

Local communities' interaction culture through involving in Ufa agglomeration development

Angelina Borodina

*Bashkir State University, Associate
Professor of the Chair of Sociology and
Youth Work, Candidate of Sociological
Sciences,
Ufa, Russia
Angel_Borodina@mail.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1102-4369>*

Alexander Kulikov

*The Institute for Strategic Studies of the
Republic of Bashkortostan,
Junior Researcher,
Ufa, Russia
alexanrb@mail.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6281-5673>*

Natalya Lavrenyuk

*Bashkir State University, Associate
Professor of the Chair of Sociology and
Youth Work, Candidate of Sociological
Sciences,
Ufa, Russia
nmlavr@yandex.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4843-4161>*

Abstract — In this article, we outline the basic concepts and current practices of forming a culture of local community interaction through involvement in the strategic development of the Ufa agglomeration. In particular, we specify and characterize the category “local communities of agglomeration” which defines a concept of interactive culture between local communities in the context of a socio-cultural approach. The research aims to describe the process of the Ufa agglomeration strategic development with the participation of local communities; reviewing local community involvement technologies in the strategic development of agglomerations. We analyze the practices of involving local communities in the strategic development of the Ufa agglomeration, draw conclusions and demonstrate actual practices of working with local communities in the city of Ufa and adjacent territories in the process of interactive culture created by socio-economic development.

Keywords— *local agglomeration communities, interaction culture, formation, agglomeration development strategy, local communities involvement, initiative, participatory budgeting*

I. INTRODUCTION

Relevance. Paraphrasing R.Park, the social interaction space in modern large cities turns into agglomerative social systems with diverse local communities and different cultural identities. [1] The factor that unites these urban and rural multicultural communities is the general socio-cultural necessity for socio-economic development of the co-residence territory. In this area, a contradiction is growing between the development of institutions and technologies of community interaction and real practices of their application. In view of the above, it is of particular importance to study the interaction culture formed through the practices of community involvement in a joint strategy of developing the socio-cultural space of the agglomerative living environment.

The Ufa agglomeration is an entity actively being formed by the administration of the Republic of Bashkortostan and the population. In the strategic plan, the effectiveness of the available resources development and the creation of new, distinctive competitive advantages

concerning the Russian Federation depends on the coordinated participation in this process of formal and informal agents.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS (MODEL)

The purpose of the article is to conceptualize and generalize the practice of forming an interactive culture between local communities engaging in the strategic development of the Ufa agglomeration. To this end, we have consistently solved the tasks of specifying the category “local agglomeration communities” and identifying their characteristics; have determined the conceptual foundations and have set the methodology for forming an interaction culture between local communities; analyzed a methodological basis for the Ufa agglomeration strategic development; reviewed the ways to involve local communities in the strategic development of agglomerations and analyzed the practices in the strategic development of the Ufa agglomeration, as well as have developed proposals for forming an interaction culture through tools engaging local communities in the city of Ufa.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. *The concept and methodology of interaction culture forming of local communities*

In a general sense, a culture of interaction can be defined as a specific way of organizing and developing activities, represented in the products of material and spiritual labor, in the system of social norms and institutions, in intellectual values, in the entirety of people's attitude to the environment, between themselves and to themselves. [2] Functionally, a culture of interaction aims at consolidating effective practices, reproducing and developing social institutions, norms, and values.

In the modern domestic and foreign scientific literature, the analysis of the “social interaction” category is presented in the contexts of the anthropological, institutional (A. Auzan, R. Ryvkina), systemic (P. Bourdieu and R. Putnam) approaches; as well as historical, cultural and sociocultural

approaches (J. Huch, E. A. Orlova, Yu.M. Reznik and T.E. Reznik).

The modern institutional approach allows analyzing shifts in the social regulative practice of social groups participation, the effectiveness of the interaction institution development in the process of changing values and habits, and new traditions and approaches appeared to solve the population's problems. However, at the level of social groups within the framework of the article, the socio-cultural approach has a more productive potential in a comprehensive explanation of the interaction culture of local communities as a system and as a process, in particular, as interpreted by E.A. Orlova. [3] She considers the fundamental foundations of the structure and growth of the social interaction process: 1) identification of a problem situation; 2) general orientation regarding problem-solving; 3) expectations of participants to each other; 4) organizational features of the information exchange interaction. External events and the internal behavior of the community influence the state of affairs in it or its living environment. In general, the structure of the interaction system is multi-level. It is customary to single out such common elements as values and meanings; customs and traditions; general rules and norms of behavior, mutual goals of interaction; common power structures; a language.

