

Modern Russian Family as a Source of Reproduction of Social Inequality

Natalia Yu. Belikova¹

Valery V. Kasyanov²

Viktor V. Shalin³

Anna V. Aperyán⁴

Valentina P. Leoshko⁵

Anna T. Latysheva⁶

1 Candidate of Historical Sciences, associate professor of the Department of History and Philosophy «Kuban State Technological University», Russia, belikova2003@mail.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2304-2089>

2 Doctor of social Sciences, Doctor of historical sciences, Professor, Faculty of history Sociology and International Relations, Department of Russian History of Russia Kuban state University, Krasnodar, Russia, culture@kubsu.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6870-7673>

3 Head of the Department of sociology and cultural studies of FSBEI HE «Kuban State Agrarian University named after I.T. Trubilin», Krasnodar, Russia. viktor_filosof@mail.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8823-3404>

4 Postgraduate student, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, a.v.aperyan@yandex.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7029-7135>

5 PhD in Economics, Associate Professor of accounting and information technology Department, Krasnodar Institute of Cooperation (branch) of Russian University of Cooperation, Russia, nirkki@yandex.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4007-9684>

6 PhD in sociological sciences, associate professor Of pedagogics and sociocultural development of the identity of the Taganrog institute of A.P. Chekhov – branch of the Rostov state economic university, Russia, 89281115155@mail.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0061-5609>

Abstract: The paper deals with the study of the image of Rome and the socio-political situation of the era, which represent a significant historic context. The focus is on the real image of the Roman emperors Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero. The presence in the novel image of the narrator acting as interpreter of history and guide for the reader to actual historical events, suggests talking about the possibility of the historical analysis of the novel. Sadoc is one of the most significant characters in the novel. We can assume that the images of the author and the narrator seem to be identical and Anthony Burgess' main ideas are given by Sadoc. The article gives attention to the analysis of the narrative features of Sadoc. Highlighting the actions of the apostles in the struggle for faith, the author doesn't hide the main political events in *The Kingdom of the wicked*.

Keywords: English literature, Anthony Burgess, biblical trilogy, the images of Rome and Roman emperors, The Kingdom of the Wicked, narrator.

INTRODUCTION

At all times, families possessed different social resources. Nothing in this regard has changed in our time. Some parents can provide their children with great

starting opportunities, while others can only rely on their own initiative and talents. Another thing is that the very formation of status positions has undergone major changes. If earlier it was tied exclusively to marital status and, accordingly, was prescribed, then now it is acquired with the help of parents or independently. This dualism actualizes the study of the problems defined in the title. Many modern Russian sociologists talk about narrowing or even “blocking” the channels of social mobility, which is associated with the dominance of horizontal mobility over vertical or, as they often say, “breakdown of social elevators”. This is explained by the fact that parents transfer their social statuses to children without society’s proper control on the legality of such a transfer. The indicated position turns the family into an archaic social institution that implements the function of reconstructing social inequality in an unchanged form. This, of course, cannot be characteristic of an open society, because one of its most important properties is the dynamism of social processes and interactions. Thus, the Russian family begins to impede the main trends in social development, among which we would like to draw attention to the correspondence of the existing model of social stratification to the real abilities of the carriers of social statuses to benefit society. This can be possible in conditions of freedom of movement in the social space, the presence in society of channels that provide all the necessary types of social mobility, and not only upward, but also downward. Free movement across existing social strata seems important for the formal social hierarchy to reflect the hierarchy of abilities of social actors, thus influencing the order of substitution of places in social stratification. This is important not only for adhering to the principle of social efficiency, which is obvious, but also, to no lesser extent, for the implementation of social justice in public relations. Moreover, these principles act as two sides of the same coin, since the society where justice is systematically violated can hardly be effective, because it undermines the faith of a social actor in his ability to realize his own talents and aspirations. In our work, we set the goal to consider the reasons, as well as determine the prospects for overcoming the negative role of the modern Russian family in the reproduction of social inequality.

