or that degree or depth of understanding of the subject's states and actions have been achieved in the end, but also a certain agreement with his motives, with the internal justification of such states and actions» (*Bgazhnokov, 2003, p. 57*).

Undoubtedly, ethnic empathy has different cultural forms of its manifestation, but it is a quality inherent for man. It can arise involuntarily and suddenly for the actor himself, for example, as an expression of compassion for the enemy, because «a person has an instinct of sympathy» (*Yung, 1991, p. 113*). If empathic experiences are blocked or distorted, then it becomes to adequately impossible connect them to the self-concept and self-awareness of a subject. It is leads to maladaptation i.e. to mismatch between the imaginary and real being of the person or society. For example, when the value of love, gratitude, respect for others focus

in image of "I". However, situation is such that it does not have such feelings and relationships. Internal conflict arises between ideal and present being (*Shibutany, 1969, p. 28*). People somehow justify their negative reactions to overcome it without losing self-esteem. For example, they feel a suffering from the actions of representatives of another nationality to their own ethnic group. Moreover, this contributing to a formation of an exaggerated, inappropriate reality of a feeling of pity and compassion for oneself. This allows demonstrating aggressive behavior and negative emotions towards other people. At the same time, we have conviction in yourself of no guilt for us. At the same time, a state of intra-ethnic tolerance is important intra-ethnic empathy affected significantly influenced. This allows supporting a necessary level of interethnic and inter-religious harmony and understanding in society. Researchers adhere to the position that empathic people are generally tolerant. Therefore, they blame others less than non-empathic people insisting on harsh punishment. Thus, it can be argued that tolerant consciousness and behavior are part of empathic consciousness and behavior.

When we consider a socio-psychological theory of contacts, it should also pay attention to the communicative concept of K. Deutsch. He has opinion that common values equalize national one-sidedness, growth in volumes and variety of contacts, exchanges between groups, and increases consolidation at the interethnic and intercultural level. G. Tajfel and J. Turner put forward ideas about outgroup negativity the essence of which is to unite communities based on «a common dislike of their neighbors».

T. Pettigrew and L. Tropp identified a) social context variables (for example, size settlement, population, percentage of migrants, level of education, unemployment rate); b) indicators characterizing the socio-demographic, social positions of the contacting groups; c) political variables (for example, authoritarianism or orientation to domination); d) personal variables; e) variables related to identity; f) indicators describing a subjectively perceived threat; g) variables associated with personal experience based on a generalization of studies of variables explaining ethnic stereotypes, prejudices and prejudices in different countries, ethnocultural and political contexts that may impede the formation of positive interethnic dialogue and interpersonal communication (*Drobizheva, 2016, p. 21*). We can say that a position of L. M. Drobizheva is a manifestation of certain skepticism regarding the theory of T. Pettigrew and L. Tropp. She said that «recently, they attach importance to informal contacts in sports, public associations, and volunteer organizations. The experience of conducting comparative studies in different countries convinced of the possibility of unequal significance of certain indicators in different cultures. It's important to say about all this in order to understand that it is impossible to judge the state of interethnic relations on the basis of one or two indicators, albeit important ones, and even less effective to evaluate them without analyzing the totality of factors affecting these indicators» (*Drobizheva, 2018, p. 129*).

If we return to our study, then it is important to identify the orientation of the interviewed urban population of Dagestan to maintaining or ignoring interethnic communication, because its intensity and density determine the state of the interethnic sphere in it (Table 2).

Results of a study show the dominance of the position stating the presence of intense ethnic contacts in the urban environment of Dagestan in the mass consciousness of the respondents. Dargins, Kumyks, Lezghins, Russians and Chechens are distinguished by ethnicity. There is Avars and Laks with a smaller share. Respondents with different educational status supported intensive inter-ethnic communication by socio-demographic parameters. Although it can be noted its increase with increasing educational level from 78,3% with secondary education to 87,9% with higher education. The picture by age is as follows. There are 89,0% «up to 20 years old», 83,1% «from 20 to 30 years old», 75,1% «from 30 to 40 years old», 80,3% «from 40 to 50 years old», 87,0% «from 50 to 60 years old» and 66,7% «from 60 years old and above». Thus, the younger generation «up to 20 years old» seems to be the most

