

The Role of Integrative and Assimilation Models of Multiculturalism in The Formation of Linguacultural Space

Mariya Abramova*

Department of the Social and Law
Research

Institute of philosophy and law SB RAS
Novosibirsk, Russia
marika24@yandex.ru

Vsevolod Kostyuk

Department of the Social and Law
Research

Institute of philosophy and law SB RAS
Novosibirsk, Russia
demosros2017@gmail.com

Galina Goncharova

Department of the Social and Law
Research

Institute of philosophy and law SB RAS
Novosibirsk, Russia
socs@philosophy.nsc.ru

Abstract. *Two models of implementation of the multicultural model of state policy (integrative and assimilative) are compared, the effect of which is the linguacultural features of communication space, including the implemented practices in the field of education, the formation of attitudes of young people to interethnic interaction. The aim of the article is to identify the influence of national policy models on the formation of linguistic and cultural space. Methods of research are critical and retrospective analysis of sources on the topic of research, analysis of statistical data. It is shown that state national policy in the field of interethnic interaction determines socio-cultural stratification within the country and regions.*

Keywords – *integrative and assimilative models of multiculturalism, politics in education, interethnic cooperation, linguistic and cultural space*.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Multiculturalism, in the context of globalisation and intensification of economic, cultural and political ties between Nations and States, are a resource for the development of the whole world, on the one hand, and a problem for the state national policy of each country on the other. Such diversity requires coordination of peoples' interests in the sphere of labour, culture, education, language, information communication and harmonisation of interethnic relations. The first condition for the establishment of positive relations between people, groups and countries is mutual understanding, which requires deep knowledge of language, culture and the development of universal practices of life in multilingual space.

We believe that the history of state formation has predetermined the strategy currently, being implemented for the organisation of intercultural cooperation within the country. Of particular interest is the influence of the specificity of different models of multiculturalism on a state's language policy. The aim of the article is to identify the influence of national policy models on the formation of linguistic and cultural space.

* Mariya Abramova (marika24@yandex.ru) is a corresponding author.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

American theorist N. Glaser, basing on the Nexis database showed that whereas if before 1988 there were no references to multiculturalism, in 1989 there were 33 references in the main Newspapers. Then already 100 – in 1990; 600 – in 1991; 1200 – in 1993 and 1500 – in 1994 [8].

However, despite of such rapid developments in the research on multiculturalism, this concept is currently very controversial. Simplistically, the concept of "multiculturalism" today is interpreted as the recognition of cultural diversity in society, including legitimisation of cultural uniqueness of separate social groups and protection of their rights by the state.

Problems of interpretation are caused by the mixing of different levels of understanding of the term multiculturalism:

- a real situation in society;
- political and strategical management;
- a scientific theoretical construction and scientific concept.

In addition to different levels, there are different traditions of implementation of interethnic interaction policy, called multicultural:

– Integrative (policy of recognising the rights of all ethnic groups represented in the country to preserve their unique culture and the obligation to provide them with assistance in their implementation [11, 12]);

– Assimilative (post-colonial), fragmentary (M. Veverka [14]), mosaic (S. Benhabib [5]) (solving the problems of cultural identity and functioning of cultures according to the adequately constructed norms of political life. Replacing the concept of national state focused on the formation of monoculture, multicultural due to purely demographic, economic and sometimes ideological reasons).

By M. Veverka's definition, differentiation takes place between the policy of cultural differences and the policy of social inequality: in fact, this is not a policy of cultural recognition, as it is said so often, but social policy. Its purpose is to enable people to gain access to work, study, markets, etc. by establishing special ways aimed at them.

The goal here is to confront the disadvantage from which these people suffer as a result of belonging to historically suppressed minorities [14, p. 23]. Thus, inequality is being fought, which is not really the recognition of different cultures.

