

DESTRUCTIVE FACTORS OF INTERETHNIC RELATIONSHIPS IN A MULTICULTURAL REGION: THE POSITION OF THE HOST POPULATION OF TATARSTAN

Tatiana Alekseyevna TITOVA*
Vadim Evgenyevich KOZLOV**
Elena Gennadyevna GUSCHINA***

In the last decades of the 20th century, liberal western society recognised the problem of minority groups as a social problem of discrimination.¹ In Russian regions this view is also being put forward. As a rule, the titular nations (e.g. the Tatars of Tatarstan) of the constituent territories of the Federation and the Russians living there have, until recently, been the main targets of academic research.² The nature of the relationship between these groups within the regional community has been the subject of research.³ There has been a tendency in recent years towards a rise in tension between the ethnic majority, which comprises the titular ethnic group and Russians living a region, and minority ethnic groups, who play an increasingly significant role in the social and economic life of regions.⁴ Tatarstan is no exception, as is proven by frequent displays of intolerance towards representatives of ethnic minorities. Despite the fact that the bulk of these displays are declarative or latent in character, real manifestations of xenophobia also occur.⁵

Any national identity contains rather complex, sometimes mutually exclusive elements, such as different structures and methods of self-

* Kazan Federal University, Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation; e-mail: tatiana.titova@rambler.ru.

** Kazan Federal University, Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation; e-mail: vadim-ekozlov@mail.ru.

*** Kazan Federal University, Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation; e-mail: e.g.gushchina@list.ru.

¹ Simon 2012.

² Busygin 1966; Vorobyev 1930; Iskhakov 2002.

³ Stolyarova 2004.

⁴ Gabdrakhmanova 2004.

⁵ Titova et al. 2010, p. 14.

definition or various ways of perceiving other national (internal) ethnic groups.⁶ At the same time the historical experience of Tatarstan still strongly influences the intensity and character of intergroup interactions which occur there in relation to the majority and minority. It was pointed out that

“Tatarstan is rather a specific region, since as a result of centuries-long interaction the population developed the mindset and mentality of the ‘intermediary pragmatist,’ an ethnsocial type familiar with the culture, customs, rules of everyday behaviour and interests of both sides.”⁷

A multi-paradigm approach was used as the basis for this study,⁸ complemented by certain points gleaned from studies on nationalism,⁹ socialisation,¹⁰ regional issues of minorities, experiences of being in an environment belonging to another nation,¹¹ and also F. Barth’s conception of the “social organisation of cultural differences.”¹²

The research methodology combined quantitative (surveys) and qualitative (in-depth interviews, focus groups, expert interview approaches).¹³ Using these methods, empirical data was accumulated by the authors in the cities and regional centres of the Republic of Tatarstan in the period of 2009-2013. In 2009, 1,300 respondents representing the host population of four cities of the republic - Kazan, Naberezhnye Chelny, Almetyevsk and Arsk - were interviewed.¹⁴ In 2013, 1,200 respondents representing the host population of five cities of the republic - Kazan, Naberezhnye Chelny, Nizhnekamsk, Chistopol and Laishevo - and seven districts - Alexeyevsky, Aktanyshsky, Drzhanovskly, Mamadyshsky, Vysokogorsky, Mendeleyevsky and Chistopolsky Districts - were interviewed. Eight focus groups and twenty interviews with the leaders of Tatarstan ethnic and cultural organisations and experts in interethnic cooperation in the region were held. Moreover, in 2013, 500 respondents representing diasporic ethnic minorities living in the territory of the Republic of Tatarstan were interviewed. Stratified quota sampling was used to interview the host population; the snow-ball sampling method was used to deal with the representatives of diasporic ethnic minorities.

⁶ Zdravomyslov 1997.

⁷ Mukhametshin, Isayev 1998, p. 6.

⁸ Drobizheva 2006.

⁹ Gellner 2009; Hobsbawm 1983.

¹⁰ Berger, Lukman 1995; Barth 1989.

¹¹ Titova 2007.

¹² Barth 2006.

¹³ Yadov 1995.

¹⁴ *Tatarstan* 2013, p. 5.

Tatarstan is a multiethnic republic, where the main ethnic groups are Tatars (53.2%) and Russians (39.7%).¹⁵ But the general smooth-running of the ethnic field of the Republic depends not only on the character of interaction between these ethnic majorities, but also on the interaction of representatives of these groups with those of ethnic minorities.¹⁶ In addition, it is necessary to emphasise that the Middle Volga Region is not only a multiethnic region, but is distinguished by academics as a historical and ethnographical region where some indigenous societies are dispersively settled. Such a society can formally be considered an ethnic minority within a particular Republic, but tends not to be perceived as such in the consciousness of the regional majority (for example, the Finno-Ugric and Turkic peoples of the region).¹⁷ Generally, local society traditionally includes those peoples who have a significant historical tradition here and who are ethnoculturally adapted (for example, the Ukrainians, the Volga Germans, the Jews, etc.) All such groups are considered as part of the host society within this investigation.

Analysis of results obtained from investigating attitudes amongst the host population makes it possible to identify some tendencies.