Among the factors affecting the interaction culture effectiveness, as part of the socio-cultural approach, experts identify the peculiarities of local mentality (settlement size; inclination for collective and individual social activity). R. Putnam [4]; Nikovskaya L.I., Skalaban I.A. [5] note the role of informal connections of support, interpersonal trust, and volunteering. Other scholars stress the importance of historical experience (for example, "successful practices of interaction between local communities and government bodies" [6]); as well as the level of intellectual, scientific and educational resources [7] and competences. Experts especially highlight the creativity competencies (creative, innovative - R. Florida) and leadership abilities [8], as well as the high professionalism of the "creative class" according to R. Florida. 9]

The essential condition for a productive interaction process is the information exchange organization. Experts emphasize the need to form a common communication strategy of partners in the external socio-cultural environment ("communicative discourse" of subjects), in which information and communication technologies, including virtual network technologies (see, for example [10;5]) and even the technology itself (see about this [11]), take on special significance. Thus, they emphasize that the use of the Internet and participation in online communities can contribute to the accumulation of social capital [12].

E.A. Orlova notes that the interaction situation is important in interpreting the interaction process. Problem situations are characterized either by the need to unite in order to solve them or to change the nature of the interaction (level, paradigm, scenario). [3] The paradigms of social interaction include consolidation, conflict, negotiations (or the "consensus" and "conflict" perspectives according to Alexander). [13]

If necessary, people use all three paradigms in a problem situation. E.A. Orlova identifies the following main

positions and forms of social interaction: active-constructivist - partnership; passive constructivist - solidarity; active-destructive - conflict; passive-destructive - disunity. If we take this classification as a criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of the interaction culture, the partnership should be considered as the highest degree of its development. Representatives of the modern domestic discourse on the socio-cultural development of neighborhoods consider social partnership also a fundamental basis for the relations of local communities. In line with the "negotiating paradigm" (E. Orlova's term) a group of authors led by Yu. M. Reznik and N.I. Mironova interprets the partnership phenomenon as a form and technique of interaction in solving general problems for the community. [14]

In modern society, an increasing subjectivity, activity of its participants are taking on greater importance, since the interaction culture, as the coordination of community self-organization, is viewed in a broader context: as a factor and condition for the development of civil society, [15] as "participatory culture", (Y. Filippov) [16]; culture of "civic participation" (D. Agapova [17]); as a "resource of social, economic development".

Following this research trend, a social intergroup partnership theory originated in the 80s-90s of the 20th century has significant potential in explaining the phenomenon of the interaction culture between groups and communities in the context of the desire for a partnership dialogue between subject actors at the local level [18]. It is based on a multi-conceptual approach to the explanation of social interaction.

As part of this theory, foreign authors actively consider both a social partnership in a broad sense as a system and as a process (see, for example [19; 20;21] et al); success factors of cooperation and partnership; and practical aspects of cooperation and partnership of local communities, in the regeneration of cities in general (see, for example [22]), and in the strategic development of cities, in particular (see, for example [23;24] et al).

Thus, in the context of the social partnership theory, the formation of the interaction culture between local communities should mean the formation of such a system for creating and implementing joint projects and actions that take into account the interests of all actors entering into a dialogue, technologies and skills of joint strategic planning in addressing the common issues of local communities.

B. Concretization of the category "local agglomeration communities" and the characteristic of local communities of the Ufa agglomeration

In the Russian Federation, as part of the administrative approach, in accordance with Article 2 Federal Law No. 131, the local (municipal) community is defined as the population of different types of settlements included in direct or indirect local self-government. In the case of agglomeration communities allocated by territorial and settlement criteria, the local community may include both urban and rural communities. In accordance with the Federal Law No. 131 different types can be represented in

the agglomerative community, as an integrated system of compactly located settlements.

As part of the administrative-territorial division, researchers are limited to the level of municipal districts and urban districts, rather than municipal settlements as the common level for the study of the local population, mainly due to the lack of relevant statistical information about them.

The modern trend is the increasing complicated structure of certain territories in Russia. This leads to new types of modern local communities, as associations of citizen interaction systems (social actors) of a specific space, capable of participating in the socio-economic and socio-political processes of a municipal entity social management, independently and collectively making decisions to improve their own life based on shared goals, values, and interests.

