



*Aseorías 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. 7223898475*

RFC: AT1120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

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

Año: VI

Número: Edición Especial

Artículo no.:95

Período: Marzo, 2019.

TÍTULO: Estrategias de investigación empírica para la cohesión social.

AUTORA:

1. Galina D. Kovrigina.

RESUMEN: El documento analiza ideas y principios básicos de la investigación aplicada a problemas de identidad e integración social de diferentes comunidades y grupos de interés. El autor revisa la investigación empírica nacional e internacional para el estudio de la cohesión social. El método aplicado es el análisis comparativo, que considera las condiciones para la aparición y los mecanismos para el estudio de la integración social en diferentes grupos sociales utilizados por científicos de todo el mundo. La conclusión es el resumen de los principales resultados empíricos y las directrices prometedoras para el desarrollo del estudio de la solidaridad social en la ciencia mundial. El tema de investigación de este documento muestra un conjunto de datos para los precursores que definen las condiciones del entorno social.

PALABRAS CLAVES: integración, reproducción social, solidaridad social, áreas de estudio, reciprocidad.

TITLE: Empirical research strategies for social cohesion

AUTHOR:

1. Galina D. Kovrigina.

ABSTRACT: The document analyzes basic ideas and principles of research applied to problems of identity and social integration of different communities and interest groups. The author reviews national and international empirical research for the study of social cohesion. The applied method is the comparative analysis, which considers the conditions for the appearance and the mechanisms for the study of social integration in different social groups used by scientists from around the world. The conclusion is the summary of the main empirical results and the promising guidelines for the development of the study of social solidarity in world science. The research topic of this document shows a set of data for the precursors that define the conditions of the social environment.

KEY WORDS: integration, social reproduction, social solidarity, areas of study, reciprocity.

INTRODUCTION.

Solidarity as a social phenomenon has attracted increased attention in science both in its theoretical and methodological reflections, as well as in the applied sociological research. The problem of social solidarity attracts increasing attention of almost all social sciences: social philosophy, sociology, political science, economics, and social psychology. Moreover, in the last two or three decades, social conjunction, its origins, mechanisms of formation, and methods of implementation has become actualized for evolutionary and social biology and neurocognitive science. In other words, the problem of integration of society as a whole, its communities, components, territories, and institutions has recently become acute. The reason for it may be the global process of redefinition of the basic principles of social conjunction, faced by nearly all modern societies.

The most valuable theoretical sociological conceptualization of this phenomenon are made by the theory of structural functionalism, phenomenological sociology, symbolic interactionism, critical sociological discourse, and theory of frames. The latter concept has proved itself to be a sufficient

heuristic matrix of sociological study of conjunctive processes - solidarity or prosocial behaviour. Despite it is still being tested and needs further validation, its analytical potential seems sufficient. Many researchers around the world study social cohesion. The problem of social unity is due to many challenges facing the modern world, including interethnic consent, UN legal consolidation, territorial integration, organizational, socializing and institutional aspects of solidarity, etc. Consider some of the most significant approaches and studies.

Thus, the study of social solidarity is relevant for both the need of the analysis of this challenging phenomenon and the need to verify, specify and develop the key methodological principles of its study.

DEVELOPMENT.

Materials and methods.

Material for this study was the works of Russian and foreign scientists concerning the social solidarity processes. The work emphasizes the empirical study of social cohesion, which allow assessing the contexts of solidarity, forms of its development and the characteristics of its behavior. They also help to identify the conditions and consequences of solidarity for different social groups.

The method applied is a comparative analysis of empirical studies concerning social solidarity, which allows identifying the general patterns and special cases of the integration of society and separate social groups.

Results.

