



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898473*

RFC: ATII20618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticayvalores.com/>

Año: VI

Número: Edición Especial

Artículo no.:48

Período: Marzo, 2019.

TÍTULO: La familia y los niños en el sistema de las instalaciones vitales de los jóvenes del sur de Rusia. Un estudio sociológico.

AUTORES:

1. Anna V. Vereshchagina.
2. Valery V. Kasyanov.
3. Dmitry V. Krotov.
4. Anna T. Latysheva.
5. Larisa I. Kobysheva.
6. Larisa N. Tutova.
7. Elvira M. Zagirova.

RESUMEN: En el artículo se discute la posición y el estado de la familia en el entorno social, así como su percepción en la sociedad rusa moderna. De acuerdo con los resultados de nuestro estudio, identificamos que existe una actitud negativa hacia la falta de hijos voluntaria en la mente masiva de los pueblos de Daguestán. Aunque muchos de los encuestados indicaron que el propósito principal de una mujer es ser madre; al mismo tiempo, los encuestados se refieren a las familias sin hijos y en especial a aquellas que se quedaron sin hijos debido a la condición de uno de los cónyuges.

PALABRAS CLAVES: familia sin hijos, falta de hijos voluntaria, crisis familiar.

TITLE: Family and Children in the system of vital installations of youth of the South of Russia. A sociological study.

AUTHORS:

1. Anna V. Vereshchagina.
2. Valery V. Kasyanov.
3. Dmitry V. Krotov.
4. Anna T. Latysheva.
5. Larisa I. Kobysheva.
6. Larisa N. Tutova.
7. Elvira M. Zagirova.

ABSTRACT: The article discusses the position and state of the family in the social environment, as well as its perception in modern Russian society. According to the results of our study, we identify that there is a negative attitude toward the lack of voluntary children in the massive minds of the people of Dagestan. Although many of the respondents indicated that the main purpose of a woman is to be a mother; at the same time, the respondents refer to families without children and especially those who were left without children due to the condition of one of the spouses.

KEY WORDS: childless family, voluntary childlessness, family crisis.

INTRODUCTION.

There is the crisis of the family institution, especially in Western countries. Therefore, we have the question about the spiritual and moral state of the world community and the social and cultural risks of social health, specifically Western countries in which alternative types of families are actively

promoted and legalized (Natalya, et al. 2018). That is same-sex marriage and freedom of sexual behavior. Moreover, recognition of such as marriage union is declared a necessary sign of civilization of the country. And those states that have not yet reached the recognition of such a form of marriage are accused of violating human rights. For example, Russia is accused of promoting homosexuality among minors in it. And there are such very tolerant public figures in our country. They stand for "sexual education", including about non-traditional sexual orientation, starting from the lower grades. They refer to advanced civilized Europe. Komov who is representative of Russia and the CIS at the World Congress of Families noted that it was recommended "to repeal the law against the promotion of homosexuality by minors, and even explain the rights of sex minorities to children at the United Nation meeting devoted to the rights of the child. In other words, the United Nation imposes ideas on sovereign states, invented by some pseudoscientific centers, public organizations protecting the rights of homosexuals, etc. At the same time, no one tells children that the homosexuals have higher risk of contracting AIDS and hepatitis. It is about 20 times. They have a high suicide rate, alcoholism, drug addiction than in other sectors of society. It is clear that a normal family will be excluded from the number of institutions vital for the preservation of moral laws in the life of people in such a situation (Daragan, Margovskaya, 2014: 2).

Many problems in modern society are explained by the fact that the family itself has weakened, which is traumatic for society in general, and young people in particular (Natalya et al, 2018). Children were raised, instilled in them the moral and ethical rules of social being and behavior in it. Moreover, it can be argued that the family does not fulfill its functions. Of course, the educational process is trying to completely pass on to the parents' shoulders, then to the schools. However, it is unlikely to bring the desired results without their close cooperation and cooperation because education is laborious, requiring a lot of patience and full efficiency.

The status and role of a woman has changed in the information society (Vereshchagina, et al. 2015). She has become involved in the most complex social processes for objective reasons. In addition, the woman herself leads an active lifestyle. She does business, politics. Respectively, she has little time and energy to raise children. Juvenile justice makes its own, sometimes negative, contribution. One part has the position that the state is the owner of all children and their upbringing to their parents for a while.