[25] We understand the urban community as a local poly-structural connection of social and territorial communities of city residents who do not have a high degree of interdependence in social life. [26] The rural community is a historically developed, relatively autonomous, the socio-cultural system of territorial organization, having its own social mechanisms for supporting self-identity in rural areas, and therefore relatively high interdependence.

The agglomeration in accordance with the “Recommendations for the selection of pilot projects for approbation and improvement of management mechanisms for the development of urban agglomerations in the Russian Federation” is defined as a combination of municipalities united in a developing system with common use of adjacent territories and development resources. The agglomerative community is a system of interaction between local urban and rural communities.

There are different types of agglomeration models: monocentric, polycentric, and of a mixed nature. The Ufa agglomeration model is monocentric, formed around its core - a large settlement - the capital of the Republic of Bashkortostan - the urban district of the city of Ufa. The local community of the Ufa district positions Ufa as the center of the Ufa district.

Two zones are methodologically distinguished in the territorial structure of the Ufa agglomeration. The first, in accordance with hourly transport accessibility, maximum commuting, active development and growth in the number of the resident population, as well as close industrial links and developed transport links, includes two municipal districts with town - centers (Blagoveschensky and Kushnarenkovsky municipal districts) and four municipal districts with villages - centers (Iglinsky, Karmaskalinsky, Ufimsky and Chishminsky municipal districts).

The second zone, taking into account the hour and a half of transport accessibility to the capital, negative migration and resettlement attractiveness, includes three rural districts: Arkhangelsky, Blagovarsky and Nurimanovsky municipal districts.

It should be noted that experts include more parameters in the number of agglomeration signs: high population density and compactness of residence, availability of transport corridors, accessibility (maximum 1.5 hours),

concentration of industrial production and labor resources, close economic and labor, cultural and everyday life, recreational, administrative, political, organizational and economic ties; high level of connectivity, integrity of labor markets, real estate and land; legal independence of settlements; complex structure; responsiveness. [27]

The basic feature is high density and compactness of population living. According to Table 1, the population of Ufa’s city without municipal districts-satellites is 1.1 million, and in total about 1.5 million, which makes 37.5% of the total population of the Republic of Bashkortostan. The population of the Ufa agglomeration for 2011-2017 increased by 3.4%. The most attractive for the residents of the region are the Ufa and Iglino municipal districts from zone 1, where there is a migratory influx due to higher housing affordability. Zone-2 is less attractive for living. In all three municipal districts, there was a reduction in the number of inhabitants.

Human resources concentrate closer to the center of the agglomeration with the growth of transport corridors, the availability, and concentration of industrial production, close administrative-political, organizational and economic ties; a high level of functional connectivity, integrity of labor, real estate, and land markets, and on the periphery - close cultural, social and recreational relationships.

TABLE I. THE POPULATION GROWTH OF THE UFA AGGLOMERATION IN 2011 AND 2017, THS PEOPLE [28]

Municipal district/Urban district	2011	2017	Balance, in %
Ufa urban district	1078.3	1114.0	0.5
Zone-1			
Blagoveschensky	49.8	31.8	- 5.2
Kushnarenkovsky	25.0	25.0	0.0
Iglinsky	50.1	61.8	3.1
Karmaskalinsky	51.1	50.1	-1.0
Ufimsky	68.2	89.6	4.0
Chishminsky	52.2	53.4	0.3
Zone-2			
Arkhangelsky	18.4	17.6	-0.6
Blagovarsky	25.9	25.4	- 0.3
Nurimanovsky	20.7	20.2	- 0.5
Total:	1439.7	1488.9	3.4

According to official statistics for 2014, among million-plus cities in the Volga Federal District, Ufa was more attractive economically than socially. The results of a sociological study conducted in the regional capital by joint efforts of the Ufa City Administration, the Institute of Socio-Political and Legal Studies of Bashkortostan and the Institute of Social and Economic Research of the Ufa Scientific Center RAS in 2015 showed a rather high level of dissatisfaction among the residents of the capital of Bashkortostan with different parts of their life. To a greater extent, it is associated with income, wages (44.8%), financial situation (38.3%); environmental conditions (40.5%); opportunities for recreation and entertainment (36.8%).

The difference (gaps) in the assessments of various aspects of life in the city varies from 4.2% (unanimity in dissatisfaction with the financial situation) to 13.3% (ecological situation) and 13.5% (recreation and

entertainment). Therefore, the involvement of the local population in the strategic development of the territory has become an urgent and ambitious task for the administration of the capital and nearby areas.