METHODOLOGY

The theoretical and methodological base of the study consists of the conceptual provisions of sociological theory, revealing four basic concepts: “family”, “social inequality”, “social stratification” and “family types”. Methodologically, the use of the presented concepts can be considered in the context of two different approaches: institutional (V. Wilson, T. Cole, K. Friedrich) and neoinstitutional (D. North, D. Apter, B. Peters). The institutional approach is aimed at studying the actor in a social context (Amenta & Ramsey, 2010). His social characteristics and features are analyzed as a subject socialized in a certain way, whose activity is within the strict framework of norms, obligations, stereotypical ideas, etc. The neoinstitutional approach is based on the fact that the actor makes independent decisions related to the expected utility of such a decision, and consistent with the principles of rationalism and pragmatism. With this understanding, the social context can be viewed from the perspective of the restrictive framework only to the extent that the actor is consciously ready to choose it for himself, hoping to receive the desired utility from the perfect choice as a reward (Analytical report by the IS RAS on the topic, 2013). The first approach - institutional, allows us to establish the importance of the family as a factor of social inequality by using the concept of "social resources of the family";

the second is neoinstitutional, it makes it possible to assess the role of the family in the designated subject area, based on the term “quality of family communication”, bearing in mind that, firstly, the characteristics of interaction in the family may depend on its typological features, and secondly, typological features can determine the individual resources of young people. Thus, we determine the integrity of the two approaches within the framework of the stated problems since they reflect the subjective and objective capabilities of the family in the reproduction of social inequality in the context of its typological characteristic.

THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Studies conducted by Russian sociologists in the 90s to determine the significant factors and resources that influence the mechanisms of formation of a model of social inequality in Russian society showed that the respondents did not consider the family in the indicated quality, that is, as a factor or resource that determines social trajectories for gaining social statuses. The mass of social resources of parents did not play a leading role in shaping the social status of their children, although they had a definite, mainly indirect effect on their statuses, excluding small groups of elites already formed in the early 90s (Angel et al., 2015). Since the middle of the “zero years”, opinion polls have recorded quite different results. Based on a 2013 study of Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IS RAS) on the topic “Poverty and Inequalities in Modern Russia: 10 Years Later” (Astoyants et al., 2016), during which 1900 respondents were interviewed. N. Ye. Tikhonova gives quite eloquent data that allow us to assess the degree of attachment of the respondent’s status to the status of his parents from the point of view of his own representation.

Table 1. The ratio of the position of the parental family and the respondents' place in society according to their own self-assessments on a ten-point scale of social status (%)

Status Positions	Own					
	Upper (7-10) steps	6 step	5 step	4 step	3 step	Lower (1-2) steps
Upper (7-10) steps	50	13	16	13	11	13
6 step	13	30	9	10	10	13
5 step	23	28	43	18	22	17
4 step	9	16	17	33	17	17
3 step	4	10	11	20	28	11
Lower (1-2) steps	1	3	4	6	12	29

SUMMARY

From Table 1 significant frequencies of coincidences between one's own social status and parental one are visible. Moreover, this is most clearly seen on the upper (7-10) steps of the pyramid, where the identity reaches fifty percent in total. But in general, if we draw a diagonal from a conditional line formed at the junction of intersections of status positions, then the highest values will appear on this diagonal (to facilitate the visual perception of information, this conditional diagonal is highlighted in bold tone). The data presented indicate that the family begins to play an active role in turning the social pyramid into a fixed and unchanging reality, which, by the nature of mobility on its steps, starts to resemble a closed (traditional) society, since vertical movements have been significantly limited in recent years. Next, we turn to the identification of forms of social inequality that are formed as a result of processes taking place in a modern Russian family. Analysis of the literature allows us to distinguish three such forms: educational, economic and regional.

It should be noted that education, as a factor in the formation of social inequality, has been thoroughly studied by Russian sociologists, who came to it from different perspectives. For example, in a study conducted by N.G. Lunyakova, it was found that less than 10% of single mothers have higher education (Bakhmanova & Amonova, 2016). Meanwhile, according to statistics from the early 2000s, over one third of this social category of the population in the analyzed age group of women had a university diploma. These differentiations alone cannot be considered a social sentence, but, as other studies show, parents with higher and secondary education determine the social trajectories of their children in completely different ways. The difference was well defined by the example of a study conducted by L.L. Shpakovskaya. The sociologist notes that the working class families lack a clear understanding of what strategies should be used to choose a higher education institution and how to assess the quality of educational services, which will undoubtedly affect the quality of education received by their children in the future, and subsequently their social status (Coleman, 1990). Educational inequality is closely related to economic one, although a direct connection is seen here with different educational opportunities in families of different types, and not the influence of parental education on the future social status of their children (<https://www.gks.ru>; Gafiatulina et al., 2018).