According to representatives of juvenile justice when there is violation of the rights of the child, the state has the right, through a juvenile court, to take away their parents' children from parents, or to assign them to the “necessary” education of social workers, representatives of guardianship bodies, etc. Another part insists that parents have a priority right in raising their children as they see fit. Those who oppose the rules and norms of juvenile justice, they fear unreasonable state intervention in their family.

Along with juvenile justice are protects the rights of the child, and we can see a negative attitude towards large families in society. There is a demographic crisis in our country. It is not able to cope with this very urgent and topical a problem despite the material encouragement of parents. We can find the opinion “Why produce poverty?” in the public mind of the Russians.

Thus, a demographic problem is becoming important now. It became very acute in the post-Soviet period. The demographic situation deteriorated dramatically in the early 1990-th due to the political, economic, social and moral degradation caused by the destruction of the Soviet Union. It was manifested in the so-called “Russian cross”, i.e. in the graph of the intersection of birth and death rates in 1992 and excess of deaths over births in the subsequent. And we still cannot recover from this shock (Noskova, 2012: 65).

Death in the near future marriages of convenience, the elimination of late marriages, the strengthening of emotional ties with relatives, reducing the number of childless and incomplete families at the end of the 70th XX century. However, "a quarter of a century has passed, and, nevertheless, there are no signs, for example, reducing single-parent families on the contrary, their share increases from year to year" (Golod, 2003: 1 06). Meanwhile, in the opinion of native demographers, it is necessary on average 2,5 children per woman (we now have 1., children) to maintain the population of the country at the current level. Accordingly, half of the women in Russia should have four to five children, because someone will have no children at all, someone only has one child, etc. The state has been taking the right steps in solving the demographic problem and strengthening the status of the family in last year's (Gryshai, et al. 2018), and although the maternity capital or the issuance of free land plots are rather symbolic incentives, which in real life are quite difficult to obtain, nevertheless, even such measures change the atmosphere in the family and marriage sphere announced by the state.

Thus, one of the main directions of solving the demographic problem is an increase in the birth rate, an increase in the number of children in the family. Small families are dominated in the family structure of Russia now. Only 6 percent of families raise three or more children (in Western European countries, the figure is 12–15 percent) (Antonov, 2017). In other words, the preservation of the Russian people is possible only with a significant increase in the proportion of families with three or more children.

Of course, the Russian authorities are aware of the complexity of the problem and several steps were taken to implement it, including the adoption of the Law of the Russian Federation "On Additional Measures of State Support for Families with Children" in 2006. It is a maternity capital for women giving birth to their second child. "Concept of Russia's demographic policy until 2025" was approved in Russia in 2007. At the same time, the question arises of whether the measures

taken are capable of changing the situation in the demographic sphere and the demographic behavior of the Russians? An in-depth analysis of the family and marital sphere carried out by native familists. It showed that there is crisis, loss of family value as such (Vaskov, et al. 2018), changes in reproductive attitudes among women who are more career oriented and career growth in the era of globalization, and only after reaching their goals do, they plan children and then no more than one child in it now.

In connection with the above, it seems to establish the causes and factors that impede the implementation of state policy in increasing the share of large families in the structure of the population of Russia when we are analyzing the demographic situation in the country (Madina, et al. 2016).

By the famous Russian familist S.I. Golod, “it is really, it is preferable, but not necessary to marry, it is desirable to have children, but childlessness does not seem abnormal now. Although, it is known, even some specialists (demographers and sociologists) perceived childlessness as a violation of the norm” 30–40 years ago (Golod, 2012: 30). According to the demographer L.E. Darsky, “one can argue about the best number of children in a family, but a childless family is a pathological phenomenon from any point of view” (Darsky, 1972: 129). But the opinion of the Leningrad sociologist V. Golofast: “After some time, if all the permissible explanation possibilities are exhausted (studies, absence of one’s own housing, etc.), childlessness becomes the subject of close evaluative attention of spouses, relatives and outsiders’ individuals. There comes a moment (first of all, apparently, for the spouses themselves) when this situation qualifies as abnormal” (Golofast, 1972: 53).

