

Sociocultural background of human resource management in modern Russia

Rachipa, Andrey V.; Abazieva, Kamilla G.; Samygin, Sergey I.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Rachipa, A. V., Abazieva, K. G., & Samygin, S. I. (2022). Sociocultural background of human resource management in modern Russia. *State and Municipal Management: Scholar Notes*, 2, 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2022-1-2-43-49>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

SOCIOCULTURAL BACKGROUND OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN MODERN RUSSIA

Andrey V. Rachipa¹, Kamilla G. Abazieva², Sergey I. Samygin³

¹Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, rachipa@sfedu.ru,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4693-0126>

¹Moscow Aviation Institute (National Research University), Moscow, Russia

^{2,3}Rostov State University of Economics, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

²abazieva_kamilla@mail.ru

³samygin78_@yandex.ru

Abstract. The purpose of the article is to analyze the sociocultural background of human resource management in modern Russian society. Research methodology is based on a culturological approach to the analysis of management, as well as the concept of organizational culture. The authors show that the process of human resource management has a sociocultural specificity, which must be taken into account in the implementation of management activities. The specificity of human resource management in modern Russian society is caused by several factors: the need to increase the efficiency of organizations, the peculiarities of the political situation the Russian economy is developed in, as well as sociocultural management features preserved from the Soviet model of governance.

Keywords: human resource management, organizational culture, modernization, personnel management, efficiency, motivation

For citation: Rachipa A. V., Abazieva K. G., Samygin S. I. Sociocultural background of human resource management in modern Russia. *State and Municipal Management. Scholar Notes. 2022;(2):43–49.* (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2022-1-2-43-49>.

СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ОСНОВАНИЯ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКИМИ РЕСУРСАМИ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ РОССИИ

Андрей Валерьевич Рачипа¹, Камилла Григорьевна Абазиева²,
Сергей Иванович Самыгин³

¹Южный федеральный университет, Ростов-на-Дону, Россия, rachipa@sfedu.ru,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4693-0126>

¹Московский авиационный институт (национальный исследовательский университет), Москва, Россия

^{2,3}Ростовский государственный экономический университет (РИНХ), Ростов-на-Дону, Россия

²abazieva_kamilla@mail.ru

³samygin78_@yandex.ru

Аннотация. Целью статьи является анализ социокультурных оснований управления человеческими ресурсами в современном российском обществе. В качестве методологии исследования используется культурологический подход к анализу управления, а также концепции организационной культуры. Авторы показывают, что процесс управления человеческими ресурсами обладает социокультурной спецификой, которую необходимо учитывать при осуществлении управленческой деятельности. Специфика управления человеческими ресурсами в современном российском обществе обусловлена несколькими факторами: необходимостью повышения эффективности деятельности организаций, особенностями политической ситуации, в которой осуществляется развитие российской экономики, а также сохраняющимися социокультурными особенностями управления, обусловленными советской моделью управления.

Ключевые слова: управление человеческими ресурсами, организационная культура, модернизация, управление персоналом, эффективность, мотивация

Для цитирования: Рачипа А. В., Абазиева К. Г., Самыгин С. И. Социокультурные основания управления человеческими ресурсами в современной России // Государственное и муниципальное управление. Ученые записки. 2022. № 2. С. 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2022-1-2-43-49>

Introduction. Human resource management is the most important aspect of management activity, the quality of which directly affects the productivity and efficiency of the organization.

The main components of human resource management of an organization are: hiring employees, their selection and recruitment; adaptation of a new employee to the established norms, rules and requirements in the organization, familiarizing him with professional duties; employee performance assessment; organization of personnel training, contributing to their professional growth; strategic and career planning; incentives for employees; ensuring safety and social guarantees; coordination of labor relations; work planning; control of labor activity, motivation of employees, etc. [1; 2].

Thus, the range of tasks carried out in the framework of human resource management of an enterprise is quite extensive. It covers almost the entire sphere of interpersonal interactions within the organization. Human resources are the employees of the organization, its human capital, which is able to bring profit to the enterprise and to the employees themselves, with effectively established management that combines the interests of the organization and the employees themselves.

There are many theoretical approaches in management based on the recognition of the importance of the human factor. Starting with the theory of human relations proposed by E. Mayo, according to which the efficiency of workers depends on the attitude of the leadership towards them, theoretical management has been improving management practices. This has been facilitated by various theories of motivation (A. Maslow, F. Herzberg, D. McGregor, etc.).