The representatives of ethnic majorities within the Republic of Tatarstan clearly differentiated between the representatives of different ethnic minorities. Indigenous minorities were perceived as “ours,” while minority groups phenotypically and ethnoculturally different from the local population were perceived ambiguously and sometimes negatively. This became evident as respondents’ answers were graded according to the Bogardus scale; also it was mentioned more than once by representatives of the ethnic minorities.¹⁸ In 2009 this dynamic was more distinctly displayed towards such groups as “Chechens” and “Georgians.” Furthermore, an ethnic group which may be characterised as an outcast group - the “Gypsies” - was identified: according to the results of the Bogardus scale-based analysis, the level of tolerance towards this group was found to be significantly lower than that for other groups of ethnic migrants. For example, when asked “Would you be prepared to accept representatives of this ethnic groups as your marriage partner or the marriage partner of your child?” positive responses were given about Turks by 21.1% of respondents; peoples of the Caucasus - 20.3%; Arabs - 18.8%; peoples of Central Asia - 18.6%; Georgians - 17.3%; Chechens - 16.4%; representatives

¹⁵ <http://www.an-tat.ru/?id=1709>, accessed 23 December 2013.

¹⁶ Titova et al. 2013, p. 15.

¹⁷ Stolyarova et al. 2007, p. 5.

¹⁸ <http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/socio/4627>, accessed 23 December 2013.

of Asian and eastern countries - 16.0%; and Africans - 15.4%. However, it was Gypsies who were seen most clearly as outsiders in terms of acceptability as potential marriage partners: only 8.9% of respondents were ready to accept representatives of this group in such a role.

Answers to the question "What feelings does living in the same city as representatives of the above-mentioned ethnic groups invoke in you?" revealed significant emotional opposition with regard to these ethnic groups. For example, respondents demonstrated rather an ambiguous attitude to such groups as the "Peoples of the Caucasus" and the "Peoples of Central Asia." 40.8% of those interviewed expressed a positive attitude to the former group and 36.5% a negative attitude. 40.9% expressed a positive attitude to the latter group and 36.1% a negative one. Respondents' attitudes towards the group "Georgians" was a little less positive, but at the same time also ambiguous: positive feelings about living in the same city as them were expressed by 34.5% and negative feelings by 37.6%. Concerning the groups "Chechens" and "Gypsies" unambiguously negative attitudes were expressed. Negative feelings about sharing a city with Chechens were declared by 49.2% of respondents and positive attitudes were expressed by only 29.7%. Results concerning "Gypsies" showed the critical non-acceptance of this group by the local population: 63.8% of respondents expressed negative feelings about living in the same city as them, while only 19% expressed positive feelings.

From the authors' point of view, the results described above testify to the existence of divergent attitudes in society, which are formed in the context of a contradictory information field - in particular the state-run media's official declarations of the value of interethnic tolerance and the simultaneous highlighting of ethnic factors when describing crimes and various conflict situations. Moreover, the facts suggest that intolerance, as a characteristic of social interaction between the local population and groups of ethnic migrants, does not carry a high risk of aggressiveness but appears mainly in the form of difficulties and problems in the process of learning and defining new ways of interaction on the part of the local inhabitants.

Analysis of the correlation between respondents' social attributes and their attitude towards migrant groups proved informative. A connection between the level of declared intolerance by representatives of the ethnic majority and socioeconomic factors was distinctly displayed. Rather unexpectedly, the least tolerant attitudes were demonstrated by respondents aged 36-45, despite the fact that the majority of earlier investigations show that, as a rule, lower levels of tolerance are more typical amongst the oldest age group (55 and above). However, comparing the answers of

representatives of different age groups to the question “If living in the same city as representatives of the afore-mentioned groups causes you discomfort, what is the reason for this?” it was possible to explain this unexpected result. It was found that the vast majority of those who chose the answer “the fear that they will take my job or the job of my relatives and friends” to explain the negative attitude of respondents in the 36-45 age group towards migrants. Since this group is one of the most economically active among all age groups, it is possible to conclude that competition in the labour market, which has increased during times of economic crisis, magnified the influence of economic background on interethnic tolerance.

The geographical factor was also found to be an important parameter, demonstrating a correlative dependence with the level of ethnic tolerance. Respondents in Almetyevsk and Naberezhnye Chelny demonstrated a higher level of tolerance than those in Kazan and Arsk. This may be explained by the fact that both Almetyevsk and Naberezhnye Chelny are young cities, which were initially formed as All-Union development areas and have a different citywide mentality, as well as a multiethnic population. In comparison with these cities, Kazan has preserved a stable ethnocultural landscape for a long time; however, it has been exposed to a rather intensive burst of migration in recent decades which, obviously, has influenced the self-sentiment of the city’s ethnic majority. The city of Arsk has a unique urban environment which is ethnically homogeneous, strongly marked by a conservative rural component which, apparently, was the determinative factor in the attitudes of respondents.

By contrast with the social parameters mentioned above, a connection between the level of interethnic tolerance and gender characteristics of respondents was not clearly defined. However, on the whole, men demonstrated a higher level of declared tolerance, to a statistical accuracy of 3-5%.

From these results, an attempt to model the social portrait of a representative of the ethnic majority who might be characterised as “less tolerant” than others produces a citizen of middle or elderly age, residing in a small town with a conservative, mono-ethnic cultural landscape, having an income of under 5,000 roubles per month, and in possession of well-established, standard stereotypes.