We can consider the features of preservation and development of linguistic and cultural specificity in the conditions of the above-mentioned models of implementation of the interethnic interaction policy. It is obvious that for the first model the task of preserving languages of both large and small groups is solved within the framework of the policy of recognition of all ethnic groups' right to preserve their unique culture, while in the second one this task is solved in favour of the dominant group.

The second approach to the construction of linguistic and cultural space creates certain hotbeds of tension. It is not typical of the integration strategy implementation, carried out fully by ethno-cultural group or individual in a multicultural community, which approved positive for interethnic interaction psychological assumptions:

- universal acceptance of cultural diversity as value for society;
- positive mutual relations between ethno-cultural groups;
- The sense of belonging and identification with a large society in all individuals and groups;
- The desire to preserve cultural heritage;
- Relatively low level of prejudice (minimal ethnocentrism, racism, discrimination).

It is especially important to distinguish the influence of the two models of multiculturalism in determining the strategy of development of cultural policy, which, as V. Zhidkov notes, should pursue such goals as:

- formation of a national picture of the world and its dissemination among citizens;
- maintaining and preserving the existing worldview in the form of tradition and passing it on to future generations;
- development, modernisation, adaptation of the existing picture of the world to the changing reality [15, p. 53].

Analysing the strategy of development of state cultural policy, it is important to emphasise the significance of preserving the national view of the world and protecting it from any external destructive influences. Thus, without taking into account that different models of regulating the policy of interethnic interaction can be implemented at the state level, V. Zhidkov divides all cultures into donor and recipient [15, p. 55]. In his opinion, the interaction of equivalent cultures is the interpenetration of the elements of cultures, resulting in the fact that the view of the world of each nation is changing, but their socio-cultural core is preserved. The interaction of diverse cultures can lead to the assimilation of a weaker culture, which leads to the loss of one of the interacting peoples of their ethnic identity, value orientations, traditions, customs, religion and language. In

fact, the description of the differences in the strategies given by the researcher is an illustration of the implementation of two models: integrative and assimilative, the results of which determine the status of cultures within the framework of national policy: donor or recipient.

The problem of formation of interethnic interaction culture was acute for Russia throughout its centuries-old history. Features of creation of the state which is initially multinational, caused polyethnicity as a special characteristic of society, and multiculturalism as the property of Russian culture [3].

It is important to realise that despite the critical attitude to the history of the Soviet Union adopted today; a lot of work has been done in terms of the consolidation of peoples in the country. The first documents of the Soviet state on national policy ("Declaration of the rights of the peoples of Russia", 1917), the Constitution of the RSFSR of 1918, Declaration on the formation of the USSR, Constitution of the USSR of 1924) proclaimed a voluntary and honest union of the peoples of Russia, the right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination, equality and sovereignty of peoples, the abolition of all national and national-religious privileges and restrictions, the free development of national minorities and ethnographic groups. The same approach is implemented in the USSR Constitution of 1977 (article of the law 70) [6]. Thus, the model of Soviet national policy was based on the understanding of the nation as an ethno social community (a high degree of integration of ethnic groups), in contrast to other (primarily Western European) models, where nationality is considered as citizenship in the state (low degree of integration of ethnic groups). The peoples of the USSR had the right for free development of language, national culture; their equal rights in the spheres of politics, economy, social and cultural relations were recognised.

The modernisation of the political structure implemented in the 90-s of the XX century in Russia has created conditions for ethnic Renaissance. At the same time, in 1992, the Law On Education was changed. Instead of implementing the model of international education, a *policultural model* found its place [7]. The ideological component of education system was also removed, which created conditions for the formation of what seemed to be a more democratic doctrine.

In fact, freedom in interpreting the history of both the country and individual peoples has received very contradictory forms of implementation. Republican and regional education authorities were reviewing the amount of time to study the history of the region and the country and created new textbooks, which sometimes reflected only fragmentary information about the events, aggravating negative information about some and magnifying the achievements of other peoples. There was an active planting of ideas about the "colonisation of territories", the right and the need to revise the borders, the freedom of state self-realisation of individual territories. Thus, the ideology allegedly removed from education actually returned as propaganda of absolutely other principles and values

promoting not multicultural education, but rather disintegration of the people.