Materials and methods. Within the framework of the proposed topic, it is important to emphasize the methodological significance of the culturological approach to management, which has become the basis of the theories of organizational culture.

There are many definitions of organizational (or corporate) culture, just as there are many definitions of culture in general. Organizational culture is a part of the culture of the society in which it exists; therefore, we can say that it is not a completely autonomous from the external environment system. Organizational culture includes values, ideas and perceptions, as well as the rules of conduct the organization operates on [3]. Organizational culture is largely determined by the specific activities of the organization, its goals and functions. In addition, organizational culture directly depends on the culture of the society where the organization operates. Human resources of the organization are themselves representatives of a certain culture, and the effective work of the organization's personnel largely depends on how the culture of the employees corresponds to the cultural standards accepted in the organization. This problem becomes especially noticeable in the case when management staff and other employees belong to different cultural traditions – such a situation occurs in many large organizations of the modern global world. The globalization of the modern world is, first of all, the globalization of the economy, which means the global spread of market mechanisms and standards on a global scale. These mechanisms, Western in origin, have long been universal, but this does not mean their complete uniformity. The universal elements of the market organizational culture function in different cultural contexts [4], which have an opposite effect on them. Therefore, it makes sense to talk both about the sociocultural grounds of economic activity in general, and about the features of managerial activity due to the sociocultural heritage of a particular society.

For several decades, modern Russian society has been in the process of market transition – the formation of a market economy after the destruction of the socialist model of the economy. The modern Russian management culture has a synthetic character, combining the universal requirements of market efficiency with its own cultural heritage, which also determines real management practices. Therefore, the task of studying the sociocultural grounds of human resource management in modern Russian society seems to be urgent.

Numerous studies show that organizational performance is directly or indirectly related to organizational culture. A healthy and stable organizational culture gives the company numerous advantages: a competitive advantage through innovation and improved customer service; stable and efficient work

of employees; team cohesion and high morale; strong focus of the company on achieving the goal [5]. Organizational culture can be a factor in the survival or ineffectiveness of an organization, although this is difficult to prove empirically given that the required longitudinal analysis is unlikely to be feasible. However, the sustainable competitive advantage of firms such as IBM, Procter & Gamble and McDonald's, may be at least in part, a reflection of their organizational culture.

A study conducted by the Harvard School of Business in 2003 [6] showed that culture has a significant impact on long-term economic performance of an organization. The study looked at management practices in 160 organizations over ten years and found that culture can either increase productivity or be harmful to it. Organizations with a strong performance culture showed better financial growth. In addition, research showed that cultural characteristics such as risk taking, effective internal communication and flexibility are important factors influencing the individual performance of employees. Moreover, innovation, productivity and the ability to cooperate, like other cultural factors, also have positive economic implications.

Denison, Haaland and Geltzer [6] found that culture contributes to the success of an organization, but not all aspects of organizational culture contribute to this success in the same way [7]. It was found that the influence of different parameters is not the same in different regions of the world, which suggests that organizational culture is influenced by national culture.

Organizational culture determines how people perform tasks, set goals, and manage the necessary resources to achieve goals. Culture influences ways of making decisions, reacting to opportunities and threats emanating from the external environment of the organization.

Job satisfaction is positively related to the degree of consistency between the general culture of personnel and the culture of the organization they work in [1; 3]. The mismatch between learned norms of general culture and norms of organizational culture generated a number of negative consequences, including lower job satisfaction, higher workload, general stress and staff turnover. It is suggested that organizational culture could influence the creativity of employees, their motivation, the tendency of employees to report unethical conduct. However, more research is needed to confirm these findings.

Organizational culture also influences staff recruitment and stability. People tend to be attracted to organizations that they believe meet certain cultural standards and expectations, people tend to work in such organizations, and high turnover can be related to the interaction of culture and the effectiveness of the organization. The culture of the organization does not always respond to new challenges on time, which results in a deterioration in performance and the desire of employees to change jobs.

An overly rigid organizational culture can hinder innovative activity, especially when employees get used to the existing system, they are well aware of the requirements of their roles that they must fulfill in the organization, they are focused primarily on stability and are not ready for change. Thus, the existing culture of employees can become a brake on the development of the organization. According to Mar [8], 70% of all efforts to change the situation fail because of the culture of the organization staff. One of the main reasons why these difficulties arise is that organizational cultures and the organizational structures they are embedded in often bear the "imprint" of earlier periods in the development of the organization and society as a whole. This demonstrates the ability of culture to inertia.