It should be emphasised that in the perception of the youth representing the host population, factors seen as contributing to the comfortable life of ethnic migrants in the Republic of Tatarstan were “tolerance by the local population” and (to a significantly lesser extent) “good living conditions.” At the same time, among the reasons given for

the uncomfortable life of ethnic migrants in the Republic of Tatarstan, “the intolerance of the local population” and “discrimination by the local population” were mentioned. For many of the young respondents who participated in focus groups, the reasons for such unfriendly attitudes were absolutely incomprehensible. Obviously, this is connected with internal ambivalence and confusion over their strategy of behaviour in relation to migrants in the Republic of Tatarstan, indicating that a definitive evaluation of their interethnic relationships has yet to become part of the worldview of these younger members of the host population. They are still in the process of thinking about and gradually forming their attitude towards interethnic interaction, which allows the avoidance of interpretations characterised as prejudices.

Within this study, respondents representing the host population were offered to define what, from their point of view, were the positive and negative points of having ethnic migrants live in the Republic of Tatarstan. Among the positive points “the joy of having an opportunity to communicate with the representatives of a different culture” (27.5%), “the thought that people of different nations and cultures live in our city is pleasing to me” (20.7%) and “the thought that all of us are different is pleasing to me” (14.9%) were mentioned. Nevertheless, such declarations of interethnic tolerance did not always reflect the respondent’s real attitude to this problem. For example, the vast majority of the respondents answered that their attitude to ethnic migrants would not change under any conditions. The second most frequent answer was “the attitude would be better if the number of these people in the city decreases.” In summary, this means that more than half the respondents were not ready to change their attitude towards these groups. Only one third of respondents suggested that their attitude might become better under certain conditions (the majority of them pointing out that their “attitude would become better if the representatives of ethnic migrant groups behave as the majority of citizens do,” “if their knowledge of the Russian language improves” and also “if I learned more about the characteristics of their culture from the mass media”).

The following negative attitudes towards migrants living in the Republic of Tatarstan proved to be of significance: “I worry about my own safety and the safety of my relatives” - 24.6%; “It is not pleasant for me to be in the same public places as them because of their behaviour” - 15.5%; “I am afraid that their presence increases the possibility of infectious diseases” - 10.2%; and finally, “their presence in the city irritates me” - 21.1%. The second and the fourth of these responses reflects the levels of

xenophobia (the non-acceptance of something different and distinct) spread throughout society. As well as disease, opponents of migration also considered migrants to be a source of crime and responsible for the presence of low quality goods and products. The perception that rising competition within the labour market is caused by the arrival of migrants, and the fear that migrants take jobs and cause a decrease in rates of pay were also widespread amongst the local population.

Ideas about levels of migration and the sphere of activity of arriving migrants were complemented by stereotypes regarding the ethnic composition of this group. Approximately half the focus group participants supposed that it was mainly people from the Caucasus coming to the city. Amongst questionnaire respondents from the ethnic majority, almost one in three were sure that Azerbaijanis prevailed among those arriving in the city, while another third thought that migrants mainly consisted of people from Central Asia, and also expressed the assumption that Tajiks and Uzbeks prevailed among immigrants.

The results of this investigation confirmed the authors' hypothesis regarding the increasing influence of real and perceived social and economic factors on the perception of migrants by the host population. In particular, the less tolerant attitudes demonstrated by respondents in the middle age category are, in the authors' opinion, the direct consequence of fears over job security under conditions of rising competition in the labour market as a result of social and economic instability. It is worth mentioning that psychological factors play an important role, since these kinds of misgivings reflect the level of social frustration amongst this socio-demographic group rather than actual reality.

According to results from the 2013 research period, the most negative feelings amongst representatives of the host population were evoked by such ethnic groups as the Uzbeks, Tajiks and Azerbaijanis, the representatives of whom local people mainly dealt with at the market. 60% of Russians and 54% of Tatars interviewed felt discomfort at living in the same city as Uzbeks; 62% of Russians and 60% of Tatars felt this way about Tajiks; and 60% of Russians and 53% of Tatars expressed the same attitude towards Azerbaijanis.

Data obtained through in-depth interviews confirmed the existence of an apparent distance between the host population and the groups of migrants being studied:

“When migrants come here, we don't know what they're talking about. They look down on us, look on us with a jaundiced eye. They have come to dominate the space in which we live. And they see us as simpletons. These people are impudent and, I guess, enterprising” (a Tatar man, 43 years old).

Experts consider there to be no cause, as of yet, for social strain as a result of migrants living in the republic:

“We have a stable situation now: people who come from Central Asia haven’t yet reached a critical mass, though their numbers keep growing. They irritate some people, but it is necessary to get used to it; it is one of the costs of economic progress: people will come to better places.” (a Tatar man, 43 years old).

However, this investigation has shown that representatives of the local population sometimes demonstrate a low level of readiness for interethnic contacts, and the closer the level of contact, the less ready they are for interaction.

Generally speaking, respondents demonstrated a fairly high level of readiness to accept the representatives of different ethnic groups as the inhabitants of their locality. For example, half of all Russian and Tatar respondents were ready to accept Uzbeks, and one in three were ready to accept Tajiks and Azerbaijanis. Regarding Jews, Russian and Tatar respondents showed a greater willingness to interact: in spite of the fact one third of the respondents said that they almost never dealt with Jews, 59.8% of Russians and one in two Tatars were ready to accept them as inhabitants of their locality. In this case the Jews, who undoubtedly belong to the local population, are considered as an alien group with a long local history in the mass consciousness of Russian society. Concerning Arabs and Turks, Russian respondents demonstrated a lower level of readiness for interaction: 39.7% of Russians and 49.3% of Tatars were ready to accept them. The respondents expressed the lowest level of readiness to interact in relation to Gypsies: only one fifth of Tatar and Russian respondents were ready to accept them.