The leading role of economic inequality in the reproduction of social inequality is confirmed by research, a sociological survey of Ulyanovsk sociologists O.V. Shinyaeva and Yu.V. Ushkova. Summarizing the survey data, the authors note that "of the three components of family capital younger generation estimated the level of economic resource of parent families as the lowest primarily because the reforms "have eaten" all the savings of ordinary Russians. The state of the human and cultural component of family capital is estimated by young people at an average level, partly because part of the resources of intangible origin were lost during the transition to new ideological foundations of a market economy; but more because of the incomplete compliance of the cultural and human resources of the parents with the requirements of a dynamically changing society" (Gafiatulina et al., 2018). Thus, considering the factor of economic inequality confirms that in modern conditions, high-status families reproduce rich actors; middle-status families reproduce middle-income actors, and low-status families – poor ones.

The presence of regional inequality is confirmed by the results of studies by sociologists who studied the influence of regional characteristics on the educational

strategies of families from different types of settlements. Analyzing this issue at the end of the "zero years" I.A. Plokhova, found that the worst results were in families living in rural areas, because 67% of respondents said they were unable to provide their children with higher education due to low-income families. Slightly worse results were found in families of small towns, where 60% of respondents reported difficulties in ensuring the education of children in universities (Gafiatulina et al., 2018). Of course, a whole complex of reasons led to the current situation when a new role of the family is being institutionalized. Some of them are exogenous, because they are mediated by external conditions regarding the processes occurring within the family institution, others are endogenous, since they are mainly due to the characteristics of communication in specific types of families. Among the first should be the exhaustion of the potential of social mobility of the 90s, the traditionalization of consciousness and the imbalance of resource opportunities between the region and the center. The second group of reasons includes an incomplete set of role interactions in single-parent families, defects in preparation for entering a university in low-status families, and gender asymmetry. Consider the reasons presented in the order and within the framework of the typology in which they were identified, starting their analysis with causes of exogenous nature.

1. Exhaustion of the potential of social mobility of the 90s. One cannot but take into account that the sharp increase in the importance of personal resources of youth in the 90s of the last century was largely due to the collapse of the social structure that had developed in the Soviet era. The gateways were raised on the channels of social mobility, they were significantly expanded, which provided the opportunity to move up not only to youth, but also to representatives of other age cohorts. As a result, the structure of social inequality began to take on a new shape. Representatives of lower social groups penetrated the upper and middle layers of the public pyramid in large numbers, which objectively contributed to the formation of new combinations of the upper and middle classes, including due to the crowding out of those representatives of the old nomenclature and the Soviet intelligentsia who were unable to be at the highest levels of the emerging social structures (Hogg et al., 2004). At the same time, it is not necessary to believe that the formation of new circuits of social inequality in the 90s occurred solely due to the change of value paradigms. Successful adaptation to market values, requiring an active life position, is only one side of the issue. We must not forget that the growth of social mobility in the last decade of the 20th century and at the beginning of the "zero years" was largely due to the economic situation in which market reforms started in our country. The choice of reformers in favour of "shock therapy" led to mass impoverishment of the general population, and the subsequent economic growth objectively created good starting opportunities for social promotion to most actors on an equal footing. Gradually, the social structure, as being saturated with new social actors able to quickly move up the steps of the public pyramid, starts to acquire a stable character, and the economic stagnation, in which the Russian market has been for more than ten years, has become a powerful factor in narrowing the channels of social mobility. Now Russia is no longer a "country of great opportunities", because for the most part they are privatized by a small group of high-status families. Access to the middle classes is still possible, but for people from low-status families it is blocked because of disabilities of their resources. Thus, vertical mobility typical of the 90s is being replaced by horizontal mobility inherent in the modern era.

2. The traditionalization of consciousness. It is understood as the rejection of modernist values that are relevant for the period of transition from the

administrative-command system to a market economy, and a return to the values of paternalism that are familiar to the Russian consciousness causing the activation the state's role in relations of production and redistribution. This transformation does not involve the actor's actions demonstrating an active social position, full responsibility for his fate, self-support through participation in social interactions. Traditionalism directs a participant in public relations to expect social assistance from the authorities, to recognize dependence on their decisions, to strictly institutionalize social interactions based on formal rules and to abandon the principles of self-organization. This radically changes the nature and conditions of interaction between the state and society. They cease to be equal partners. This evolution, among other things, changes the nature of family relations. Communication between parents and children at the stage of their vocational training and primary professional socialization becomes like the model established for the interaction of power and society, that is, paternalistic. Not only parents, but also their adult children accept the rules of the game, according to which the provision of long-term financial support to adult children, finding a job, buying an apartment and expensive durable goods, etc., becomes the norm. Children at different stages of life are affiliated with their parents. As a result, a significant part of young people begins to consider paternalistic guardianship as the most important condition for successful social activity, a necessary attribute of achieving social viability.