A change in organizational culture may be necessary to reduce employee turnover, influence employee behavior, improve the company, reorient company goals, organizational scale and structure, improve customer service, achieve specific goals, and increase company performance. Culture change is influenced by a number of elements, including the external environment and industry competitors, changing industry standards, changes in technology, the number and quality of staff, and the history and management of the organization.

The most important aspect of organizational culture that affects the performance of personnel is the aspect of understanding what people are working for. The study of organizational culture was significantly influenced by the analysis of the experience of Japanese corporations, which reached an unexpected peak of growth in the 80s of the 20th century. It turned out that the values underlying their activities were significantly different from the values underlying the activities of Western companies at that time. It was important for Japanese workers to belong to the corporation like a large family, and they linked personal success to the success of the company much more than Western workers. At the same time, the approval of others and mutual responsibility were very important for Japanese workers, which made them very disciplined. They preferred stability to rapid career growth, guaran-

ted by hard work and exceeding normal labor standards. Japanese workers were much more relaxed about the hierarchy, following its principles; they did not seek to emphasize inequality, but, on the contrary, outwardly demonstrated the closeness of top management and ordinary workers thanks to the system of rituals. Western workers focused primarily on personal success and a personal career, achieving a high level of well-being, did not seek to identify their interests with the interests of the company as a whole, they were guided by the spirit of individual rivalry and competition. Actually, in many respects, it was from the study of the specifics of Japanese management (which over time lost its aura of superiority) that the analysis of the importance of culture for achieving corporate success and human resource management began. At the same time, the importance of historical traditions for the development of models of effective management was realized. Many typologies of organizational culture were developed and proposed, negative and positive aspects of different models were highlighted; all this experience one way or another found its expression in the management practice of different countries. In this regard, the question of the sociocultural foundations of human resource management in Russian society seems to be relevant. As well as the influence of specific Russian experience on the universal management models developed over the years by analyzing the influence of cultural factors on human resource management.

Research results and their discussion. Specifics of management culture and human resource management in Russian society.

Russian management models, in many respects, inherit the Soviet experience of management, very specific, due to those tasks of the development of society determined by ideological tasks. The paradox of the Soviet experience of management was that the main goals of management were a synthesis of the real needs of economic development and ideological principles, which, in many respects, hindered the effective solution of economic problems and created large-scale costs, and these costs concerned human resources. The term "human resources" was used in Soviet official discourse along with the term "cadres" (personnel). The importance of "cadres" and personnel policy was embodied in the well-known statement of I. Stalin "Cadres decide everything," but the attitude towards cadres in Soviet society was utilitarian. What were the specific features of the Soviet management model in relation to human resources?

The new Soviet state emerged as a result of the revolution was based on an ideology, the declared goal of which was the emancipation of labor and people of labor, both the working class and the peasantry. In practice, from the first years of Soviet power, real workers and peasants, as well as representatives of other social strata, became a "resource" for building a fundamentally new and never-before-existing socialist economy, which was supposed to surpass the capitalist one. In reality, the country faced a difficult and catastrophic path of mobilization development in order to catch up with the most developed industrial countries, while many of the economic achievements of pre-revolutionary Russia were practically lost during the years of the civil war.

The mobilization type of development, which the Soviet state embarked on, presupposed strict centralized state management of the economy – from setting goals to attracting and distributing resources. The state set advanced goals: it needed the development of industrial production, the Russian countryside became a resource for the development of Soviet industry, from which both material and human resources were withdrawn. In the 1920s and 1930s, even in developed capitalist societies, the exploitation of hired workers and their weak security was a normal state of affairs, but in the Soviet state this exploitation took on a state and repressive character, its methods were not only economic, but also political. The results of the industrialization and collectivization of Soviet society in the pre-war period are well known, and it is important for us to note here that at this time a specific model of human resource management was laid, which practically excluded the personal initiative of the employee, free mobility of labor resources, the interest of workers in the growth of material well-being, centralization and total bureaucratization of management and the constant use of the threat of reprisals as a mechanism for maintaining labor discipline and meeting productivity standards descended from above.