As a result of the above-mentioned trends, various programs have been adopted at the level of the republics with regard to inter-ethnic interaction and language learning. The specificity of the strategy chosen by the republics is explained as the ratio of the titular and Russian ethnic groups, the history and duration of cohabitation, the degree of integration, the activity of migration processes, the number of buildings of all-Union importance in the Soviet period. We can talk about models that can be described as: integration and assimilation.

III. METHOD

As a part of our study, we compared two models of national policy in the republics of Khakassia and Sakha (Yakutia), which are a part of Russia. The Russian republics differ in the ratio of the Russian and the Yakut, Russian and Khakass population, the type of policy (soft and hard). The research methodology integrates methods of content analysis of the legal framework of national and language policy in Russia and the republics of Sakha (Yakutia) and Khakassia, data of ethno sociological and sociolinguistic studies in the regions, modeling, typology. We conducted sociological surveys of young people in Yakutia and Khakassia on the basis of a zoned sample. The Russian respondents aged 14-29 years were analysed as follows: in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) – 1690 Sakha, 1166 Russians, 624 representatives of other Nations, in the Republic of Khakassia – 405 Khakas, 1180 Russians, 238 people representatives of other Nations.

In this publication, a comparative analysis of sociological surveys conducted on the example of young people of Russian and titular ethnic groups of the republics Sakha and Khakassia. These groups which are most numerous and determining the nature of interethnic relations in the regional communities of Yakutia and Khakassia is presented. According to the national population census in 2010, total population of Sakha (Yakutia) (958 thousand people) Sakha accounted for 49.9%, Russians 37.8 %; in the Republic of Khakassia (532,4 thousand people) Khakas was 12%, Russians of 80.3%.

Differences in the ratio of the population of Russian and titular ethnic groups (Sakha and Khakas), in the geographical characteristics of the territories of Yakutia and Khakassia to some extent affect the nature of inter-ethnic communications. It is manifested in language communication and in models of language policy. Theoretical and practical aspects of regional models of the state national policy of Russia are considered by us above [13]. Their conceptual basis forms a model of policy in the unity with the activities of the state, the structures of civil society and the mechanism of policy implementation (subjects, their tasks, the content of activities, forms of interaction). Two methodological parameters are of particular importance for this study. The first meaningful point is the proposed analysis scheme of the ratio of declared and implemented regional policy models. Typological approach to the regional policy models is the

second vital criterion [13, p. 24-25, 29-31]. These two points will be discussed later.

The history of regulation of the international relations in Yakutia throughout the period of the development was accompanied and continues to be followed by the existing in some sense opposition of Russian government and the government of Yakutia. It is possible to make such conclusions on the base of the analysis of dynamics of formation of the national policy model of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) that reflects in the documents developed during periods of weakening of influence of the center on the Republic and presented generally by the title *ethnos* in the post-Soviet period [13, p. 113]. This also applies to the sphere of language policy, the model of which can be defined as directive and binding on the part of the authorities of the Republic. Judging by the normative legal documents, such are the Law on languages in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), the Concept of updating and development of national schools [13, pp. 84-91; 1].

There is a question. Does the opposition of the Federal and Republican authorities influence the state of interethnic relations? Partly yes. As shown by recent events in one of the elite neighborhoods of Yakutsk, where at the end of December 2018 a national school, which did not provide Russian-speaking classes, was opened. Due to the lack of infrastructure in the still developing neighborhood, the remaining families had the opportunity to enroll their children to schools remote from their place of residence, which provoked tension in inter-ethnic relations between Sakha and the Russians. But overall, N. I. Ivanova and R. I. Vasilyeva's studies show that in the Republic there is a high degree of interlingual tolerance [10], especially in the areas near the Lena river (Lenski, Khangalassky, Olekminskiy) – parts of long and sustained bilingual and multilingual engagement of Sakha, Russian and Tungus.