3. Disproportions of resource opportunities between the region and the center. Russia is a country of resource imbalances between the region and the center. Historically, the basic resources necessary for acquiring high social status exist in the capital and the largest cities. There are more labor vacancies, less significant parents' social ties, a much more mobile labor market, and it is easier to apply self-employment strategies. This fully applies to the fact that the leading educational institutions are in two capitals - Moscow and St. Petersburg, as well as in several regional centers. At the same time, the prestige of metropolitan universities, and most importantly, employment for a well-paid job with the prospects of further career advancement, is incommensurably higher than in regional cities. As for towns and rural areas, now most of the school graduates living in them are not able to get education without moving to large cities. Previously, the problem was partially solved by creating a wide network of branches, where mainly children from rural families went to study, but at present, the Government's policy is focused on closing branches, which sharply worsened their educational opportunities. As a result, the percentage of school graduates from small towns and rural areas receiving higher education has markedly declined. In addition, economic inequality is overlapping regional inequality, as the income level of families living in large cities is incommensurably higher. This provides their children with better starting opportunities.

Further, we continue the analysis of endogenous causes that are relevant for families of a certain type.

4. An incomplete set of role interactions in single-parent families. Here the reasons lie on the surface, and they are described in numerous studies in the most comprehensive way. This gives us the opportunity to focus only on those aspects that are defined in accordance with the name. First, we want to say that the low status of single-parent families is largely due not only to a lack of objective resources (parents' education, material wealth), but also to low rates of subjective resources (quality of family communication). Without a doubt, single-parent families are a source of poverty reproduction. According to official statistics, the situation with the spread of

poverty in recent years tends to worsen.

Table 2. Deficit of income of poor households on average per household member, in thousand rubles (Kovalev et al., 2018)

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Deficit of cash incomes of poor households, on average per household member, rubles	1702,6	1703,5	2330,7	2609,1	3098,6	3085,2	3142,7

From the data of table 2, the deficit of cash incomes of poor households almost doubled over seven years, which to some extent exacerbated their already difficult economic situation. However, no less important is the fact that single-parent families lack full-fledged socialization of children. It is enough to point out the fact that single mothers most often use authoritarian methods of raising their children, choosing the tactics of hypersocialization. This objectively leads to the formation of dependencies on excessive guardianship, lack of independence skills, and lack of initiative, in general, underdevelopment of what is vital for active social activity, including actions in building a career and implementing practices to achieve it.

5. *Defects of preparation for entering a university in low-status families.* The simplest spectrum of understanding provides an assessment of the objective resources of the family. Parents in such families have low incomes and, most often, they have a low educational level. This inevitably gives rise to two circles of problems: the inability to independently prepare children for admission to the university (due to a lack of their own educational potential) and the narrowing of the possibilities for using tutors in this capacity (due to a lack of material resources). In addition, it is necessary to take into account that parents from the analyzed type of family can hardly choose a quality tutor on their own, because of which, formally, they are guided by the successful experience of other actors from their own social environment but in their case, it may not give the desired result. Moreover, they may encounter difficulties in checking the quality of knowledge received from a tutor, whose low level will be realized only after receiving low scores on unified state exam. In addition to educational and material resources of the family, it is necessary to consider the characteristics of the quality of family communication. In low-status families, it is usually noticeably worse.

6. *Gender asymmetry.* In principle, gender asymmetry is both an exogenous and an endogenous reason for the reproduction of social inequality by family communication practices. It is exogenous, since ideas about gender are institutional in nature creating the appropriate matrix within which gender norms, gender stereotypes, gender roles, and gender traditions are formed. Social actors, men and women, are placed in the cells of this matrix, taking places predefined by social and cultural rules. It is possible to abandon this predetermination, but it requires significant efforts, mutual readiness and the presence of an appropriate social meaning for the spouses (a woman may have higher salaries, more developed activity and mobility, better adaptability, which together creates the social meaning of

rejecting the existing gender asymmetry). However, in real family practice this usually does not happen. Women agree (under the pressure of external circumstances or according to internal acceptance) that the gender world order created by previous generations in the current social conditions is more suitable for the implementation of family functions than the principle of egalitarianism, the essence of which is not so much in equality (equality does not contradict modern neopatriarchy), but in role interchangeability. In support of this, we refer to interesting data obtained during the study of the labor motivations of women in the Rostov Region.