One in three respondents among Russians and Tatars were prepared to make friends with Uzbeks; one in four with Tajiks, Azerbaijanis, Arabs and Turks; nearly 39.7% Russian respondents and one in four Tatar respondents were ready to see Jews as their friends. Willingness to make friends with Gypsies was expressed by 10% of respondents.

One in ten Russians were ready to accept Uzbeks, Tajiks, Azerbaijanis, Arabs, Turks as a husband or wife or a marriage partner of their child or relative; one in five respondents were prepared to accept a Jew as a relative by marriage, but only 4.8% would accept Gypsies. Amongst Tatars, one in six respondents expressed readiness to accept an Uzbek as their relative; one in seven were ready to accept a Turk or an Arab, one in eight a Tajik, Azerbaijani or Jew, and again, 4.8% a Gypsy.

The lowest level of readiness for interaction was demonstrated by respondents in relation to marriage contacts with the representatives of other nations. 6.7% of Russian respondents were ready to accept an Uzbek, an Arab or a Turk as their or their child's marriage partner; 5.8% were ready to accept a Tajik or Azerbaijani. While 15.7% would accept a Jew, only 5.5% would accept a Gypsy. Amongst Tatar respondents, 9.9% were ready to accept a Turk or an Arab as a marriage partner; 6.9% would accept an Uzbek or a Jew; 5.6% a Tajik and 3.7% an Azerbaijani.

A quarter of respondents representing the local population felt that their relationships with Uzbeks, Tajiks and Azerbaijanis might be better if "they behaved as local people do." One in six Russian and one in seven Tatar respondents felt that migrants must improve their knowledge of the Russian language. One in ten respondents felt the same way about Jews, Arabs and Turks. One third of local respondents declared that their attitude towards Uzbeks, Tajiks, Azerbaijanis and Gypsies would never change. One in seven Tatars and Russians felt that their attitude to Uzbeks, Tajiks and Azerbaijanis would improve if the number of representatives of these nations living in Tatarstan decreased. One in ten respondents held the same opinion in relation to Turks and Arabs.

Local inhabitants were not very interested in being better informed about the distinctive cultural practices of migrants. 4.8% of Russian respondents and one in ten Tatars felt they needed to know more about the culture of Uzbeks, Tajiks and Azerbaijanis, although one in six respondents expressed a desire to know more about the culture of Jews, Arabs and Turks.

Comparison of the results of the 2013 research with those of 2009 indicates an increased level of intolerance towards migrants amongst representatives of the host community. In particular, in 2013 56.3% of respondents stated that they felt discomfort as a result of living in the same city as migrants, whereas in 2009 this opinion had been expressed by only 32% of the sample. The above-mentioned concerns of the local population resulting from the increase in the number of migrants may be one possible cause of this point of view. One in two Russian and Tatar respondents considered the number of Uzbeks, Tajiks and Azerbaijanis to have increased recently.

"There is the negative experience of Europe, where an increase in the number of migrants is also observed. There are Tajiks and Uzbeks among our students, although there are not so many of them, therefore they behave quietly. But from my army experience I remember that if their number increases they will behave in a different way. And when five families appear in our area instead of two, as it is now, they will play first fiddle. When they

are together, they hold on to each other. They are united and dictate their will to society” (a Tatar man, 55 years old).

The appeal to the opinion of the majority for legitimization of one’s own opinion has been revealed as a typical trait. For example, more than 60% of respondents consider that more than a half the inhabitants of their locality have the same attitude to migrants as they do.

External attribution of ethnic intolerance is the consequence of complicated and contradictory processes operating at a deep psychological level which are hard to analyse quantitatively. However, according to the analysis of respondents’ answers it is possible to state that the representatives of the ethnic majority hold controversial attitudes towards ethnic minorities (migrants) in the Republic of Tatarstan. This is obvious from the answers of the younger representatives the host population, which testified to the fact that the appreciation of interethnic relationships has not become part of the world view of these young people yet.

On the one hand, a high level of interethnic tolerance is declared. For example, among the positive points, “the joy of having an opportunity to communicate with the representatives of a different culture,” “the thought that people of different nations and cultures live in our city is pleasant to me,” “the thought that all of us are different is pleasant to me” were mentioned. On the other hand, analysing the everyday situations modelled in this survey in detail, we can observe intolerant attitudes towards the representatives of the ethnic minorities. For instance, more than half the respondents felt that their “attitude to the representatives of ethnic minorities (migrants) will never change” or that their “attitude would change if the number of representatives of these nations living in Tatarsan decreases.” Only one third of respondents confirmed that their attitude might improve under certain conditions. Amongst this group, the most widespread answers were: “my attitude would improve if the representatives of ethnic minorities behaved as the majority of citizens do,” or “if they improved their knowledge of the Russian language,” and also “if I learned more about the peculiarities of their culture from the mass media.”

The views of representatives of the host population correlated with the social attributions of respondents: the degree of declared tolerance was influenced by social and economic factors and the internal psychological background connected with the sex and age characteristics of respondents.