It should be noted that unlike Yakutia, in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods of Khakassian history, ethnocentric trends in national and language policy were weak. A.V. Huseynova, analysing the dynamics of the language situation in the Republic of Khakassia, notes: The Law on languages reflects mainly the imperative provisions of the Federal Law on languages, and the consolidation of the functional status of the Khakas language in it is mainly permissive. The soft type of the Republican language legislation in relation to the use of the Khakass language contributes, on the one hand, to preservation of inter-ethnic harmony, and on the other – to the reduction of prestige and demand for the Khakass language, limiting its functioning in socially significant areas. As a result of the study, she comes to the conclusion that the soft (permissive-recommendatory) model of language legislation of the Republic of Khakassia leads to a decrease in the proportion of Khakasians among young people [9]. The Khakas language is classified as a disadvantaged one by UNESCO, which means that its operation is limited. At the same time a reduced language competence of young people threatens ethnic reproduction.

Sociolinguistic researchers draw attention to another problem of language policy in the republics: the replacement

(displacement) of the languages of the titular ethnic groups in the education system of indigenous languages. In the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) it is Dolgan, Chukchi, Evenk, Yukaghir languages; in the Republic of Khakassia – Shor language [4, p. 227-228; 295-296]. This publication does not analyse this problem, although it is no less important and requires a separate study.

In 2018, the State Duma of the Russian Federation adopted in the final, third reading and made adjustments to the Law on Education in the Russian Federation regarding the study of native languages [7]. Interpretation of these adjustments in the regions can get different outcomes. From the rollback to the 90th of the twentieth century, when the Republican authorities everywhere forced to study the language of the titular ethnic group all the inhabitants of the republics. The other polar situation took place when citizens' rights to choose education in their native language were recognised of to really recognise the rights of citizens to choose education in their native language.

Now the concept of "titular ethnos" has left the text of the law. Instead, there was an indefinite concept of national language of the region. Changes in the law on education should neutralise the situation of regional pressure of representatives of the titular ethnic groups and leave the choice of which language to take as a native one to the children's parents. However, the situation of restricted choice can be preserved only because of methodological and personnel unwillingness of schools. There arises a question of how to teach a native language to the classes including twenty representatives of various ethnic groups. Another problematic issue is hiring a large number of qualified teachers ready to provide a decent language education for minority pupil groups. The issue may be even more complicated when protecting the rights of schoolchildren living in the republics who consider their native language to be Russian or non-national (non-title) language of the region.

Unfortunately, the unavailability of personnel, financial and methodological support can lead the law to the fact that at the regional level the concept of "native language" returns to the concept of "language of the titular ethnic group". Moreover, the existing clause in the law which tells that its implementation "is carried out within the limits of the educational system" gives ample opportunities for interpretation. To a large extent, the solution of the above problems and the awareness of the right of schoolchildren and their parents to choose their native language depend on regional authorities, on their chosen language policy and, finally, on a well-thought-out implementation of national policy by Federal authorities.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Our mass ethno-sociological surveys of young people confirmed the dependence of the linguistic situation in the regions both on the ethnic structure of population and models of implementation of national-language policy. So, in Yakutia and Khakassia respondents indicated different languages as their native ones. It should be noted that in Russia young ethnic population does not so often indicate

their native language as such as compared to Sakha (65% and 85 % correspondingly) (table. 1).

Among the Khakass youth who recognise Russian as their native language, a third does not speak Khakass. Among the Russian-speaking youth of Sakha, there are significantly fewer of them (every fifth). In Russian-Yakut bilingualism the level of proficiency of Sakha youth in Yakut language significantly reduces (from 89 to 68% of fluent speakers), then Khakass-Russian bilingualism of Khakass youth (from 70 to 42%). That is, even the phenomenon of bilingualism requires attention from the family and the education system to the quality of mastering the languages of their ethnic group by young people in order to reproduce ethnicity and ethnic culture.