C. Methodological foundations for the Ufa agglomeration strategic development

The methodology for the socio-economic development strategy of the city of Ufa of the Republic of Bashkortostan (RB) until 2030 is quite formalized. It is based on the legal framework of the Russian Federation, which defines the general principles for its development, including the "Strategy for the socio-economic development of the Republic of Bashkortostan until 2030 (adopted in 2018 at a meeting of the Government RB) and a number of other documents of the regional and municipal level.

Methodological issues of the Ufa agglomeration strategic development until 2035 are at the intersection of the infrastructure approach and the ideological positioning approach, as well as in the area of the Ufa metropolitan strategies coordination as the core of the agglomeration and the municipal districts of the 1st and 2nd zones.

The projected Ufa Development Strategy is three-component: from the analysis of the current state to the creation of an image of the future and ways to achieve it. We have analyzed the current state from the general to the particular: from the analysis of global and all-Russian tendencies to a comparative study of Ufa with the million-plus cities of Russia and the analysis of the socio-economic development of the city.

Creating the desired image of the future capital includes a goal and priorities in the following directions: "strong economy", "social comfort of citizens", "harmonious living space", "high-quality urban environment", "effective and open authorities"; target indicators and forecast of the main indicators. Ways to achieve them are projected through strategic initiatives, projects, and activities.

The Strategy will be implemented in two phases: the first (2019–2024) is the period to improve the primary conditions for sustainable economic growth and the life quality of Ufa residents. The second stage (2025–2030) is to complete the identified priority projects.

All this should lead to achieving the Ufa's mission: "To become a convenient, comfortable, hospitable city, creating conditions for business development and realizing the potential of citizens in all areas, implementing effective mechanisms for managing the city by 2030," and achieving the strategic goal: To take the leading positions in the quality of the people's life, the level of urban development, infrastructure and socio-economic development among million-plus cities and become a high-tech center of competences of the Republic of Bashkortostan and Ufa agglomeration." [29]

The urban community was involved in the development of the Strategy through a poll to study public opinion regarding the development prospects, as well as through the organization of public hearings on the draft Strategy for Social and Economic Development of Ufa until 2030 with

the participation of residents (the project was developed by the city administration jointly with the Ufa Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences). The purpose of public hearings is to allow each resident to make suggestions for improving the city. However, the Ufa City Council received only 85 such letters; another 28 people wanted to take part in the hearings personally and express their opinion publicly. [30] "The participants in the hearings included residents of Ufa, deputies, heads and deputy heads of administrations, representatives of the media and other guests. According to the registration, 545 people were present in the hall." [31] On the one hand, this is a reproach towards the civic stance of the city residents, since according to a poll in 2018, only 33.6% of respondents were willing to participate personally in solving problems of the city, 25.8% were ready, but only in solving the problems that concerned them personally; 40.6% were not ready to take part in that activity. [32] On the other hand, it is a reproach towards the organizers of interaction with the urban community, as well as developers who failed to motivate residents to participate.

Napoleon Bonaparte said: "Strategy is a way to use space and time". According to G.P. Schedrovitsky, it's the way to achieve the long-range, often not fully defined, meaningful goal, the "design objective of an ideal". In-depth studying of the strategy concepts that existed at different times and in different societies convinces more of an impossibility to find an idea common to all eras and peoples." Following T. Parsons, a culture of interaction involves searching for a common identity in the context of interpenetrating societies, cultural loyalty. The question of search remains open from the standpoint of the ideological positioning approach. It is confirmed by the opinion of experts who considered the strategy as devoid of a message, and Ufa as a city without its image (like Perm and Chelyabinsk) as opposed to Yekaterinburg, Tyumen, and Kazan [33].

Objectively, the ideological and mental context of the Ufa and Ufa agglomeration strategic development as a multi-cultural association is multifold. Ufa dates back its history since 1574, when at the confluence of the Belaya and Ufa Rivers a fortress of the same name was founded, which in 1586 received city status. Since 1922, the city of Ufa is the capital of the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, from 1992 - the Republic of Bashkortostan.