Participants of the focus-groups representing the ethnic majority considered the main positive points in relation to migrants living in the Republic of Tatarstan to be connected with economic factors: “migrants do the jobs local people don’t want to do,” “migrants supply cheap goods and

products,” and “migrants build and repair houses and flats at a low price and with high quality.” Some participants pointed out social advantages such as “the improvement of the demographic situation,” and “expansion of the ethnic and cultural variety of the city.” Negative points concerning the presence of migrants living in the Republic of Tatarstan included: “I worry about my own safety and the safety of my relatives,” “it is not pleasant for me to be in the same public places as them because of their behaviour,” “I am afraid that their presence increases the possibility of infectious diseases” and finally, “their presence in the city irritates me.”

It is important to note that the character of interaction between ethnic minority representatives and those of the host society appears quite contradictory. The positive attitude displayed by the significant part of the host population is appreciated by the representatives of ethnic minorities. But despite this, most of the minorities investigated in the Republic of Tatarstan still had grave misgivings connected with everyday manifestations of unfriendliness from the local population.

Nevertheless, when representatives from the largest groups of diasporic minorities were asked, the majority declared a high level of satisfaction with the results of their arrival in the republic: 38.0% of respondents said their expectations of coming to Tatarstan were completely satisfied and 47.5% said their expectations were almost completely satisfied. Only 5.5% of respondents felt that their expectations had proved to be wrong. Given this high level of satisfaction with life in Tatarstan, respondents’ answers to the question of where they would migrate to if they had the chance to choose again are logical. 68.5% of respondents stated that they would choose Tatarstan again, 19.5% would stay in their native country if possible, and only 3.0% replied that they would choose another region of Russia.

Analysing the results from the investigations of 2009 and 2013, not only can an increased level of intolerance towards migrants be observed on the part of the host population, but also a shift in some of the key motivating factors for this intolerance. In particular, in the 2009 study, socioeconomic competition was one of the main reasons declared for negative relations with migrants, influenced by the serious economic crisis of 2008-2009. In 2013 the actualisation level of this factor had returned to within statistical norms and socio-psychological factors had instead become determinant. In order of importance to the representatives of the host population, these factors manifested in a greater concern over the behaviour of ethnic minority people in the host society; the ethnic background of ethnic minorities; changes to the socio-demographic makeup in the region;

and the opinion of representatives of ethnic minorities about their new place of residence and the host society. In any given situation, the influence of these factors may be multi-faceted or combined, but determinant in any case.

Thus, the process of the intergroup polarisation has not yet caused any permanent perceptual defects and may be amenable to change depending on the particular nature of ethnic contact and the specific migration situation.

Destructive Factors of Interethnic Relationships in a Multicultural Region: The Position of the Host Population of Tatarstan

(Abstract)

In the last decades of the 20th century, liberal western society recognised the problem of minority groups as a social problem of discrimination. As a rule, the titular ethnic group (e.g. the Tatars of Tatarstan) of the constituent territories of the Federation and the Russians living there have, until recently, been the main targets of academic research. The nature of the relationship between these groups within the regional community has been the subject of research.

Recent years have seen a rise in tension between the ethnic majority, which comprises the titular ethnic group and Russians living a region, and minority ethnic groups, who play an increasingly significant role in the social and economic life of the regions. Tatarstan is no exception, as is proven by frequent displays of intolerance towards representatives of ethnic minorities. Despite the fact that the bulk of these displays are declarative or latent in character, real manifestations of xenophobia also occur.

From the results of this empirical study, various factors influencing the formation of attitudes amongst representatives of the ethnic majority towards ethnic minorities were distinguished. These include (in order of the importance they were given by respondents) the behaviour of the ethnic minorities in the host society; the ethnic background of the representatives of the ethnic minorities; changes to the socio-demographic situation in the region; and the opinion of representatives of the ethnic minorities about the new place of residence and the host society. In any situation the influence of these factors may be multi-faceted or combined, but determinant in any case. Thus, the process of intergroup polarisation has not yet caused permanent perceptual defects and may be amenable to change depending on the particular nature of ethnic contact and the specific migration situation.

Bibliographical Abbreviations

- Barth 1989 - Fredrik Barth, *Analysis of Culture in Complex Societies*, in *Ethnos*, 4, 1989, p. 120-142.
- Barth 2006 - Fredrik Barth, *Etnicheskiye gruppy i socialnyye granitsy*, Moscow, 2006.