The share of Russian youth, fully or partially speaking the Yakut language in Yakutia is 2 times more than the Khakass language in Khakassia (14 and 7% respectively). The "rigid" model of language policy of the Republican authorities is more productive than the "soft" one, as the knowledge of the language of the titular ethnos expands the opportunities of Russian youth both in the sphere of interpersonal communication and in the state-political activity.

Another poll. To what extent does the level of language proficiency (Russian and titular ethnic groups) affect the interethnic attitudes of young people? In order to study this understudied problem, we used the typology method in our ethno sociological project. The respondents were asked: How important is it for you to speak the language of your nationality? Combinations of respondents' answers were

TABLE 1. MOTHER TONGUE AND THE LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR NATIONALITY (YAKUT, KHAKASS), %

<i>Nationality</i>	<i>Native language</i>	<i>Is fluent</i>	<i>Owens partly</i>	<i>Does not own</i>
Sakha	Yakut	89	10	1
	Russian	7	74	19
	Two languages	68	30	2
Khakas	Khakas	70	28	1
	Russian	6	62	32
	Two languages	42	55	3

divided into four groups [2, c. 49-50]:

1) It is very important to live among the people of your nationality and it is very important to speak the language of your nationality (ethno-centrists);

2) It is very important to live among the people of your nationality, but it is not very important or it does not matter if you speak the language of your nationality (prefer a mono-ethnic environment);

3) It is not very important or not important at all to live among the people of your nationality, but it is very important to speak the language of your nationality, which reflects the need for verbal manifestation of ethnicity, the

coincidence of semiotic picture of the world with the people from the circle of communication (prefer monolinguist environment);

4) It is not very important or not important at all to live among the people of their nationality, and to speak the language of their nationality (ethno-indifferent).

Table 2 presents the distribution of selected ethno-cultural types among young people with different degrees of knowledge of the Yakut and Khakass languages.

It should be noted that among the fluently speaking youth of Sakha there are more ethno centrists than among the Khakass youth (24 and 19% respectively). At the same time, among the Khakass youth the proportion of those who prefer the medium amount of communication in the Khakass language is twice higher than among the Sakha youth (39 against 20%). Perhaps this is due to the differences in the language surroundings and the ratio of the share of Russian population (in Yakutia about 1:1, in Khakassia 1:4). The youth from the Khakas people who are fluent in the language of their ethnic group in the Republic of Khakassia communicate more comfortably in it, and non-linguistic environment (10-11% in the group) is not particularly valuable partly for the knowledge of the native language (both Khakas and Sakha). The Russian bilinguals, Yakut – Russian and Khakass-Russian, are also characterised by the above. Among them there are very few ethnocentrists: 3% – among the Khakas, 8% among the Sakha, with 71-75% ethno-indifferent and ethno centrists which chosen as the native language – Russian among the Sakha and Khakas, are virtually absent (0-2%). However, only 6-7% of them speak Sakha and Khakass fluently.

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNO-CULTURAL TYPES OF YOUTH DEPENDING ON LANGUAGE COMPETENCE, %.

Republic	Nationality	Native language	Degree of ownership of Yakut, Khakass languages	Ethno-cultural type*			
				1	2	3	4
Sakha-Yakutia	Sakha	Yakut	<i>Is fluent</i>	24	4	20	52
			<i>Owens partly</i>	5	9	11	75
		Yakut & Russian	<i>Owens partly</i>	2	2	2	94
			<i>Is fluent</i>	8	4	13	75
	Russian		<i>Owens partly</i>	0	2	6	92
			<i>Does not own</i>	22	2	36	40
Khakass-sia	Khakas	Khakass	<i>Is fluent</i>	19	4	39	38
			<i>Owens partly</i>	7	7	10	76
		Khakass & Russian	<i>Owens partly</i>	0	2	4	94
			<i>Is fluent</i>	3	0	26	71
	Russian	Russian	<i>Owens partly</i>	3	2	8	87
			<i>Does not own</i>	20	1	41	38
			<i>Owens partly</i>	12	1	33	54

- 1 – ethno centrists;
- 2 – a mono-ethnic environment;
- 3 – monolinguist surroundings;
- 4 – ethno-indifferent.