Socio-economic transformations of the post-Soviet period covered all spheres of the functioning of society. Respectively, new trends appeared in the family and marriage sphere. As you know, the family institution plays an important role in the process of reproduction of the population and

ensuring the basic needs of society in the sphere of regulation of social relations, socialization of individuals, and their moral and physical well-being, vital self-realization. There is modifications characteristic of modern society in the sphere of family and marriage relations. On the one hand, there is the growing interest in the future of the family as a social institution is determined by sociocultural factors. On the other, the transformation of the family institution is reflected in demographic processes. Consequently, the study of the processes associated with the institutional transformation of the traditional family seems necessary to determine the prospects and trends of the evolution of the family in Dagestan society and its demographic development (Mullahmedova, et al. 2017).

The crisis of the traditional family is reflected in the nature of family relationships and family behavior. It is expressed in the dynamics of reproductive, marital and parental attitudes, the increase in the number of divorces, and consequently, incomplete families. The latter factors are relevant to the problem of destruction of the foundations of the traditional family and its values and the need to identify trends in family evolution in Dagestan.

Ignoring the problems of demographic development, ineffective social policies for the family, the lack of family policies aimed at supporting them, and as a result, negative trends in the reproduction of family values require a sociological study of the traditional family and ethnic crisis in modern Dagestan and specific of the development of the sphere of family and marriage relations was characteristic for the post-Soviet period of development of Russian society.

In connection with the foregoing, a question arises: "How do these ideas combine with the ideas of childhood in the family and motherhood?" To identify the reproductive attitudes in the mass mind of the Dagestan peoples for a sociological study, the respondents were asked a number of questions, which allowed them to clarify their positions on this issue.

DEVELOPMENT.

Methods.

There are the results of a sociological study in empirical base of our study. It was conducted on the theme “Transformation of a Traditional Dagestan Family” in Dagestan and the Rostov Region in 2018.

Study results.

Analysis of the material obtained shows that the representatives of different nationalities of Dagestan responded approximately according to the criterion of positive and negative attitudes to the question of how they relate to childless families. It is corresponding to the selected family members in general. But the respondents showed pity for such families in the majority.

Chart 1.

There is distribution of answers to the question “**How do you feel about childless families?**” (*The answers are given to nationality groups in percentages from total number of respondents*)

The variants of answers // Family status	Positively, it is the right of every family	Positively, if people are good without children	Negatively, there should be a child in the family	Negatively, there is demographic problem in country	Negatively, the purpose of a woman to become a mother	Indifferently	I feel sorry for them, maybe they can not have children for health reasons
Married men	24,3	5,3	31,6	2,0	5,3	2,0	31,6
Unmarried men	24,4	5,4	22,5	1,6	4,3	5,4	36,0
Married women	17,0	6,2	20,6	3,0	5,5	2,1	45,7
Unmarried women	17,9	4,8	14,6	0,3	3,5	3,8	58,6
Widow	21,6	5,4	18,9	2,7	5,4	0	43,2
Widower	20,0	0	40,0	20,0	20,0	0	0
Total:	18,9	5,1	20,5	1,5	4,7	3,4	45,6

Distribution of answers to the same question by the criterion of marital status showed that much depends on the life situation of the respondents, on their marital status. The most critical in relation to childless families were respondents who are in family relationships, especially widowers (every second respondent), compared with married men (every third respondent), unmarried men (every fourth respondents), married women and widows (every fifth respondent), unmarried women (every seventh respondent). A subgroup of widowers (every fifth respondent) showed high responsibility for the demographic state of society and extremely critical attitudes towards childless families. They believe that a woman's purpose is to fulfill her reproductive function (every fifth respondent) compared to other subgroups whose share varies from 5,5 percent of married women to 3,5 percent of unmarried women. Really, every fifth respondent among widowers spoke for the right of every family to have or not to have children. There is "positively, this is the right of every family" in the complete absence of pity for childless families.