Table 3. What should be a job for a woman and for a man? (%) (Levaya, 2015)

Family type	Means of self-realization of personality	Extension of communication capabilities and social circle of relations	Main meaning of life	Source of income
For a woman	44,9	26,5	0,2	28,4
For a man	12,6	2,5	2,0	82,9

We see that the meaning of work for women in their motivational orientation is not equivalent in their ideas about work for men. The man is still regarded as the breadwinner, the earner, which inevitably transfers the burden of female attention to domestic problems and worries. By this logic, there is synergy in the harmonization of family roles. We will not touch on the question of why this happens, we note that the father, being the main connecting force between the family and the outside world, acts as the main locomotive in the consciousness of children of high school age and in the student period to disperse the trajectory of their own social status. That is why the role of the father is leading (Lunyakova, 2001).

Finally, a few words about the prospects for overcoming these problems. A special feature of exogenous conditions is that their negative impact on the reproduction of social inequality can be overcome exclusively within the framework of a general social policy. Thus, the exhaustion of the potential of social mobility of the 90s is due to economic stagnation and, therefore, potential growth is possible with an increase in the indicators of the country's socio-economic development. The traditionalization of consciousness takes place because of modern state policy aimed at reviving conservative values (Shakbanova et al., 2018). Accordingly, a rejection of this policy is necessary, which is incompatible with the values of the late modernity. Disproportions in resource opportunities between the region and the center are exacerbated by the desire of the federal authorities to play the role of an agent in the distribution of all socio-economic resources. Thus, the situation of families on the periphery of the regions will continue to deteriorate as this policy is followed. The negative impact of endogenous conditions can be overcome through a direct impact on the consciousness of social actors in the practice of family communication. The problem of an incomplete set of role interactions, characteristic of single-parent families, is partially overcome in extended type families, and this should be considered in family policy. Nevertheless, special attention should be paid to gender, as it is gender asymmetry that is the most important source of lowering resource opportunities in families of a certain type. It can be overcome in two ways: either through the strengthening of traditional family values, which involves creating the

conditions for social actors to independently solve all emerging material and other difficulties, or on the basis of the gradual disintegration of gender practices in the conditions of creating a welfare state of the Scandinavian type.

DISCUSSION

The analysed issue is on discussion in domestic sociology. N.A. Levaya revealed the potential of social instability, highlighting such factors as a low level of material wealth, value heterogeneity, and the presence of a negative socio-psychological background in role-playing interactions, low academic performance of children, and a high level of offenses recorded by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Prokofieva, 2013). Another type of family that is usually considered by sociologists in the context of poverty reproduction is rural. R.R. Salakhutdinova insists on the need to distinguish a rural family in the form of a specific object of social protection (Peters, 2000). The reasoning of the scientist is to ensure that in rural areas there are objectively more complex conditions of social life, which, taking into account the significance of the results of rural labor for the whole society should be compensated by the fair redistribution of resources. L.M. Prokofieva also emphasizes the low level of development of social infrastructure in the countryside, the high incidence of chronic diseases among children, lower educational opportunities compared to the city, more intensive work that absorbs free time and does not leave it for creativity and self-education, low level of material wealth (Rønsen, 2004; Salakhutdinova, 2018). E.A. Manukyan points out that there are big problems in the system of social services for the rural population arising from insufficient funding of the relevant organizations responsible for the implementation of social protection of the population (Salakhutdinova, 2018). T.G. Bakhmanova and O.V. Amonov draw attention to the main contradiction inherent in almost all large families: they make the greatest contribution to the indicators of demographic reproduction, but at the same time, they have low economic opportunities, because according to statistics, the majority of large families live behind or in close proximity to the poverty line (Shalin, 1999; Tambiyants et al., 2017).

CONCLUSIONS

To summarize the issues discussed. In the last decade and a half, the role of the family has been transforming as a factor in the reproduction of social inequality. From the secondary, it becomes the leader. This evolution is manifested in the fact that in modern Russian families the parents choose those strategies for transferring social status to their children that are more characteristic of traditional than modernist societies. As a result, the youth's personal resources cease to be the leading condition providing them with the desired trajectory of the social movement. The family influences the reproduction of four types of social inequality relevant to the formation of status characteristics of youth: gender, educational, economic and regional. To achieve a high social status, social actors overcome the lack of family resources most difficultly if it is caused by regional inequality (rural families and families from small towns), further matters economic inequality (single-parent and large families), the third most relevant is gender inequality (single-parent maternal families) and the least role is revealed in educational inequality (parents lack higher education). The result of this situation was a whole range of reasons. Some of them are exogenous, others endogenous. Among the first should be the exhaustion of the

potential of social mobility of the 90s, the traditionalization of consciousness and the imbalance of resource opportunities between the region and the center. The second group of reasons includes an incomplete set of role interactions in single-parent families, defects in preparing for the unified state exam in low-status families, and gender asymmetry.