Therefore, the level of language proficiency their ethnic group and the choice of their native language have a decisive influence on the inter-ethnic attitudes of young people.

The decrease in the level of language proficiency their ethnic group reduces the ethnocentric attitudes of the youth of Sakha and Khakas.

Among Russian youth in Yakutia, the share of ethno centrists is slightly higher than in Khakassia (22 and 20%, respectively, in groups that do not speak Yakut and Khakas languages). Speaking of the ethnocentricity levels among Russian youth in the two studied groups, we can state that insufficient command of the native language produces a greater impact in the Republic of Khakassia than in Yakutia. We have followed the reduction of ethnocentrism from 22% to 18 % in Khakassia and from 20% to 12% in Yakutia.

Mass sociological surveys of young people showed that the proportion of well-spoken Yakut language among Sakha is higher than Khakass among Khakas. However, at the same time, among the Khakass youth, the proportion of people of ethnocentric type (who prefer to live among people of their nationality and speak the language of their nationality) is lower, which is important in the aspect of integration of the interethnic community of the region.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The obtained results allow us to conclude that the regional model of national (and language – as part of it) policy has a certain influence on the formation of young people's attitude to the choice of their native language and language, ensuring success in the communication space of the region. The model of implementation of language policy in the region touches upon the issue of the access to educational resources. It indirectly affects the interethnic attitudes of young people, and consequently the processes of socio-cultural transformation of interethnic communities.

There are two types of a regional model of language legislation, which are reflected in the educational system through measures applied to the choice of language instruction – "soft" (permissive-recommendatory) and "hard" (directive-mandatory). Both types are a compromise of interests of Federal and regional authorities and lead to contradictory results. The "soft" model is more integrative in the aspect of interethnic relations, though strengthens the assimilation processes of the titular ethnic groups. A "hard" model leads to opposite results. The typology of the presented models corresponds to the above-mentioned models of regulation in multicultural community: integration and assimilation. Integrative policy recognises the rights of all ethnic groups represented in the country and has aimed at preserving their unique culture. Assimilation policy is aimed at solving the problems of cultural identity and functioning of cultures in accordance with adequately constructed norms of political life.

The results of the study confirmed our assumption that state national policy in the field of interethnic interaction affects not only the nature of interethnic relations, but also