R. Veenstra (Netherlands) studies the development of prosocial and antisocial behaviors in children and adolescents leaning on the frame theory by S. Lindenberg. The conclusion is that young people do not always show prosocial or antisocial behaviors, but show the common combination of both. The theory of framing regards the teenagers' antisocial behavior as the structuring of their social

environment by using a hedonist frame. This trend stems from individual strains that are formed when problem children interact with stressful environment at home. Since childhood, the individual strains accumulate the capacity, thus limiting the opportunities to practice prosocial behavior. With time, the recovery becomes troublesome due to maladaptive individual dispositions and narrowing possibilities of the choice of life. Thus, the strongest predictors of persistent antisocial behavior are indicators of individual and family traits. Such adolescents often do not possess the conventional means to achieve social status and a high level of subjective well-being. "Poor cognitive and social skills and deviations in the personality, such as high impulsivity and the strive after novelty, make the investment into normal resources difficult. In addition, they do clearly understand their expectations from the relationships with others. As a result, they often fail in social relationships and are mainly treated as unfriendly. This group of adolescents is described as persistent antisocial group throughout their life" (Veenstra, 2006).

On the contrary, children and adolescents "who can be described as "prosocial" (i.e. those highly estimated in the prosocial and lowly - in antisocial behavior) usually structure their social environment and their own lives by using the normative frame. They have the skills to ignore the random temptations, and they also tend to forgive each other if something goes wrong from time to time. As a result, these adolescents have good relationships with friends and family. Their prosociality pays off as a means of achieving a high level of personal well-being" (Veenstra, 2006).

However, as the empirical studies show, constant demonstration of prosocial behavior and withholding antisocial behavior does not guarantee high social status. An alternative way to achieve this goal is to be prosocial in some situations and antisocial in others. According to the findings of the researcher, this group is generally well adapted and highly efficient. Machiavellian approach of the members of such groups assumes a certain balance between smooth relationships and a leap forward; they may take into account the interests and goals of others, and seem to accept social norms,

though perhaps do not observe them in reality. According to Veenstra, they may be called "antisocials, limited with the time of youth" (Veenstra, 2006).

During this period, they can be involved in some illegal actions, but they are able to stop if the price gets too high. The focus on control suggest that a dual strategy of such children probably allows them to treat the prosocial/antisocial actions strategically. From the point of view of the framing theory, these young people use the achievement frame when dealing with their social environment; that is, they follow social norms of fairness and legalness while they serve their interests, but refuse the solidarity in case the latter offer no prospects for them.

Gorban analyzes intercultural and interethnic contradictions on the example of the companies in modern Moldova. The researcher believes these problems determined the political consciousness and behavior of the country's population, as well as the form of statehood. The study shows that Moldovan society remains divided into proponents of construction and development of the national state and the supporters of the development of a multicultural state. The relationship between them is rather strained, formal, and inefficient. One of the main criteria of dividing the population concerning these opposite categories is ethnic identity, which has a key part in determining the nature of cross-cultural dialog in the country.

The initiatives of the Moldovan leadership in the field of language, culture and history are disapproved in a significant part of Moldovan society, and also cause the rejection of autonomies within Moldova. All this can be described as the failure of structuring the Moldavian solidarity and social cohesion around any common ideals and value orientations (Gorban, 2011).

The situation is troublesome in seemingly stable China. The Chinese researcher Wu studied regional autonomy of ethnic minorities of China and their role in the realization of cultural rights of minorities. He proved that ethnic autonomy needs the reforms of the implementation of cultural rights in order to strengthen national unity, social harmony, solidarity, and equality between ethnic groups in China.

The recent ethnic conflicts in a number of Chinese autonomous regions and provinces showed that cultural conditions in the country had changed, and the leadership of the state lagged behind the current trends. The author proposes to reform the policy on the rights of ethnic minorities leaning on international practices. According to Wu, the existing administrative and political system needs to be adjusted, and the Chinese government should implement new approaches based on the rule of law, electoral democracy and international standards in the field of human rights. The new approach should guarantee respect for the identity of ethnic minorities; the funds for realization of cultural rights in the autonomous regions should also be provided (Wu, 2014).

The framing theory has also proved its heuristic character in the work by R. Wittek and D. Fetchenhauer (both Netherlands) that studied solidarity in the absence of external sanctions or pressure; when fair (prosocial) behavior was measured on a cross-cultural basis compared to the opportunities of the offending one. The study also engaged such fields as economic growth, interpersonal trust, crime rate, and educational system styles (authoritarian and democratic). The sociologists compared 15 countries and recorded the positive correlation of a high level of fair-share conduct and different levels of the above indicators.