- Berger, Lukman 1995 - Peter Berger, Thomas Lukman, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge*, Moscow, 1995.
- Busygin 1966 - Evgeniy Busygin, *Russkoye selskoye naseleniye srednego Povolzh'ya*, Kazan, 1966.
- Drobizheva 2006 - Leokardiya Drobizheva, *Metodologicheskiye problemy etnosociologicheskikh issledovaniy*, in *SZ*, 3-4, 2006, p. 89-101.
- Gabdrakhmanova 2004 - Gulnara Gabdrakhmanova, *Rol migracii v preobrazovanii etnicheskoy struktury Tatarstana*, in *SI*, 6, 2004, p. 62-68.
- Gellner 2009 - Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell, 2009.
- Hobsbawm 1983 - Eric Hobsbawm, *Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, 1983.
- Iskhakov 2002 - Damir Iskhakov, *Tatary. Kratkaya etnicheskaya istoriya*, Kazan, 2002.
- Mukhametshin, Isayev 1998 - Farid Mukhametshin, Georgiy Isayev, *Respublika Tatarstan v zerkale obshchestvennogo mneniya (90-ye gody. Socialno-economiceskij aspekt)*, Kazan, 1998.
- Simon 2012 - Thomas W. Simon, *Ethnic Identity and Minority Protection: Designation, Discrimination, and Brutalization*, Lanham, 2012.
- Stolyarova 2004 - Guzel Stolyarova, *Fenomen mezhetnicheskogo vzaimodeistviya: opyt postsovetskogo Tatarstana*, Kazan, 2004.
- Stolyarova et al. 2007 - Guzel Stolyarova, Tatiana Titova, Lidiya Toksubaeva, *Etnografiya narodov Volgo-Uraliya*, Kazan, 2007.
- Tatarstan 2013 - *Respublika Tatarstan: kratkiy geographicheskiy spravochnik*, Kazan, 2013.
- Titova 2007 - Tatiana Titova, *Etnicheskkiye menshinstva v Tatarstane: status, identichnost, kultura*, Kazan, 2007.
- Titova et al. 2010 - Tatiana Titova, Vadim Kozlov, Rinar Kushaev, Sagid Dzhaksybaev, *Etnicheskkiye menshinstva v Tatarstane: teorii, strategii i praktiki mezhetnicheskogo vzaimodeistviya*, Kazan, 2010.
- Titova et al. 2013 - Tatiana Titova, Vadim Kozlov, Elena Frolova, *Diaspory i soobshchestva migrantov v Respublike Tatarstan: etnosociologicheskiye ocherki*, Kazan, 2013.
- Vorobyev 1930 - Nickolay Vorobyev, *Materialnaya kultura kazanskikh tatar (opyt etnograficheskogo issledovaniya)*, Kazan, 1930.
- Yadov 1995 - Vladimir Yadov, *Sociologicheskoye issledovaniye: metodologiya, programma, metody*, Samara, 1995.
- Zdravomyslov 1997 - Andrey Zdravomyslov, *Relyativistskaya teoriya natsiy i reflektivnaya politika*, in *ONS*, 4, 1997, p. 115-122.

Keywords: interethnic relationship, multiethnic, multicultural, region, ethnic minorities, discrimination, ethnic majority.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AA	- Acta Archaeologica. Copenhagen.
AAL	- Asien Africa Lateinamerika. Zeitschrift des Zentralen Rates für Asien-, Afrika- und Lateinamerikawissenschaften in der DDR. Berlin.
AAMT	- Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory. Orlando.
AAnt	- American Antiquity. Society for American Archaeology. Washington.
ABM	- Alaska Business Monthly. Anchorage.
Acta Asiatica	- Acta Asiatica. Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture. Tokyo.
AO	- Arkheologicheskoye otkrytiya (1965-2013). Moscow.
AOASH	- Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Institute of Oriental Studies. Budapest.
AP	- Arkheologiya Podmoskov'ya. Materialy nauchnogo seminara. Institute of Archaeology Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
ArchOttoman	- Archivum Ottomanicum. Wiesbaden Ottoman Archives. Wiesbaden.
Ars Judaica	- Ars Judaica. Bar-Ilan University. Ramat Gan.
Art-menedzher	- Art-menedzher. Business magazine considering culture and art as a resource for the social and economic development of society and offering various technologies and methodologies of management of this process. Moscow.
Bibliosphera	- Bibliosphera. The Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Novosibirsk.
BKF	- Baltiiskii filologicheskii kurer. Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University. Kaliningrad.
BM	- Byulleten' Moskovskogo obshchestva ispytateley prirody. Otdel biologicheskoy. Moscow Society of Naturalists. Moscow.
BMMS	- Byulleten Muzeya Marka Shagala. Marc Chagall Museum. Vitebsk.
Byilyie godyi	- Byilyie godyi. Sochi State University. Sochi.
CAn	- Current Anthropology. Chicago.
CHR	- The Canadian Historical Review. University of Toronto Press. Toronto.

CIS	- Culturologicheskie issledovania Sibiri. Omsk State University. Omsk.
Comparativ	- Comparativ. Leipziger Beiträge zur Universalgeschichte und vergleichenden Gesellschaftsforschung. Universität Leipzig, Global and European Studies Institute. Leipzig.
CRJ	- Classical Reception Journal. The Open University (UK). Oxford.
Den'gi	- Den'gi. Publishing House "Kommersant." Moscow.
EDV	- Ekonomicheskaya zhizn Dalnego Vostoka. Geographic Society. Khabarovsk, Amur.
EHQ	- European History Quarterly. University of London. London.
EJNH	- European Journal of Natural History. The Russian Academy of Natural History. Moscow.
Ethnos	- Ethnos. Journal of Anthropology. London.
Études/Inuit/Studies	- Études/Inuit/Studies. Association Inuksiutiit Katimajit Inc. Québec.
EZ	- Evolucijazni na Zemle. Tomsk State University. Tomsk.
Femida	- Femida. Media Corporation "ZAN." Almaty.
Florilegium	- Florilegium. The journal of the Canadian Society of Medievalists. Ottawa.
Forsait	- Forsait. Higher School of Economy. Moscow.
Francia	- Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte, hg. vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris (Institut Historique Allemand). Paris.
Fundamental Research	- Fundamental Research. Russian Academy of Natural History. Moscow.
Genetics	- Genetics. Genetics Society of America. Bethesda (USA).
Genetika	- Genetika. Russian Journal of Genetics. Moscow State University. Moscow.
Geologiya i geofizika	- Geologiya i geofizika. Institute of Geology and Geophysics of the Siberian Department of the Science Academy in the USSR, Novosibirsk. Published by the Siberian department of the Science Academy in the USSR. Novosibirsk.
Gyanovashchya	- Gyanovashchya. Dnepropetrovsk State University. Dnepropetrovsk.
HN	- Hraniteli naslediya. Altay State Pedagogical Academy. Barnaul.
HZ	- Historische Zeitschrift. Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main.
Karavan	- Karavan (newspaper). Almaty.
KAS	- Der Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung - Auslandsinformationen. Berlin.