determines socio-cultural stratification within the country and regions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abramova, M. A., Goncharova, G. S. Kostyuk, V. G. (2018). *Tipy identichnosti molodezhi i vzaimodejstvie v mezhetnicheskom pogranič'e* [Types of youth identity and interaction in the ethnic borderlands]. *Rusin* 1. (51): 282-298. DOI: 10.17223/18572685/51/18. (In Russ.)
- [2] Abramova, M. A., Goncharova, G. S., Kostyuk V. G. (2014). *Sociokul'turnye tipy molodezhi: regional'nye i eticheskie aspekty* [Socio-cultural types of youth: ethnic and regional aspects]. Novosibirsk: Avtograf. (In Russ.)
- [3] Abramova, M. A. (2016). *Mul'tikul'turalizm kak sociokul'turnyj fenomen: istoricheskaya dinamika, translyaciya monoethničnymi i mezhetnicheskimi sem'yami* [Multiculturalism as a socio-cultural phenomenon: historical dynamics, translation by monoethnic and interethnic families], V. G. Kostyuk (ed.). Novosibirsk: Sibirskoe nauchnoe izdatel'stvo (In Russ.)
- [4] Arefev, A. L. (2014). *Yazyki korenyh malochislennyh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka v sisteme obrazovaniya: istoriya i sovremennost'* [Languages of indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East in the education system: history and modernity]. Moscow: Centr social'nogo prognozirovaniya i marketinga. (In Russ.)
- [5] Benhabib, S. (2005). *Prityazaniya kul'tury. Ravenstvo i raznoobrazie v global'nyu epohu*. [The claims of culture. Equality and diversity in the global era]. Moscow: Logos. (In Russ.)
- [6] *Konstituciya (Osnovnoj zakon) Soyuza Sovetskikh Socialisticheskikh Respublik (prinyata na vnocherednoj sed'moj sessii Verhovnogo Soveta SSSR devyatogo sozyva 7 oktyabrya 1977 goda)* [Constitution (Basic law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (adopted at the extraordinary seventh session of the Supreme Soviet of the ninth convocation on October 7, 1977)]. http://constitution.garant.ru/history/ussr-rsfsr/1977/red_1977/5478732/ (Date of access 10.06.2019). (In Russ.)
- [7] *Federal'nyj zakon. № 317-FZ ot 03.08.2018 "O vnesenii izmenenij v stat'i 11 i 14 Federal'nogo zakona "Ob obrazovanii v Rossijskoj Federacii"* [Federal law №. 317-FZ of 03.08.2018 "On amendments to articles 11 and 14 of the Federal law "On education in the Russian Federation"]. (In Russ.)
- [8] Glazer, N. (1997). *We Are All Multiculturalists Now*. Cambridge: Mass. Harvard University Press.
- [9] Guseinova, A. V. (2014). *Dinamika yazykovoj situacii v Respublike Hakasiya* [Dynamics of the language situation in the Republic of Khakassia]: PhD Thesis. Ulan-Ude, Burjatskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. (In Russ.)
- [10] Ivanova, N. I. (2011). *Mezh'jazykovaja tolerantnost': sociolingvističeskij kontekst (na materiale Respubliki Saha (Jakutija)* [Interlanguage tolerance: sociolinguistic context (based on the materials of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)]. *Istoricheskij opyt vzaimodejstviya narodov i civilizacij: 350-letie prisoedineniya Buryatii k Rossii* [Historical experience of interaction between peoples and civilizations: the 350th anniversary of the accession of Buryatia to Russia], B. V. Bazarov, L. V. Kuras (eds.). Ulan-Ude, Irkutsk, Ottisk. (In Russ.)
- [11] Le Coadic R. (2002). *Multiculturalism*. http://www.eawarn.ru/pub/Pubs/DialogueMulticulturalism/02_Multiculturalizm.htm (date of access: 07.05.2019).
- [12] Nizamova, L. R. (2009) Rossijskaya i Zapadnaya interpretacii mul'tikul'turalizma [Russian and Western interpretations of multiculturalism]. *Sociologičeskie issledovaniya* [Sociological studies] (10): 80-89. (In Russ.)
- [13] *Regional'naya model' gosudarstvennoj nacional'noj politiki sovremennoj Rossii* [Regional model of the state national policy of modern Russia] (2016), M. A. Abramova, V. G. Kostyuk, S. A. Malukova, O. A. Farsi, Yu. V. Popkov (eds.). Part I. Novosibirsk: Avtograf (In Russ.)
- [14] Veverka, M. (2005). The formation of the difference. *Sociologičeskie issledovaniya = Sociological research* (8): 13-24.
- [15] Zhidkov, V. (2000). Kul'turnaya politika i formirovanie kartiny mira [Cultural policy and the formation of the world picture]. In *Simvoly, obrazy i stereotipy: istoričeskij i ekzistencial'nyj opyt = Symbols, images and stereotypes: historical and existential experience*. Saint-Petersburg: Jejdos, 41-58. (In Russ.)