The research project "Wealth, climate, and framing: cross-national differences in solidarity" made by E. Vliert and S. Lindenberg (Netherlands) also uses the comparative cross-cultural basis. Note that the data obtained by these two researchers is somewhat contrary to the conclusions made by the authors listed above. For example, one of the main results of the study conducted by Wittek and Fetchenhauer was the fact that the inhabitants of the rich countries demonstrate a greater propensity for prosocial behavior due to the fact that they live in more economically prosperous countries and therefore can afford to be more generous.

The study by Vliert and Lindenberg indicates that sociology shows opposite results: in poor countries, the helping behavior is more pronounced and more common, and the prosperity only makes people more selfish. The framing theory helps to resolve this contradiction. One of the main factors here, according to the scientists, is the climate; that is, its more or less favorable character. Sociologists conclude that a complex, demanding climate creates a strong demand of private and public resources to meet the daily needs of people. When the country is poor, this huge need for resources creates a strong solidarity in a small group and in everyday situations, but it also initiates selfish and opportunistic behavior in relationships between groups. From the point of view of framing, such situation creates an incompatibility between the normative and the achievement frames. The people who are treated sympathetically (small circle) are separated from people that can be treated opportunistically (people of external groups). "When these countries become rich, the small circles need less help, and there emerges a great need to regulate "systemic interdependence" (i.e., the behavior among the members of society, be it friends or strangers). Thus, the norms of solidarity that have been previously applied in a small circle disappear and turn into rules that support egalitarianism, tolerance and respect for the strangers" (van de Vliert & Lindenberg, 2006).

Vliert and Lindenberg conclude that solidarity is intertwined with income-oriented interaction with friends and strangers, and therefore, it is used as a regulatory means to get profit. Thus, normative and achieving regulatory frames are compatible and are combined in a weak form of solidarity between groups (with values of egalitarianism, tolerance and respect). "People in rich countries with demanding climate seem to show more solidarity in common values and national security, while people in poor countries with demanding climate seem to show a greater tendency to help in everyday life with a little altruism between groups" (van de Vliert & Lindenberg, 2006). That is how the theory of framing solves the dilemma of the differences in prosocial behavior found in countries with different economic development level.

The major attention is drawn to the issues of territorial and ethno-cultural integration in Canada. N. Changfoot and B. Cullen proved that the development of federalism in the neoliberal era of 2000s allowed setting the conditions for more stable cooperation between the federal government of Canada and the government of Quebec, helping to reduce separatist inclinations in Quebec. In the context of neoliberalism, the "federation – province" agreements created the conditions for sufficiently fair asymmetry in the relationship between the federal government of Canada and the government of Quebec, thus easing the historical problem of Quebec self-determination. Such relationships differ from the past with their significant change, after which the neo-liberal focus becomes a single value in cooperation development.

According to the authors, if the Canadian federalism continues its present course of neoliberalism without any major shock, then for the first time since the crisis periods of the 1990s and early 2000s, the relationship of "federation – Quebec" are likely to be stable, without crises of national unity, which took place in 1980 and 1995, when Quebec held a referendum on sovereignty (Changfoot & Cullen., 2011).

In turn, another Canadian researcher, S. Arnold, explores the identity of Canada as a "Nordic nation" (nordic/northern nation) through the "northern dimension" of foreign policy and security policy. The idea of "Canadian Nordicness" originated from what used to be called "Inuit vision of the North". The image of the Canadian "Nordicness" contributes to the harmonious development of relations between the Inuit of Canada and the Canadian government. These relationships are based on respect, the importance of dialog between the representatives of indigenous peoples of America and descendants of immigrants. They find their expression in the goals of Canadian foreign policy and international agenda of the Inuit over the last ten years. Indeed, after the rupture of the colonial era and the policy of assimilation, the relationship between Canada and the Inuit now embody the "new spirit of partnership." This image works for adding significant influence to the voice of Canada in the

Arctic, as well as for the importance of trust between the government and the Inuit both within the country and abroad. The image also serves as an important resource in strengthening national unity of the Canadians, in integrating the Inuit in "typical Canadian values", and vice versa (Arnold, 2012). G. Fecht and A. Flache (Netherlands) studied the dual effect of interdependence and social diversity on the status of solidarity in work collectives. In recent decades, modern labor organizations face the two trends that are crucial to solidarity and activities of working groups, as the researchers believe. First, as a result of layoff, re-engineering and increased information load, the degree and intensity of interdependence between the members of the organization have increased significantly. The reason for this is that many employees who had previously worked individually, were reorganized into working groups or teams. Second, the organization and, therefore, the working groups within have become more diverse due to the changed demographic composition of the workforce. More and more people of different ethnic origin, gender, age, skills, and abilities have joined the organization and should effectively work together in working groups or teams. These trends toward greater interdependence and diversity makes solidarity within the working groups increasingly necessary for team work, and at the same time, this solidarity is stressed.