"A few years ago, it seemed that Ufa was rushing towards new urbanism The UrbanBairam Forum was ... the biggest event in the field of urban planning in the Urals" [ibid.] The development of agglomerations, park areas, the transformation of urban mobility and other issues were discussed at the level of European experts, but the forum has ceased to exist. Ufa is historically known as a forum venue for concluding agreements. One of the last major events was the Forum of the Shanghai Commonwealth Organization and BRICS (groups of five countries: Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) in 2015. However, a weak use of the territory's creative potential and aspiring for some unification is characteristic of the region as a whole. Thus, the said survey set specific boundaries for the choice of residents of the Ufa city strategy development: "Ufa is a developed industrial center of the Russian Federation

manufacturing products competitive in the domestic and foreign markets” (24.8%); “Ufa is an ecologically clean area with a developed infrastructure, comfortable for life, work and leisure” (23.5%); “Ufa is a promising living area for people, for realizing their strengths and potential” (20.4%), “Ufa is a center of high technologies, modern production, and science” (17.8%), “Ufa is favorable for entrepreneurship development, a city of developed business” (13.4%).

The territory identification set proposed for selection is of a practical, instrumental, impersonal nature. At the same time, according to the 2017 PWC agency, the Creative Capital Index (based on R. Florida’s “creative class” concept) of Ufa [34] was equal to 43.17 units. This is the 15th result among the 16 cities surveyed in Russia. In the “People” section, it took the 10th place, and in terms of openness - the 3rd place with a figure of 48.65 (after Moscow and Vladivostok). What tools are available to engage people's potential in the strategic development of the agglomeration?

D. Tools for engaging local communities in the agglomeration strategic development

One of the ways to involve the local communities of Ufa and the Ufa agglomeration in the strategic development of agglomerations is the initiative budgeting mechanisms. These include sets of techniques that allow the population to participate in solving local issues by distributing part of the budget funds and choosing a project for which these funds will be used.

For the first time, local communities were involved in the strategic development of agglomerations through initiative budgeting mechanisms in Ufa and adjacent areas in 2016, via the competitive selection of community infrastructure projects based on local initiatives throughout the Republic of Bashkortostan. In 2016, an agreement was concluded between the Government RB and the World Bank. The role of the World Bank was to organize work and share its knowledge and competencies. Like all projects of initiative budgeting, this competitive selection implied the participation of the population in solving local issues.

In rural areas, directly residents of settlements chose the problems to solve. In urban districts, the applicants could be councils of apartment buildings, subdistrict committees, bodies of territorial public self-government, homeowners' associations and localities belonging to the urban district. It was recommended to conduct several events devoted to involving the population and choosing a project. At the final meeting, residents selected a project for participation in the competition by voting for the earlier proposed project initiatives. As a result of the meetings, they formed an initiative group from among the residents of the locality, which later assisted in the preparation of tender documentation, informing the public about the progress of work, raising funds from the public and monitoring the progress of work performed by the contractor.

The contribution in money terms is an essential indicator of the population activity. Every year since 2016, 300 million rubles are allocated from the regional budget. Residents of municipalities claim to receive subsidies on a competitive basis of up to 1 million rubles subject to co-

financing by the population from 3% to 15% depending on the sum of the requested subsidy in rural areas and from 5% to 15% in urban areas.

The following methods were used to involve the population in the initiative budgeting in 2016: reporting information directly to citizens who had previously been active through face-to-face meetings or written requests, posting information about the competitive selection in the media, on municipal websites, and involving representatives of public organizations, schools. This practice is currently implemented in the territory of the Republic of Bashkortostan, including the areas that are part of the Ufa agglomeration.

Analysis of application forms from six regions showed that residents were concerned about the quality of roads, water supply, and the state of educational institutions, which generally repeated the situation throughout the region. Table 2 presents the ratio of the number of applications to the number of wins among the districts of interest.

TABLE II. ACTIVITY AND PARTICIPATION RESULTS OF THE UFA AGGLOMERATION DISTRICTS IN THE PROGRAM OF LOCAL INITIATIVES SUPPORT IN RB IN 2016-2018, UTS. [35]

Districts	Applications to the number of wins ratio in 2016	Applications to the number of wins ratio in 2017	Applications to the number of wins ratio in 2018	Total rural settlements
Blagoveschenskiy	7/6	2/1	9/3	16
Iglinsky	10/6	15/6	17/15	19
Karmaskalinsky	16/8	15/12	16/9	16
Kushnarenkovsky	2/1	7/3	6/3	12
Ufimsky	19/19	18/11	18/15	19
Chishminsky	16/16	16/12	16/15	16
Ufa	10/10	30/9	16/10	
Total in RB	661/487	787/484	831/598	832

Ufa residents are also concerned about the condition of roads, but the roads in the settlements that are within the city district. There is a high demand for sports facilities - outdoor sports fields and playgrounds.