communicative. It is quite justifiable. At first there is a multinational school they are located. Then it is a secondary specialized and higher educational institutions in which students of different ethnic, religious, gender, age groups are studying. It should be noted activity of youth in social networks which also intensifies interpersonal contact. There is the answer or «rarely contact» (every eleventh respondent in the entire array) on second position. There is a share of those compared with other subgroups among Chechens (every fifth respondent) Avars and Lezgins (one eighth) by ethnicity. There is avoiding international communication in 3 sub arrays Compared with other age subgroups: «from 30 to 40 years old» (10,4%), «from 40 to 50 years old» (10,5%) and «from 60 years and higher» (15,4%). According to educational characteristics, respondents with secondary specialized education (16,5%) are distinguished with almost the same share in subgroups with secondary (7,0%) and higher education (7,7%). Practically, they do not enter into interethnic communication or support it only in the «case of emergency», a statistically small part of the respondents. There are sub arrays of Avars (every fifteenth respondent) and Russians (every fourteenth interrogated) in the first and in the second case. Respondents with secondary specialized education (8,7%) and age cohort «30 to 40 years old» (6,1%) do not enter into interethnic contact at all.

**Table 2**

*The distribution of answers to the question «How often do you contact representatives of other nations?» (in percentage)*

<b>Answer options // Nationalities</b>	<b>I have contact always</b>	<b>I have not contact</b>	<b>I have seldom contact</b>	<b>I have contact in case of emergency</b>
Avars	71,9	6,7	12,6	6,7
Dargins	82,0	1,1	9,0	6,7
Kumyks	84,2	1,8	8,8	1,8
Lezgins	81,3	3,3	13,2	1,1
Laks	78,7	6,4	4,3	0
Russians	89,3	7,1	0	0
Chechens	81,8	0	18,2	0
Other	91,5	0	5,1	1,7
<b>Total:</b>	<b>80,8</b>	<b>3,7</b>	<b>9,4</b>	<b>3,5</b>

A close and dense ethnic contact is a basis for a positive interethnic dialogue, interethnic and inter-religious tolerance. And this contributes, firstly, to the peaceful resolution of inter-ethnic conflicts, and secondly, to the settlement of emerging contradictions between Dagestan peoples. A role of interethnic communication is very important in this process. Its positivity is essential for maintaining stability in a multinational society. Therefore, frequency of ethnic contacts involves identifying the nature, emotional component of interethnic communication (Table 3).

Results of the study show that respondents have a positive assessment of interpersonal interaction by a wide margin. Moreover, there are a more of Russians and Chechens subgroups. At the same time, a proportion of people entering into interethnic communication with a positive attitude are growing with an increase in the educational level. It is 74,4% with secondary, 63,5% with secondary specialized and 80,1% with higher education. Empirical data are distributed on age as follows: 87,0% «up to 20 years old», 78,5% «from 20 to 30 years old», 64,3% «from 30 to 40 years old», 75,0% «from 40 to 50 years old», 72,2% «from 50 to 60 years old», 71,8% «from 60 years and above». There are 77,9% of residents of Makhachkala city, 77,8% of Derbent city, 68,7% of Khasavyurt city and 61,0% of Kaspiysk city indicate positive emotions from interpersonal interaction in cities of republic.

**Table 3***The is a distribution of answers to the question «How would you describe these contacts?» (in percentage)*

<b>Answer options // Nationalities</b>	<b>I have a contact with pleasure</b>	<b>I have a contact as appropriate</b>	<b>I am trying to avoid these contacts</b>	<b>I have uncomfortable and tense when communicated</b>
Avars	70,4	14,8	6,7	3,0
Dargins	75,3	15,7	4,5	1,1
Kumyks	77,2	10,5	7,0	1,8
Lezgins	75,8	16,5	2,2	2,2
Laks	70,2	4,3	8,5	4,3
Russians	82,1	14,3	3,6	0
Chechens	90,9	9,1	0	0
Other	78,0	13,6	1,7	1,7
<b>Total:</b>	<b>74,8</b>	<b>13,7</b>	<b>4,8</b>	<b>2,1</b>

There is orientation to maintaining interethnic contact only «if necessary» (one seventh of the entire array) on second ranking place with a significant margin. There is least of all who noted this judgment in a sub array of Laks and Chechens in comparison with other subgroups. There are a proportion of those is greater in the age cohort «from 30 to 40 years old» (19,1%) and «from 50 to 60 years old» (20,4%), as well as with secondary specialized education (18,3%) in the subgroup. If necessary 20,9% of Khasavyurt people, 14,8% of Derbents people, 12,4% of Makhachkala people and 11,9% of Kaspiysk people have contact.