Excessive diversity of the participants of the working groups has an especially negative impact on group solidarity. In the context of the theory of framing, it is the difference in the group members' notion about the most appropriate and normative typed of behavior that is the greatest threat to the stability of solidarity. Even if all members of the group create the frame of the situation from the point of view of regulatory obligations, in demographically heterogeneous group this may lead to separate members perceiving solidarity from their own point of view and acting their own way. The others may interpret this as a symptom of an opportunistic motivation; for example, the researchers state that "when you're working in demanding deadlines, the representatives of the Western cultures can see clear evidence of a lack of commitment to the task in the behavior of colleagues, for example,

from Islamic cultures, who spend more time talking and socializing at work. Conversely, the latter may see the lack of caring about the group in the abstinence some of their colleagues from communication and focusing solely on their work. For both sides such negative signals about mutual relations, putting pressure on the commitment to the team and cooperation with colleagues may lead to a weakening of their frames of solidarity" (van der Vegt & Flache, 2006).

The organizational aspect of solidarity is the object of attention, and K. Sanders (et al.) study the effects of social inclusion in modern organizations through framing (Sanders et al, 2006). In modern organizations, hierarchical control through the authority chains is often replaced by a more horizontal organizational structures. The basis for this development is the shift towards using more flexible production technologies in response to less predictable markets, increased global competition and the microelectronics revolution. One of the features of modern organizations is that employees bear much greater responsibility for achieving production goals than in the "classical" hierarchical firm. In modern organizations, employees often work in groups or teams where they are responsible for the coordination and organization of its work (management groups, project teams or autonomous teams). Such groups may be responsible for the hospital department or for the salvage of the vessel and its cargo, or be the special police unit.

In modern teams, the employees have vast autonomy, and employers expect the team members to demonstrate teamwork, voluntary participation, willingness to cooperate, and mutual informal control, in order to save the organization. In other words, the employer needs the solidary behavior in the employees. "Accordingly, the vertical solidarity of employees (i.e., solidarity with the organization) is considered as one of the most important factors of success. Indeed, the studies have shown that organizational solidarity is positively associated, for example, with the work of employees and negatively associated with short-term absence" (Sanders et al, 2006).

M. Lamb studied the possible ways of consolidation for ethno-cultural communities of Northern Ireland that were divided for a long time. By a number of sociological studies, Lamb developed a series of practical proposals based on the the necessity forming common values associated primarily with the subject of human rights (this topic is fairly obvious to all communities and can serve as a kind of ideological "overlap", that may serve as a basis for a dialog on other vital issues) (Lamb, 2013).

The fact that the discussions on ethnicity, nationality and social cohesion are part of a broader discussion that reflects the problems associated with identity, its ethnic and religious components, as opposed to a homogeneous national (civil/state) identity Is proved by British scientist E. Vasta. One of the main problems in the receiving states is that many immigrants and ethnic minorities are not integrated in the host societies. This poses risks to whether newcomers feel part of the national (civil) identity of the dominant host society. Such fears, if they prevail in society, endanger social solidarity and social cohesion, as well as destabilize the foundations of any democracy. The author proves that fear and worries are interconnected in the individual and society through the notion of "the sense of belonging" to society, government and nation. In other words, to be "a responsible citizen", one needs to "test the sense of civil commonality with other people". The author makes this conclusion after analyzing the stories of immigrants in London, considering their so-called "models of affiliation" with its multifaceted nature, be it immigrants and ethnic minorities having no "sense of belonging" to the host society, or those with the fragmented "sense of belonging" to any symbol or territory of the host society, which may also be characterized as "a sense of commitment to the common good", promoting social solidarity and consolidation of society.