A participant of the competitive selection receives the highest number of points in case of the population contribution in the amount of 15% of the subsidy volume. The average contribution of the agglomeration population regularly exceeds the required maximum. This suggests that the mechanism as a whole stimulates people to express active civic stance and can serve as an indicator of readiness to participate in solving issues of local importance.

In the city of Ufa, on average, the level of co-financing is 13.5%, which is lower than in the areas adjacent to the city. This indicates a high level of infrastructure development in the center, as well as low solidarity of residents. Residents of the city are less willing to unite to solve problems. Since 2017, the “Ufa Courtyards” project has been implemented in the territory of Ufa. The mechanism of this project as a whole coincides with the Program of Local Initiatives Support but aims at improving the courtyard area of one or several apartment buildings. In 2017 and 2018, residents of apartment buildings yards

received information about this project from the organization's managers, the homeowners' associations. The news was published on the website of the Ufa administration. The Center for the Study of Civil Initiatives organized a series of training events for representatives of urban administrations and managing companies.

Personal observations of A. Kulikov during working trips to 832 settlements of Bashkortostan showed that in rural areas, social connections and the level of direct communications were much higher than in the city. Interaction with representatives of municipal authorities occurred without complications, openly. In Ufa itself, due to the complexity of the administrative structure and division into intracity neighborhoods, the interaction process was prolonged and inefficient.

This conclusion is based on the experience of the article co-author A. Kulikov interacted with representatives of the administrations of all urban districts of the region. The author was a curator of the competitive selection in urban districts and directly communicated with the representatives of the local municipal authorities. In the course of initiative budgeting projects, started in 2016, he held more than forty in-person meetings with representatives of administrations of urban districts and settlements, during which they discussed issues related not only to initiative budgeting but also to problems of municipal management.

At this stage of initiative budgeting development in the Russian Federation, there is no clear understanding of how this work should be conducted with the urban population. This can be either an information campaign to increase the literacy in this area or the use of international experience involving city dwellers using the example of Sydney, Porto - Alegre, Is. Madeira, and others. Similar global practices were successfully implemented in St. Petersburg under the name "Your Budget" with the support of the Government of St. Petersburg and the city of Sosnovy Bor. This mechanism has specific effects: an opportunity to be active and to propose your initiatives for the development of the urban environment; to increase the level of financial literacy, to make an impact on the efficiency of budget spending, the quality of life in the city.

In addition to the practices described above, during the development of the Ufa socio-economic development strategy until 2030, the population was involved in initiating projects of public and communicative spaces and strategic master-plans of territories using the example of participatory design (specifically by territories: Dema neighborhood - construction concept of the Dema-10 residential district, Kashkadan Park, Maksim Rylsky Street, the embankment of the Ufa River).

Residents of the city and stakeholders creating new infrastructure and comfortable environment were involved in the discussion of these projects. Such ways of engaging the population in strategic development, if not agglomerations, then separate territories, allow forming citizens' consciousness at a new level and breaking down imaginary barriers between the government and citizens.

IV. CONCLUSION

Today, the culture of communities interaction is considered in a broad context: as a factor and condition for the civil society development, as a "participatory culture"; as a "resource of social, economic development". In consequence of this rhetoric, two main strategies to form effective interaction are possible: 1) regular mobilization of the population as participants, but not partners to solve current issues; 2) a more sustained, but in the long term more effective for all participants - partnership interaction strategy. The success of the latter is closely related to the development of the common subject, civil and partner competencies of individuals and groups in modern society.

Strategizing the participatory culture formation through the engagement of administration and local communities in the initiation and implementation of joint projects must accompany the socio-economic development of municipal districts and urban districts. There is a need for an educational program for the public, which should involve authorities, experts, public organizations, and entrepreneurs in its formation and implementation.

It is essential to create an effective integrated communication strategy of partners in the external environment for positioning the activity of local communities and its results for the interaction process. It is necessary to promote in public discussion the theme of the Ufa townspeople participation in the matters of territory development strategy.

It is possible to involve residents of large settlements, such as Ufa, by dividing the territory of residence of a certain number of citizens according to interests and common issues. Small groups of citizens leaning toward certain areas, residents of a neighborhood or quarter should be engaged in this process. Consistent work with initiative citizens will gradually allow increasing the scale of the residents' involvement and effective cooperation.

The Ufa agglomeration is a complex formation that has not yet been recognized by local communities as a single socio-cultural space. The population is drawn to the center of the Republic of Bashkortostan and the agglomeration – the urban district of Ufa, where human, transport, logistics, technological and other resources are concentrated.