REFERENCES

1. Amenta, E., & Ramsey K. M. (2010). Amenta E. Institutional Theory. Handbook of Politics: State and Society in Global Perspective / K. T. Leicht and J. C. Jenkins (Eds.). NY; London: Springer Science + Business Media, LLC.
2. Analytical report by the IS RAS on the topic (2013). Poverty and Inequalities in Modern Russia: 10 Years Later. https://www.isras.ru/analytical_report_bednost_i_neravenstva.html?&printmode.
3. Angel O. Yu., Astoyants M.S., Davlyatova S.V., Kovalev V.V., Levaya N.A., Uzentsova E.A., Shevchenko O.N. (2015). Russian family: problems and development prospects (based on the experience of the Rostov region) (scientific monograph). Novosibirsk: CRNS, 78-79.
4. Astoyants M.S., Kovalev V.V., Davljatova S.V., Shevchenko O.N. (2016). Family Dysfunctions and Ways of their Overcoming by Means of Social Work. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 7.
5. Bakhmanova T.G., Amonova O.V. (2016). The influence of socio-economic inequality on the economic behavior of large families. Actual problems of the development of the social and labor sphere. Irkutsk.
6. Coleman J. (1990). Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
7. Deficit of household income on average per household member (file 7.8) / <https://www.gks.ru/folder/13807> (accessed September 20, 2019).
8. Gafiatulina N.Kh., Rachipa A.V., Vorobyev G.A., et al. (2018). Socio-political changes as a socio-cultural trauma for the social health of Russian youth. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. 2018. T. 8. № 5. P. 602-609.
9. Gafiatulina N.K., Vorobyev G.A., Imgrunt S.I., Samygin S.I., Latysheva A.T., Ermakova L.I., Kobysheva L.I. (2018). Social Health of Student Youth in South Russia: Analysis Of The Perception Of Socio-Cultural Risks. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 8(6).
10. Hogg M.A. et al. (2004). The social identity perspective: Intergroup relations, self-conception, and small groups. Small group research, 35(3).
11. Kovalev V.V., Volkov Yu. G., Lubsky A.V., Bineeva N.K., Gubnelova N.Z. (2018). Practices of solidarity as a subject of intellectual traditions in Russia and the West. International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE), 7(2.13).
12. Levaya N.A. (2015). Institute of an incomplete (maternal) family (study of the potential of social instability) / Abstract for the degree of candidate of sociological sciences in the specialty 22.00.04 - Social Structure, Social Institutions and Processes. Rostov-on-Don.
13. Lunyakova L.G. (2001). On the modern standard of living of single mothers. Sociological studies, 3.
14. Prokofieva L.M. (2013). Support for family, motherhood and childhood in modern Russia. Population, 4.
15. Peters G.B. (2000). Institutional Theory: Problems and Prospects. Political Science Series, 69.
16. Rønsen, M. (2004). Fertility and family policy in Norway-A reflection on trends and possible connections. Demographic Research, 10, 265-286.
17. Salakhutdinova R.R. (2018). Social assistance to rural families as a specific area of

social policy. *Economics and Management: Scientific and Practical Journal*, 1.

18. Shalin V.V. (1999). Polycultural education – the modern school problem. *Pedagogy*, 4(P. 3).

19. Shakbanova M.M., Gafiatulina N.Kh., Samygin S.I., Chapurko T.M., Levaya N.A., Bineeva N.K. (2018). Youth of the South of Russia: Specifics of manifestation of ethnic identity (on the example of the Dagestan republic). *Purusharta*, 10(2).

20. Tambiyants Y.G., Grin M.V., Shalin V.V., Chikaeva K.S., Spasova N.E. (2017). State-national ideology: methodological and practical problems. *Espacios*, 38(62), C. 16.

21. Vereshchagina, A. V., Gafiatulina, N. K., Kumykov, A. M., Stepanov, O. V., & Samygin, S. I. (2015). Gender Analysis of Social Health of Students. *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, 7, 223.