A sense of belonging as a factor of social solidarity can play a key role in building positive relationships between different ethnic groups in a fragmented society, because "the host majority" would see the loyalty of the minorities and could facilitate their integration (Vasta, 2013).

American sociologists E. Brondolo and M. Libretti consider social cohesion from the point of view of the obstacles caused by racism. It is known that racism can manifest at the cultural, institutional and individual levels, and influences the personal level, if individuals internalise their attitudes according to their own racial/ethnic group, rejecting the different ones. The researchers study how the different levels/types of racism destabilize the development of relationships with "the others", how they destroy accumulated social capital (or how prevents its development), how the racism hinders the development of social solidarity and consolidation in multicultural societies, and, consequently, affects the health and well-being of certain individuals. The data presented by the authors justifies that cultural racism promotes the inter-ethnic relations that contribute to social distance. Institutional racism isolates people from their opportunities to develop skills necessary for efficient cross-cultural relationships and spur on interacting with people demonstrating antisocial behavior; interpersonal racism ruins the quality of traditional interpersonal relationships and gives rise to mental anxiety when interacting with people of other nationalities; internalized racism is the reason for the omission of economic benefits in cross-cultural interaction.

Finally, the social solidarity and cohesion cannot be developed in the whole society, but only in some parts that consolidate on the basis of their own ideas who can join them and who can't. Any form of national unity with such policies can not be developed. Thus, various forms of solidarity are formed among both the oppressors and the oppressed, which ultimately leads to social fragmentation, conflict and sometimes to the disintegration of society (Brondolo et al, 2012).

British researcher S. Condor studies the formation of cultural solidarity through the prism of citizenship. She believes that in order to achieve solidarity and social cohesion on the basis of citizenship, the state institutions and society need to develop the model that takes into account the interests of both majorities and minorities (regardless of what minority is considered) (Lazić et al., 2017). The principle of civil solidarity should be based on actual equality of rights and freedoms (at

least, the state and society should aspire to it), and the freedom of one should not limit the freedoms of others. Thus, the conclusion is that the civic solidarity is based on democratic society, while the democracy can take a variety of forms (from Swedish socialism to American self-sufficiency). Anyway, the main value of such society is freedom of choice not limiting the freedoms of others. The researcher proves that the authoritarian societies cannot build a true civic solidarity and cannot consolidate as a whole, for one part is opposed to the other, and there is no common framework in this society (Condor, 2011).

There is an increasing attention to the issues of social solidarity in Russian science. In his analysis of the factors of socio-cultural fragmentation of Russian society, V.P. Babintsev draws attention to the fact that this process "destroys the public communication". People's belonging to social institutions is purely formal, and the citizens refuse not only to answer calls directed to them on behalf of the state and society, but also to cooperate constructively with each other" (Babintsev & Ushamirskaya, 2013).

The researcher describes the situation in Russian society as a "disintegration of the link of times", the characteristics of which are the discredit of the publicly significant, unifying ideas; abnormal structure of individual and social consciousness that combine the opposite values; social desertion; incoherence and even absurdity of social thinking; negative self-evaluation manifested in masochistic humiliation of the history and culture of their own country; mass public apathy and indifference; social victimization, willingness to become the object of manipulation (Babintsev & Ushamirskaya, 2013).

A.A. Semenova and N.P. Koptseva consider social cohesion to be due to three main factors, without which it is impossible. They include: the economic sector including industry, policy and law, and the spiritual life (the ideological basis able to realized in religious and philosophical doctrines). The researchers also study the reflection in the formation of social cohesion: "Mechanical or forced connection of single individuals will not last long. They need the inner strive of every single being

for the unity with the ones of their own kind; they should understand that the desired unity with others is essential for individual wholeness.

It is also necessary that some individuals wish to act in such a way that their actions could lead to their unification" (Semenova & Koptseva, 2009). N.P. Koptseva also explores the problems of forming the civil consent through the possibility of transforming the ethnic cultural identity into a national one. The researcher shows that such transformation is possible, especially due to the constructible nature of common civil identification, if compared to the "natural" bases of ethnic one (Koptseva, 2014).