Currently, a single document on the strategic development of the Ufa agglomeration within the boundaries of zones 1 and 2 is not available, which hinders the involvement of local communities in creatively making distinctive competitive advantages, and also leads to an increase in lost opportunities.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.E. Park, "Urban community as a spatial configuration and moral order" in *Sociological Review*. vol. 5, no.1, pp. 11-18, 2006.
- [2] "Culture" in *Russian sociological encyclopedia*, G.V.M . Osipov, Eds. Moscow: Group Norma INFRA M. p. 240, 1998. (in Russian).
- [3] E.A. Orlova. " The concept of social interaction in the context of the study of socio-cultural microdynamics" in *Culture Observatory*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp.5. 2014. URL: <http://observatoria.rsl.ru>. (date of access: 15.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [4] R.D. Putnam, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital" in *Culture and Politics*, L.Crothers, C. Lockhart, Eds.

- New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-349-62397-6_12.
- [5] L.I. Nikovskaya, and I.A. Skalaban, "Civil participation: discourse features and real development trends" in *Polis, Political studies*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 47, 2017. URL: https://elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_30685154_19040048.pdf (date of access: 10.05.2019). DOI: 10.17976/jpps/2017.06.04 (in Russian).
- [6] M.M. Shaw, "Successful collaboration between the nonprofit and public sectors" in *Nonprofit management and leadership*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 107-120, 2003.
- [7] S.I. Kulibaba, "Development of local community culture (in the aspects of social partnership, creativity and professionalism)" in *Vestnik VOLSU, Ser. 7. Philosophy*, issue 1 (16), pp. 119, 2012. URL: https://volsu.ru/struct/generalservices/publish/vestniki/lastmaga_zine/ser-7-philosophy-1-16-2012/3_%D0%9A%D1%83%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%B1%D0%B0%D0%B1%D0%B0.pdf (date of access: 12.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [8] C.Huxham, "Theorizing collaboration practice" in *Public Management Review*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 401-423, 2003. DOI: 10.1080/1471903032000146964
- [9] R. Florida, C. Mellander, K. Stolarick, and A. Ross, "Cities, skills and wages" in *Journal of Economic Geography*, vol. 12, issue 2, March pp. 355-377, 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbr017> (date of access: 12.05.2019)
- [10] V.K. Levashov, V.K.Saryan, A.P.Nazarenko, O.P.Novozhenina, I.Zh.Toshchenko, I.S.Shushpanova, and E.V.Salomatina, "Development of information and communication technologies and prospects of civil society" in *Sociological studies*, no. 9, pp. 13-20, 2016. URL: http://socis.isras.ru/files/File/2016/2016_9/13-20_Levashov.pdf (date of access: 15.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [11] "John Law: Sociology Between Semiotics And Topology" in *Sociological review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 24-29. 2006, URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/dzhon-lo-sotsiologiya-mezhdu-semiotikoy-i-topologiyey>(date of access: 15.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [12] Yu. Rykov, and O. Nagorny, "Internet Research in Social Sciences" in *Sociological review*, vol. 16, no. 3, P. 376-377, 2017. DOI: 10.17323/1728-192X-2017-3-366-394 (in Russian).
- [13] J.C. Alexander, "Sociological Theory Since 1945", London: Hutchinson, 1987.
- [14] "Local Communities: Problems of Socio-Cultural Development" conference proceedings, Yu.M. Reznik and N.I. Mironova, Eds. Moscow: Independent Institute of Civil Society, pp. 192, 2010. URL: http://dumatl.ru/duma_obshestvo/files/soc-kulturnoe-razvitiye.pdf(date of access: 10.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [15] O.N. Astafieva, and S.N. Gorushkina, "Infrastructure of local territories culture and place of project activity in its development" in conference proceedings, Yu.M. Reznik and N.I. Mironova, Eds. Moscow: Independent Institute of Civil Society, pp. 103, 2010. URL: http://dumatl.ru/duma_obshestvo/files/soc-kulturnoe-razvitiye.pdf (date of access: 10.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [16] Yu.V. Filippov, "Renewal of Russia: organizational and managerial resources for local development" in *Human. Community. Management*, no. 4, pp. 4-25, 2009. URL: http://chsu.kubsu.ru/arhiv/2009_4/CHSU2009-4.pdf(date of access: 9.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [17] D. Agapova, "Participatory culture: millions of dialogues" in *Museum as an educational space: game, dialogue, participatory culture*, Moscow, pp. 8-20, 2012. (in Russian).