KPZ	- Kazanskij pedagogicheskij zhurnal. Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology. Kazan.
IAIAND	- Istoriko-arkheologicheskie issledovaniya v g. Azove i na Nizhnem Donu v 2006 g., Don.
Istoriografiya	- Istoriografiya i istochnikovedenie istorii stran Azii i Afriki. Leningrad State University. Leningrad.
Istoriya i sovremennost'	- Istoriya i sovremennost'. Moscow.
Izvestia Ugo	- Izvestija Ugo-Zapadnogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Kursk.
IzvSamarsk	- Izvestiya Samarskogo nauchnogo tsentra RAN. Samara.
JBAA	- Journal of the British Archaeological Association, British Archaeological Association. London.
Kulturnoe nasledie	- Kulturnoe nasledie. Altai State University, Altai Territory, Barnaul.
Lesnoi Zhurnal	- Lesnoi Zhurnal. Izvestiia Vysshikh Uchebnykh Zavedenii. Bulletin of Higher Educational Institution. Arkhangelsk.
LKK	- Literatura i kultura v Kitae. Moscow.
LSJ	- Life Science Journal. Acta Zhengzhou University Overseas. Zhengzhou University. New York.
JAMT	- Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory. New York.
JAR	- Journal of Archaeological Research. Journal of Archaeological Research. New York.
JISV	- Jekonomicheskie i istoricheskie issledovaniya na Severo-Vostoke SSSR. Economic and historical research in the North-East of the USSR. Magadan.
KT	- Kazakhskaya tsivilizatsiya. University Kaimar Almaty. Almaty.
Marketing	- Marketing. Centre for Marketing Research and Management. Moscow.
MBD	- Molodyye v bibliotechnom dele. Youth in Library Science. Moscow.
MEJSR	- Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research. International scientific journal published by the international digital organization for scientific information (IDOSI).
Memoirs SAA	- Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology. Society for American Archaeology. Washington DC.
MENP	- Materialy po evolycii nazemnykh pozvochnykh. Moscow.
MIA	- Materialy po istorii i archeologii SSSR. Moscow, Saint Petersburg.
MIFFK	- Materialy po istorii fauny i flory Kazahstana. Kazakhstan.

Mir bibliografii	- Mir bibliografii. Moscow.
Mir obrazovaniya	- Mir obrazovaniya - obrazovanie v mire. Scientific-Methodological Journal. Moscow Psychology and Sociology Institute. Moscow.
MNKO	- Mir Nauki, Kul'tury, Obrazovaniya. Gorno-Altaysk.
Molodezh' Tatarstana	- Molodezh' Tatarstana. Newspaper. Kazan.
MUSEUM	- MUSEUM. UNESCO.
Narodnaya shkola	- Narodnaya shkola. Saint Petersburg.
Nauchnoye obozreniye	- Nauchnoye obozreniye, series 2, Gumanitarniye nauki. Lomonosov Moscow State University. Moscow.
Nauch.-tekhn. Inform	- Nauchnaya i tekhnicheskaya informatsiya. Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
Naukovedeniye	- Naukovedeniye. Institute of History of Natural Sciences and Technics named after S. I. Vavilov of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
Neues Leben	- Neues Leben [newspaper]. Berlin.
NIV	- Novyy istoricheskiy vestnik. Obshchestvo s ogranichennoj otvetstvennost'yu "Izdatel'stvo Ippolitova." Moscow.
NKOGK	- Obshchestvo i gosudarstvo v Kitae: XXXIX nauchnaia konferentsiia. Moscow.
NNZ	- Novgorod i Novgorodskaya zemlya. Istoriya i arkhologiya. Veliki Novgorod.
Novosti	- Russian News Agency "Novosti." Moscow.
NT	- Nauchnyi Tatarstan. Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan. Kazan.
NTB	- Nauchnyye i tekhnicheskiye biblioteki. The State Public Scientific and Technical Library Russia. Moscow.
Odyssey	- Odyssey. Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Universal History. Moscow.
ONS	- Obshchestvennuyye nauki i sovremennost. Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
OT	- Otechestvennyye zapiski. Saint Petersburg.
Panorama iskusstv	- Panorama iskusstv. Sovetskii khudozhnik. Moscow.
Pervye amerikancy	- Pervye amerikancy. First Americans (Almanac). Russian Society of Indianists. Saint Petersburg.
PGI	- Problemi Gumanitarnih Issledovaniy. Russian State Institute for Regional Issues in Northern Caucasus. Pyatigorsk.
Polar Record	- Polar Record. A Journal of Arctic and Antarctic Research. Scott Polar Research Institute. Cambridge (UK).
Politische Wissenschaft	- Politische Wissenschaft. Deutsche Hochschule für Politik Berlin.