O.A. Polyushkevich studies social and cultural cohesion, which he describes as the formation of a unity of objectives, intergenerational continuity, and normative and value consensus (Polyushkevich, 2015; Polyushkevich, 2017). "Any process of social solidarity are built around the cultural model, which consists of a variety of orientations < ... > that are supported by certain social groups in the form of constant practices. Practices create the appropriate socio-cultural model of values and normative patterns of interaction between people and social institutions" (Polyushkevich, 2014).

I.A. Isaev writes that solidarity is essential for society, as well as the inevitable psychological and organizational problems facing a society undergoing disintegration, and hence faced with the full force of the irrational and uncontrollable. "To survive, society have to oppose the available organization to the upcoming chaos, using external force of constraint. Of course, the main object of protection here is the integrity itself and the unity of the social organism" (Isaev, 2013). The recovery of social cohesion leads to the recovery of the internal integrity of individualsw - members of society.

O.A. Karmadonov and M.K. Zverev explore social solidarity from the point of view of the elaborated "streaming model" of cohesion (Karmadonov & Zverev, 2012). It assumes the presence of vertical and horizontal vectors of social integration are marked by the features the dynamics and integrity of each of the "streams". All the processes of forming a single, consolidated society can be described

through social conjunction that provides the analytical tools necessary for the study of social solidarity in its theoretical and applied aspects. In every sphere of social relations one may record the "conjunctive effects" as a result of consolidation practices, "disjunctive risks" as the threat from the destructive practices, and "promising conjunctions" as overdue but not yet activated initiatives emerging from the combination of different practices and focused on the achievement of potential conjunctive effect (Karmadonov & Kovrigina, 2016). The most common result of a number of private conjunctives acts as the single conjunctive code or ideology as a symbolic ideological complex that would consolidate society.

Discussion.

Social solidarity in its empirical aspect is studied differently. The authors approach the problem of its development in modern society systematically. The evolution of social consciousness focusing on the integrating points can be based on the approaches mentioned in this work, but certainly requires further methodological research.

The return of solidarity in the current thesaurus and registry of the objects the world social sciences is largely due to the challenges faced by modern society in the developed countries. From the point of view of conjunctive problems, the most significant is the problem of redesigning of power relations towards the increasing state influence in all spheres, the problem of cultural and civil identity, aggravated as a result of unprecedented migration flows to Western countries from culturally and mentally distant regions. Another significant problem of maintaining a certain standard of living and social protection is closely linked to the above mentioned. In our opinion, the increased interest of scientists and politicians of the developed countries to solidarity is due to the put into question foundations of the social conjunction.

Concerning Russian society, the problem of acceptable and relevant principles of social integration is particularly acute for 25 years, from the period of the discrediting and further collapse of the conjunctive mechanisms of Soviet society. An obvious social problem could not but cause the increasing scientific and public interest that is reflected in the growing number of studies on the social cohesion of Russian society. However, the increased attention to this problem inevitably raised the question of defining an adequate heuristic and methodological basis of its research, since solidarity (along with the other principal objects of social science, including, in particular, how social norms and values, social identity, and social adaptation) is not obvious, and therefore its social status is difficult to verify.

The existing applied studies of social solidarity are typical of narrow analytical focus. The researchers draw their attention to such factors of social cohesion as institutional trust, empathy, and altruism, social inequality, social mobilization, and civic activism. Thus, social solidarity is described essentially through its epiphenomena, concluded from the "obvious" and "unobvious" registers of objects of social science. In other words, the researchers record, verify and describe the non-obvious social object or status through other social objects that are perceived as heuristic for this company by default. That is, an object descriptor, which describes the main object, should be elected on the basis of the ideas of the classics and the masters, or on the basis of logic and common sense of the researcher.

CONCLUSIONS.

Social solidarity is unclear, elusive phenomenon due to the fact that it is dissolved in everyday interactions, and like many structures determining our actions, but not perceived, finds itself only in its own violations, reduction, or even absence. This explains the fact why solidarity is explored primarily through its epiphenomena – obvious, non-obvious, or the same social objects.