A proportion of ethno-contact avoidance-oriented people is statistically small. It is stand out Laks (one twelfth) and Kumyks (every fourteenth) by nationality. When we choose this answer option by city, you can notice the differences. For example, if 1,9% of Derbent people, 3,5% of Makhachkala people, 6,0% of Khasavyurt people have this position, then there are much more of them in the sub-mass of Kaspiysk people (13,6%). There are a greater proportion of those who feel discomfort in the process of interpersonal interaction in the subgroup of Laks and Avars in comparison with other sub arrays. Kaspiysk people (6,8%) also stand out here. It is almost 3 times less than Makhachkala people. Khasavyurt people and Derbent people did not mark this answer at all.

### Conclusion

Thus, results of a study showed a positive assessment of interethnic situation in their territory of residence in the mass consciousness of Dagestan people. Such a characteristic in the attitudes of citizens contributes to a formation of ethnic empathy and tolerance in their public consciousness and behavior. It is the basis for a positive attitude and orientation towards maintaining interpersonal communication. Further, the interviewed urban residents of republic demonstrate a high intensity of ethnic contacts with a positive prevailing assessment of interpersonal communication. Although a statistically small proportion of respondents have negative emotions and discomfort from entering into an ethnic dialogue. However, the data obtained are the basis for the assertion that the modern Dagestan cities have a high level of interethnic and inter-religious tolerance with close interpersonal communication. This is one of a key factors in maintaining stability and harmony in our republic.

A study of a character of interethnic communication shows that interpersonal contact in an urban environment can be of a different nature, in particular, in solidarity, tolerance or conflict. At the same time, a smooth development of the city's social space is possible only if there is improvement in interaction in all social spheres. Local authorities, educational institutions, the institution of the family, etc. should play a key role in this direction. In particular,

the allocation of finances for the implementation of necessary for normal the functioning of the city of programs, the education of the principles of tolerance in the mass consciousness, improving the quality of education, regular acquaintance with a foreign ethnic culture, etc. Empirical data show the dominance in the mass consciousness of citizens of a positive assessment of the state of the interethnic sphere in the cities of their residence. And such a position is the basis for the formation of ethnic empathy and tolerance in their public consciousness and behavior and also testifies to the orientation of the urban population to maintaining interpersonal communication. In addition, urban residents surveyed are characterized by intense interpersonal communication, while at the same time being positively evaluated. The proportion of people experiencing discomfort from ethnic contacts is statistically small, which is the basis for the assertion that there is a high level of tolerance in the urban space of a republic.

## **ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ / INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS**

### **Шахбанова Мадина Магомедкамиловна**

Доктор социологических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник,  
Институт истории, археологии и этнографии, Дагестанский федеральный исследовательский центр,  
г. Махачкала,  
E-mail: madina2405@mail.ru

### **Madina Magomedkamilovna Shakhbanova**

Doctor of Sociological Sciences,  
Leading Researcher,  
Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography, Dagestan Federal Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences,  
Makhachkala,  
E-mail: madina2405@mail.ru

### **Халидова Ольга Борисовна**

Кандидат исторических наук, старший научный сотрудник,  
Институт истории, археологии и этнографии, Дагестанский федеральный исследовательский центр,  
г. Махачкала,  
E-mail: o.khalidova2011@mail.ru

### **Olga Borisovna Khalidova**

Candidate of Historical Sciences,  
Senior researcher officer,  
Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography, Dagestan Federal Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences,  
Makhachkala,  
E-mail: o.khalidova2011@mail.ru

## **References**

1. Arutyunyan Yu. V., Bromley Yu., V. (Ed.) (1986). Socio-cultural face of the soviet nations: according to the results of ethnosociological study. Moscow: Nauka.
2. Bgazhnokov B.Kh. (2003). Culture of empathy // Ethnographic review. No. 1. P. 55-68.
3. Bauman Z. (2008). The city of fears, the city of hopes // Logos, Vol. 3. No. 66. P. 24-53.
4. Baranov N. (2018). Ethnic and international conflicts. URL: <http://Nicbar.Ru/Politology/Study/57-Kurs-Mezhdunarodnye-Konflikty-V-Xxi-Veke/592-Tema-5-Etnicheskie-I-Mezhnatsionalnye-Konflikty>.