- [18] L.I. Nikovskaya and V.N. Yakimets, "Institutional development of intersectoral partnership in Russia" in *Polis. Political studies*, no. 5, pp. 37-48, 2016. URL: https://elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_26733491_58509805.pdf (date of access: 8.05.2019), DOI: 10.17976/jpps/2016.05.04(in Russian).
- [19] T.Seddon, S.Billett and A. Clemans, "Politics of social partnerships: a framework for theorizing" in *Journal of Education Policy*, vol.19, no. 2, pp.123-142, 2004. DOI: 10.1080/0144341042000186309
- [20] T. Varley and Ó. Cearbhaill Diarmuid, "Towards a Theory of Statecommunity Partnerships: Interpreting the Irish Muintir Na Tire Movement's Experience" in *Community Development*, vol.33, no. 1, pp.53-70, 2002.
- [21] W. Lerner, and D. Craig, "After neoliberalism? Community activism and local partnerships in Aotearoa New Zealand" in *Antipode*, vol.37, no. 3, pp.402-424, 2005.
- [22] C. Miller, and Y. Ahmad, "Collaboration and partnership: an effective response to complexity and fragmentation or solution built on sand?" in *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, vol. 20, issue 5/6, pp. 1-38, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330010789>.
- [23] A. Christos, "Citywide and local strategic partnerships in urban regeneration: Can collaboration take things forward?" in *Politics*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 103-112, 2004.
- [24] M. Taylor, "Communities in Partnership: Developing a Strategic Voice" in *Social Policy and Society*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 269-279, 2006. doi:10.1017/S1474746405002952.
- [25] O.V. Nechiporenko, "Adaptation strategies of rural local communities in the context of reforms", abstract for the degree of Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Moscow, 2009. URL: <http://www.disscat.com/content/adaptatsionnye-strategii-selskikh-lokalnykh-soobshchestv-v-usloviyakh-reformirovaniya#ixzz445cQSYJ> (date of access: 10.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [26] D.V. Trofimenko, "Urban community: the resolution of institutional conflicts in a polyethnic environment", abstract of dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Rostov – on-Don, 2008 (in Russian).
- [27] R.M. Voronkova, "Kazan agglomeration - scope of consideration. Tasks of spatial development", presentation materials on the topic in R&D: Development of a strategy for the socio-economic development of the Republic of Tatarstan for the period until 2030, dated 14.05.2014. URL: <http://tatarstan2030.ru/UserFiles/Files/Voronkova1405.pdf> (date of access: 10.12.2019) (in Russian).
- [28] Data of Bashkortostan Statistics Agency for 2011-2017 (in Russian).
- [29] "Draft Strategy for the Social and Economic Development of the Ufa City Urban District until 2030". URL https://ufacity.info/2030/files/Project_Strategia_06_11_2018.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0p4RgjNdfBWDENbPtQQynYaHBYFQa3fC_v7OR0e4EwIzURyhzr52Pi8 (date of access: 10.12.2019) (in Russian).
- [30] "85 residents of the city made proposals to the Ufa-2030 Development Strategy". URL: <https://gorobzor.ru/novosti/obschestvo/19369-v-strategiyu-razvitiya-ufy-2030-vnesli-predlozheniya-85-zhiteley-goroda> (date of access: 10.05.2019) (in Russian).
- [31] A.M. Kiseleva, "The behavior of local communities in the system of municipality social management", abstract of dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Yekaterinburg, 2011. URL: <http://www.disscat.com/content/povedenie-mestnykh-soobshchestv-v-sisteme-sotsialnogo-upravleniya-munitsipalnym-obrazovaniem#ixzz445Z2ergp> (date of access: 10.04.2019) (in Russian).
- [32] "Results of an opinion poll in Ufa in the framework of the socioeconomic strategy development of the city of Ufa RB until 2030 and an action plan for its implementation". URL: <https://ufacity.info/2030/files/tlogi.pdf>. (date of access: 10.03.2019) (in Russian).
- [33] S. Ermak, "Gray Zone", in *Expert-Ural*, no. 1-3 (786), pp. 20-22, 24.12.2018- 20.01.2019 (in Russian).
- [34] Urban Creative Capital Index for 2017. URL: creativecapitalindex.com
- [35] Data from the Center for the Study of Civil Initiatives of the "Institute for Strategic Studies of the Republic of Bashkortostan" State autonomous scientific institute. (in Russian).