In author's opinion, one of the most heuristically promising is the approach that focuses not only on the attributes of solidarity, such as trust, social equality, justice, empathy, civic engagement, etc., but also on its precursors – that is, the basic conditions that determine the very possibility of its emergence and reproduction. The data set of these precursors is already reflected and recorded in social psychology and evolutionary sociobiology, and includes factors such as subjectivity, predictability of the social environment, and reciprocity.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Babintsev, V. P. & Ushamirskaya, G. F. (2013). Strategy for the formation of a solidary society in a region. *Diskussiya*, 5(6), 120–127.
2. Isaev, I. A. (2013). *Solidarity as an imaginary political and legal state*. Moscow: Prospekt, 176p.
3. Karmadonov, O. A. & Zverev, M. K. (2012). *Cohesion of Russian society: streams and obstacles*. Irkutsk: Izd-vo IGU, 223p.
4. Karmadonov, O. A. & Kovrigina, G. D. (2016). Social cohesion in its resource aspect. *Vestnik Instituta sotsiologii*, 2 (17), 12–28.
5. Koptseva, N. P. (2014). On the question of the conceptual foundations for building a nationwide Russian state. *Sotsiodinamika*, 1, 1–14.
6. Polyushkevich, O. A. (2015). Social empathy: Issues of the cohesion of Russian society. *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya*, 6 (130), 3–18.
7. Polyushkevich, O. A. (2014). *Sociocultural solidarity is a transforming society*. Irkutsk: Izd-vo IGU, 168p.
8. Polyushkevich, O. A. (2017). Philosophy of gratitude. *Gumanitarnyy vector*, 12(1), 67–74.
9. Arnold, S. (2012). Constructing an Indigenous Nordicity: The “New Partnership” and Canada’s Northern Agenda. *International Studies Perspectives*, 13(1), 105–120.

10. Brondolo, E., Libretti, M., Rivera, L. & Walsemann, K. M. (2012). Racism and Social Capital: The Implications for Social and Physical Well-Being. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(2), 358–384.
11. Changfoot, N. & Cullen., B. (2011). Why is Quebec Separatism off the Agenda? Reducing National Unity Crisis in the Neoliberal Era. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 44(4), 769–787.
12. Condor, S. (2011). Towards a social psychology of citizenship? Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 193–201.
13. Gorban, A. (2011). Ethnic and socio-cultural aspects of political culture in Moldova. *Eurolimes*, supplement, 133–149.
14. Lamb, M. (2013). Ethno-nationalist conflict, participation and human rights-based solidarity in Northern Ireland. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 17(7/8), 723–738.
15. Sanders, K., Flache, A., van der Vegt, G., & van de Vliert, E. (2006). Employees' organizational solidarity within modern organizations: A framing perspective on the effects of social embeddedness. In *Solidarity and Prosocial Behavior* (pp. 141-156). Springer, Boston, MA.
16. Semenova, A. A. & Koptzeva, N. P. (2009). Truth as a Form of Modelling of Integrity at Social Being Level. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 1, 31–55.
17. Vasta, E. (2013). Do We Need Social Cohesion in the 21st Century? Multiple Languages of Belonging in the Metropolis. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 34(2), 196–213.
18. Veenstra, R. (2006). The development of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: Prosocial and antisocial behavior in adolescence. In *Solidarity and prosocial behavior* (pp. 93-108). Springer, Boston, MA.
19. van der Vegt, G., & Flache, A. (2006). Understanding the joint effects of interdependence and diversity on solidarity in work teams. In *Solidarity and Prosocial Behavior* (pp. 125-137). Springer, Boston, MA.

20. van de Vliert, E., & Lindenberg, S. (2006). Wealth, climate, and framing: Cross-national differences in solidarity. In *Solidarity and Prosocial Behavior* (pp. 207-222). Springer, Boston, MA.
21. Wu, X. (2014). From Assimilation to Autonomy: Realizing Ethnic Minority Rights in China's National Autonomous Regions. *Chinese Journal of International Law*, 13(1), 55-90.
22. Lazić, B., Abramovich, S., Mrđa, M., & Romano, D. A. (2017). On the Teaching and Learning of Fractions through a Conceptual Generalization Approach. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 12(3), 749-767.

DATA OF THE AUTHOR:

1. Galina D. Kovrigina. Irkutsk National Research Technical University. E-mail:

kovrigina_gd@ mail.ru

RECIBIDO: 4 de febrero del 2019.

APROBADO: 21 de febrero del 2019.