The highest level of criticality towards childless families was shown by representatives of older generations. There are "from 50 to 60 years old" (35,8 percent) and "from 60 years old and above" (37,1 percent) compared to the subgroups "up to 20 years old" (14,5 percent), "from 20 to 30 years old" (21,8 percent), "from 30 to 40 years old" (18,6 percent) and "from 40 to 50 years old" (22,6 percent) with the lowest level sympathy for these families. There is the highest level of compassion for such families among the responses of young people "up to 20 years old" (52,2 percent) and "from 20 to 30 years old" (44,4 percent) and as in the age section "from 30 to 40 years old" (48,7 percent) and "from 40 to 50 years old" (43,2 percent). Their share is significantly lower at the age of "from 50 to 60 years old" (30,2 percent) and "from 60 years and above" (28,6 percent). The respondents "under 20 years old" are less critical of families with no children (every seventh respondent) compared to other age subgroups.

At the same time, the position “positively, this right of every family” is shared by almost the same share of respondents in all age subgroups. There are 15,1 percent “from 30 to 40 years old”, 18,9 percent “from 50 to 60 years old”, 19,9 percent “under 20 years old”, 20,1 percent “from 20 to 30 years old”, 20,0 percent “from 60 years old and above”, 21,9 percent “from 40 to 50 years old”.

The level of education of the respondents has become a factor of serious discrepancies on the studied issue with data on other variables. So, respondents with secondary (every fifth respondent) and secondary special education (every fourth respondent) showed a high degree of tolerance towards childless families, compared with those with higher education. They said towards childless families with negative attitude unlike the first (every fifth interviewed).

A tribute to traditions regarding the purpose of a woman among respondents with higher education turned out to be the most those who are convinced that a woman should become a mother (6,8 percent). Sympathy for childless families who cannot have children for health reasons is expressed by respondents with higher educational status (52,2 percent), compared to those with secondary (45,5 percent) and secondary special education (37,7 percent).

The results of the study were quite expected in terms of attitudes towards religion. The non-believers (29,2 percent) showed a markedly high degree of tolerance towards childless families compared with strongly believers (21,5 percent), believers (20,7 percent) and hesitant (19,4 percent). Although they turned out to be more tuned on the issue of the woman’s purpose traditionally. Therefore, 16,7 percent of them are convinced that a woman should become a mother. In this case, the factor of attitude towards religion does not play a significant role, but there are other motives as adherence to traditional attitudes that are not related to religious values. At the same time, 50,4 percent of faithful believers, 46,3 percent of believers, 34,0 percent have pity and empathy for couples who cannot have children. The proportion of those markedly reduced in the subgroup of unbelievers (29,2 percent) and strongly disbelievers (16,7 percent).

There were no unexpected results by gender. Men were more positive towards childless families (23,8 percent) than women (18,1 percent) with a dominant negative attitude towards them (26,7 percent). There are women with a negative attitude (18,2 percent) as well as with a positive. But women showed greater sympathy towards childless families (50,9 percent) compared to men (33,8 percent).

What is surprising is that with the results described above regarding attitudes towards childless families with a negative, the majority of respondents showed the highest degree of tolerance on the question of how they relate to voluntarily childless families (see Chart No. 2).

There is distribution of answers to the question “**How do you feel about voluntarily childless families?**” (The answers are given in percentages).

The variants of answers // Family status	They are quite understandable.	This is a private affair of each family.	I condemn such family behavior. The spouses must have children	I find it difficult to answer
Married men	15,8	32,9	46,1	5,9
Unmarried men	10,9	50,4	26,4	10,9
Married women	10,4	56,4	23,4	7,9
Unmarried women	5,8	61,1	22,2	9,6
Widow	8,1	54,1	27,0	10,8
Widower	10,0	80,0	10,0	0
Total:	9,7	54,0	26,2	8,8

The data obtained quite eloquently indicate the contradictions that exist with regard to what the family should be and how to relate to the real family. We can see the discrepancy between the ideal and the real in the space of the relationship to the family and family values as a number of children is one of the most important family values traditionally inherent in the Dagestan peoples. The situation is about the same by marital status. The most tolerant were in the subdivision of widowers and unmarried women, as well as unmarried men, married women, widows. They hold the opinion that to have or not to have children is a private affair of every family with the exception of married men. The most of them condemned voluntarily childless marital behavior (33,0 percent).