5. Drobizheva L.M. (2018). Interethnic relations in Russian space in the 2000<sup>th</sup>: the main trends in the study methodology and social practice // Russia is reforming. Yearbook. No. 16. P. 120-145.
6. Drobizheva L.M. (Ed.) (2016). Ethnic harmony as a resource for the consolidation of Russian society. Moscow: Institute of sociology of Russia Academy of science. 400. P.
7. Fedosova Ye.V. (2015). "Ordinary" city dweller: the constitution of ethnic identity using the example of Vladikavkaz city (ideological project "soviet man" // Theory and practice of social development. No. 24. P. 102-104.
8. Jung K. (1991). Archetype and symbol. Moscow: Renaissance. 300 p.
9. Lysenko G.V. (2011). Social interactions in the space of a modern city. Sociology of the city. No. 2. P. 45 - 50.
10. Miroshnikova O.V., Schekin G.Yu., Reva I.E. (2011). Tolerance in the social space of the city// Sociology of the city. No. 4, P. 29 - 35.
11. Sennet R. (2008). Capitalism in the big city: globalization, flexibility and indifference // Logos. No. 3 (66). P. 95 - 107.
12. Shibutani T. (1969). Social psychology. Moscow: Education. 534 p.
13. Warshawer E.A. (2015). Contact theory: a review. Public opinion monitoring: economic and social change. No.5. P.183 - 214.

### Литература

1. Арутюнян Ю.В. и др. Социально-культурный облик советских наций: по результатам этносоциологического исследования. М.: Наука, 1986. 453 с.
2. Бгажноков Б. Х. Культура эмпатии //Этнографическое обозрение. 2003. №. 1. С. 55-68.
3. Бауман З. Город страхов, город надежд // Логос. 2008. Т. 3. №. 66. С. 24-53.
4. Варшавер Е. А. Теория контакта: обзор //Мониторинг общественного мнения: экономические и социальные перемены. 2015. №. 5 (129). С. 183-214.
5. Дробизжева Л. М. Межэтнические отношения на российском пространстве в 2000-е годы: основные тренды в методологии изучения и социальной практике //Россия реформирующаяся. 2018. №. 16. С. 120-145.
6. Лысенко Г. В. Социальные взаимодействия в пространстве современного города // Социология города. 2011. № 2. С. 45-50.
7. Межнациональное согласие как ресурс консолидации российского общества: [Монография] / Отв. Ред. Л.М. Дробизжева; Институт Социологии РАН. -М.: Институт Социологии РАН, 2016. 400 с.
8. Мирошникова О. В., Щекин Г. Ю., Рева И. Е. Толерантность в социальном пространстве города //Социология города. 2011. №. 4. С. 29-35.
9. Сеннет Р. Капитализм в большом городе: глобализация, гибкость и безразличие // Логос. 2008. №. 3. С. 95-107.
10. Федосова Е. В. «Обычный» горожанин: конституирование этнической идентичности на примере г. Владикавказа (Идеологический проект «советский человек») //Теория и практика общественного развития. 2015. №. 24. С. 102-104.
11. Шибутани, Т. Социальная психология. Москва: Прогресс, 1969. 534 с.
12. Юнг К.Г. Архетип и символ. Москва : Ренессанс, 1991. 300 с.
13. Баранов Н. Этнические и межнациональные конфликты. 2018. Режим доступа: <http://Nicbar.Ru/Politology/Study/57-Kurs-Mezhdunarodnye-Konflikty-V-Xxi-Veke/592-Tema-5-Etnicheskie-I-Mezhnatsionalnye-Konflikty>

**Поступила в редакцию**

**28 мая 2021 г.**