Polzunovskiy vestnik	- Polzunovskiy vestnik. Altay State Technical University. Barnaul.
Pozdneplejstocenovy	- Pozdneplejstocenovy i rannegolocenovy kul'turnye svyazi Azii i Ameriki. Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy. Novosibirsk.
Prizrenie	- Prizrenie i blagotvoritel'nost' v Rossii. Izdanie Vserossijskogo sojuza uchrezhdenij, obshhestv i dejatelej po obshhestvennomu i chastnomu prizreniju. Saint Petersburg.
Problemi filosofii	- Problemi filosofii. Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
Proceedings Volgograd	- Proceedings of the Volgograd State Pedagogical University. Volgograd.
PsZ	- Psikhologicheskij zhurnal. Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
PT	- Perspectives on Terrorism. The Terrorism Research Initiative (TRI) headquartered in Vienna, and the Center for Terrorism and Security Studies (CTSS) headquartered at the University of Massachusetts' Lowell campus. Massachusetts.
RA	- Rossiiskaia Arkheologija. Moscow.
Reka vremen	- Reka vremen. Moscow.
Rivista di Bizantinistica	- Rivista di Bizantinistica. Bologna.
RossEconom	- Rossiski ekonomicheski jurnal. International Academy of Business and Management. Moscow.
Rossiyskaya Gazeta	- Rossiyskaya Gazeta. Russian government daily newspaper. Moscow.
SA	- Sovetskaja Arkheologija. Institute of Archaeology, Russia, Moscow. Moscow.
SC	- Sviyazhskie chteniya. Sviyazhsk.
Scientometrics	- Scientometrics. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest.
Serdalo	- Obschenacionalnaya gaseta Respubliki Ingushetiya "Serdalo." Nazran.
SGV	- Saratovskie gubernskie vedomosti. Saratov.
Shagalovskii sbornik	- Shagalovskii sbornik. Marc Chagall Museum. Minsk.
SI	- Sociologicheskije issledovaniya. Science Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
Soziale Geschichte	- Soziale Geschichte. Zeitschrift für historische Analyse des 20. und 21. Jahrhunderts. Bremen.
Spectrum	- Spectrum. The Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies. Astana.
SS	- Sibirskaya stolitsa. Tobolsk State Historical and Architectural Museum-Reserve. Tobolsk.

SSM	- Social Sciences and Modernity. The Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences "Science." Moscow.
SV	- Sovremennaya filologiya. Ufa.
SZ	- Sociologicheskiy zhurnal. Moscow.
Tarih Dergisi	- Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi. Istanbul.
TKA	- Tulski kraevedchesky almanah. Tula.
Tradizionnaya kultura	- Tradizionnaya kultura. An academic almanac representing the perspective direction in complex study of ethnoculture: national outlook, pedagogics, life, mythology, customs, ceremonies, poetry and music. Moscow.
Trudovaya pomoshch'	- Trudovaya pomoshch'. Izdanie Popechitel'stva o trudovoj pomoshhi. Saint Petersburg.
Vestnik AAJ	- Vestnik arheologii, antropologii i jetnografii. Institute of Problems of Development of the North, Russia. Tyumen.
Vestnik Chelyabinsk	- Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, Istoriya. Publishing house of Chelyabinsk State University. Chelyabinsk.
Vestnik Chuvashskogo	- Vestnik Chuvashskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im I. Ya. Yakovleva. I. Y. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University. Cheboksary.
VestKrasno	- Vestnike Krasnoyarskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta imeni V. P. Astafeva. Krasnojarskiy gosudarstvennyj pedagogicheskij universitet im. V. P. Astafeva. Krasnojarsk.
Vestnik Kazak	- Vestnik Akademii nauk Kazakhskoy SSR. Academy of Science of the Kazakh SSR. Kazakhstan.
Vestnik RAN	- Vestnik Rossiyskoy Akademii Nauk. Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
Vestnik Samara	- Vestnik Samarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Samara State University. Samara.
Vestn Tomsk Gos Univ.	- Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Kul'turologiya i iskusstvovedeniye. Bulletin of Tomsk State University. Tomsk.
Vestnik Semej	- Vestnik gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni Shakarima goroda Semej. Shakarim State University of Semej.
Vestnik Ufa	- Vestnik Vostochnoy ekonomiko-yuridicheskoy gumanitarnoy akademii. East Economic-Legal Humanitarian Academy. Ufa.
Vestnik VyatGGU	- Vestnik Vyatskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta: Vyatka State University of Humanities. Kirov.

Vizantiysky vremennik	- Vizantiysky vremennik. Institute of General History of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
Voprosy Istorii	- Voprosy Istorii. Russian academic journal for historical studies. The Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
Voprosi Literaturny	- Voprosi Literaturny. Writer's Union of the USSR. Moscow.
Voprosy filosofii	- Voprosy filosofii. Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow.
VTP	- Istoricheskiye, filosofskiy, politicheskiye i yuridicheskiye nauki, kul'turologiya i iskusstvovedeniye. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. Tambov.
WASJ	- World Applied Sciences Journal. International Digital Organization Scientific for Information "IDOSI Publications" UAE. Dubai.
Zapiski	- Zapiski Vostochnogo otdeleniya Russkogo arkhologicheskogo obshchestva. Archaeological Society. Saint Petersburg.
ZDMG	- Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Berlin Magazine of the German East Society. Berlin.