Young people also showed the highest degree of tolerance in this issue. 59,1 percent “under 20 years old” and 54,34 percent “from 20 to 30 years old” consider this “a personal matter of each family”. Other age subgroups hold to the same position. There is “from 30 to 40 years old” (54,5 percent) and “from 40 to 50 years old” (49,1 percent). There were representatives of older generations - “from 50 to 60 years old” (45,1 percent) and “from 60 years old and above” (45,5 percent) who condemn such family behavior. It is quite predictable and explainable

Attitude towards voluntary childlessness is slightly determined by the level of education. The respondents with different educational status treated it as a personal matter of each family choosing this position as the main one. But the respondents with higher education showed a somewhat greater degree of condemnation of such family behavior (32,3 percent), although the majority (54,5 percent) hold to a liberal position. The same position is dominant when we are analyzing the distribution of respondents' answers by their religiosity. But it should be noted that the answers were distributed equally among convinced believers. 40,6 percent believe that “this is a personal matter of each family” and 40,1 percent condemn such family behavior.

There is no particular disagreement by the gender indicator. But women again showed a greater tolerance towards voluntarily childless families, compared to men. 23,1 percent of women surveyed and 32,4 percent of men condemn that family. But most of them also believe that “this is a personal affair of each family” – 56,9 percent and 45,1 percent, respectively.

A significant degree of discrepancy between the ideal and the real manifested itself in answering the question "Do you think that every woman should be a mother without fail (have a baby?)" The answers to this question revealed the following. 74,9 percent of men surveyed and 72,3 percent of women hold the position that a woman should become a mother if her state of health allows her to do so. The opposite opinion - “not necessarily, this is a personal choice of every woman” is followed by 15,4 percent of the interviewed men and 19,1 percent of women.

Thus, when we really assess the situation on the example of childless families, we identified a high level of tolerance of the Dagestan population to childlessness and female destiny (to become a mother) for the traditional attitudes, reflecting ideal ideas about the family and its functions. Of course, it cannot but affect real family practices and the level of their conflict.

We see a similar picture with regard to maternity in the distribution of answers to religion. The majority of respondents believe that a woman should become a mother if her state of health permits. There is the most of all in the subgroup of convinced believers (81,1 percent). The non-obligation of the woman to realize this function was taken on the first position by convinced non-believers. They consider that “this is the personal choice of each woman” (50,4 percent). We did not find any discrepancies on this issue in the age and education aspect. The position that a woman should become a mother dominates with an overwhelming majority - 72,1 percent of “under 20 years old”, 73,2 percent of “from 30 to 40 years old”, 73,4 percent of "from 20 to 30 years old", 74,1 percent of "from 40 to 50 years old", 76,3 percent of "from 50 to 60 years old", 80,1 percent of "from 60 years old and above", 71,0 percent with secondary education, 73,3 percent with secondary education and

74,4 percent with higher education. The situation is same by the criterion of marital status except for the position of widower. They equally spoke that a woman should become a mother (49,5 percent) and that this is a private matter of each woman (49,5 percent).

CONCLUSIONS.

Thus, the results of our study for reproductive attitudes of the respondents show that even those women and families who plan to give birth to their second and third children often cannot decide on it. They explain their step by poor material security and living conditions, lack of housing. Their decision is very complex, at least at this stage of development of Russian society. No less significant factor is the deficit of a developed and accessible network of preschool education institutions, problems in the enrollment of children in preschool institutions, corruption in this sphere, a large number of children to groups of preschool institutions, respectively, insufficient attention to them from educators, etc.

The decision of the demographic situation in general in modern Russian society, as well as changes in attitudes in the family and marriage sphere and the reproductive behavior of the Russian family can be facilitated by the organization of a modern infrastructure with a network of medical, educational, educational institutions, conditions for family leisure and recreation, able to help women combine family and professional roles. It may be referring to the Soviet experiences, which there were an effective system of educational infrastructure, which included nurseries, kindergartens, schools, supplementary education institutions (Pioneers House), sports sections, which provided great help to parents in educating the younger generation.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Antonov A.I. (2017). Family of many children in the era of depopulation (the results of the All-Russian study of mothers of many children) // Demography Internet scientific journal. No. 8 – 9. URL: http://www.semya-rastet.ru/razd/mnogodetnaja_semja_v_jeru_depopuljacji/ (Accessed: 11.11.2017).
2. Daragan V., Margovskaya M. (2014). Interview of A.Yu. Komova "On guard of the family" // Science and religion. 2014. No 3. P. 2.
3. Darsky L.E. (1972). Formation of the family. Moscow: Statistics, 1972. - 208 p.
4. Golod S.I. (2003). The perspectives for a monogamous family: a comparative intercultural analysis // Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology. 2003. Volume VI. No. 2. Pp. 106 - 119.
5. Golod S.I. (2012). Family: procreation, hedonism, homosexuality // Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology. 2012. Volume XV. No. 2 (61). Pp. 20 - 38.
6. Golofast V. (1972). On the relationship of approaches to the study of the family // Sociological problems of family and youth. Leningrad: Science, 1972. Pp. 34 - 53.
7. Gryshai, Vladimir, Natalya Gafiatulina, Valery Kasyanov, Irina Velikodnaya, Sergei Kosinov, Nikolay Lyubetsky, Sergey Samygin (2018). Social health of youth in the context of migration processes in Russia: assessment of the threat to national security (2018) // Herald National Academy of Managerial staff of culture and arts. №2. P. 141-145. <http://heraldnamsca.in.ua/index.php/hnamsca/article/view/310>
8. Madina M.S., Natalya K.G., Anna V.V., Sergey I.S., Svetlana I.I. (2016). Social and economic consequences of regional ethnic migration for national security and social health of the Russian youth. The Social Sciences (Pakistan). 2016. T. 11. № 16. C. 3886-3893.

9. Mullahmedova S.S., Shikhaliyeva D.S., Gafiatulina N.Kh., Zagirova E.M. (2017). The spiritual development of the individual in the modernization of Russian society. Makhachkala, 2017. - 189 p.
10. Natalya Kh. Gafiatulina, Andrey V. Rachipa, Gennadiy A. Vorobyev, Valery V. Kasyanov, Tatyana M. Chapurko, Irina I. Pavlenko, Sergei I. Samygin (2018). Socio-Political Changes As A Socio-Cultural Trauma For The Social Health Of Russian Youth, Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. Vol. 8, Issue 5, May 2018. C. 602-609.
11. Noskova A.V. (2012). Social aspects of solving the demographic problem of low birth // Sociological Studies. 2012. No 8. P. 60 - 71.
12. Vaskov M., Rezvanov A., Kasyanov V., Samygin S., Gafiatulina N., Zagutin D., Scherbakova L. (2018). VALUE ORIENTATIONS OF RUSSIAN YOUTH IN THE SYSTEM OF MANAGING THE MORAL SECURITY OF SOCIETY // Вісник Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв. 2018. № 2. С. 134-140.
13. Vereshchagina, A., Gafiatulina, N., Kumykov, A., Stepanov, O. & Samygin, S.I. (2015). Gender Analysis of Social Health of Students. Review of European Studies, 2015, Vol. 7, №7, Pp. 223-230. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/res/article/view/48999>.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

- 1. Anna V. Vereshchagina.** Doctor of Sociology, Professor Southern Federal University. Russia, 344006, Rostov-on-Don, Pushkinskaya Street 160. E-mail: anrietta25@mail.ru
- 2. Valery V. Kasyanov.** 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. E-mail: culture@kubsu.ru
- 3. Dmitry V. Krotov.** Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor of Rostov State Economic University «RINH», Russia. Email: dsm2000@mail.ru

4. Anna T. Latysheva. Candidate of 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. Email: 89281115155@mail.ru

5. Larisa I. Kobysheva. Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Taganrog Institute named after A.P. Chekhov, Rostov State Economic University, Taganrog, Russia. Email: Larisa-kobysheva@yandex.ru

6. Larisa N. Tutova. Senior Lecturer, Department of Philosophy and World Religions Don State Technical University, Russia. Email: tutovu@list.ru

7. Elvira M. Zagirova. Regional center of ethnopolitical researches of the Dagestan scientific center of RAS, Russia. E-mail: elvira.2005@inbox.ru

RECIBIDO: 9 de febrero del 2019.

APROBADO: 22 de febrero del 2019.