If repression was a negative mechanism for managing human resources, then ideological education should have become a positive mechanism forming labor motivation. Ideology was the main factor giving rise to various labor initiatives and supposedly spontaneous initiatives of workers to increase labor productivity, as well as inspiring workers in socialist production to work not so much for their own good as for the great goal of building a communist society. However, the communist society as an ideal, and indeed the dominant ideology itself, meant improving people's lives. The weakening of the repressive nature of the regime after the death of Stalin and the debunking of the personality cult, a change in the social structure of Soviet society, scientific and technological development, and an in-

crease in education led to the fact that management methods were gradually changing. In the last decades of the existence of Soviet society, a relatively high standard of living and social security was achieved. However, the most basic features of the socialist management model remained: centralization, bureaucratization, planning, lack of effective methods of stimulating labor productivity, lack of space for initiative and innovation, to which were added low labor discipline, low labor motivation, flourishing of informal relations and the informal economy, distortion of real information on the results of the activities of enterprises, etc. All these factors, along with many others, contributed to the slowdown in economic growth and, as we know, led, ultimately, to the collapse of the socialist economy and the Soviet state.

In the 90s, Russian society went through a period of a sharp economic recession and feverish economic reforms, accompanied by the reset of almost all social obligations by the state and the privatization of state property. In the conditions of a normative, legal and ideological crisis, a post-Soviet market society was formed, becoming a part of the global capitalist economy. In this situation, new forms of organization management gradually began to develop, and taking care of qualified human resource management was not their primary task. The remaining sizable sector of state organizations, in many respects, was governed by practically old methods. We can say that the post-Soviet society has still been combining different management models, including human resource management. The most advanced enterprises are guided by new management theories, which is facilitated by the formation of a fairly large layer of professional managers striving to master and apply Western models, including those focused on effective human resource management. At the same time, in recent decades, with the strengthening of the state in the economy, the old management problems associated with the use of the "administrative resource", the fusion of power and property, bureaucratization, and the restriction of private initiative are again becoming relevant. The most influential and large players on the Russian market are large companies associated with the explicit or implicit presence of the state.

Russian enterprises are characterized by peculiarities of human resource management, the roots of which are in many ways connected with the Soviet past.

First of all, the directive and authoritarian style of personnel management should be noted [9]. It is expressed in the adoption of individual management decisions – without any agreements or discussions; a career growth within the organization is not so much based on professional qualities, but depending on the relationship with the manager. Violations of labor legislation, taking advantage of the fact that the majority of Russian workers do not know how or do not want (due to moral and material costs) to defend their interests in the courts, and often do not even know that some norms regarding them have been violated, and statutory obligations are not being met.

The directive management style is characterized by a rather primitive method of working with human resources. It comes down to hiring (or firing) and maintaining the necessary documentation. Adaptation of a new employee, his prospects, problems of professional development, employee motivation – all these are not solvable or even set tasks. Naturally, in such conditions, the task of forming an effective corporate culture is not even posed. This situation is due to the fact that hired workers are seen as relatively easy to replace and more interested in maintaining their jobs than the employer. A similar situation takes place even in Russian universities, the resources of which, it would seem, should have the necessary competence both to defend their rights and to participate in decision-making. Nevertheless, university workers, constantly showing dissatisfaction with the level of wages and workload, as a rule, do not quit, but continue to fulfill their duties, resorting only to informal resistance in the form of failure to comply with certain instructions and requirements. This is the situation in state universities, but at the same time in commercial universities, of which there are very few left in Russia, employees have even fewer rights and opportunities than in state ones.

More flexible and diverse models of human resource management can be observed in foreign companies operating in Russia, but not in all, adaptation to the peculiarities of the Russian market, power and culture may be accompanied by the assimilation of accepted local rules. Moreover, there are not so many foreign companies with foreign management in Russia. Although some Russian companies are striving to introduce Western management practices.

Human resource management, like other elements of economic and entrepreneurial activity in Russian society, is ultimately associated with cultural stereotypes assimilated by Russians in the course of their

socialization and perception of the cultural experience of previous generations, formed in certain historical conditions. The study of the cultural characteristics of Russian entrepreneurs of different levels made it possible to identify the following set of qualities that affect their professional activities.

The high value of personal rather than professional qualities, the desire to build business relationships based on personal characteristics, the desire for trusting relationships – and at the same time, a low level of trust.

Conformity, dependence on the opinion of the group, and at the same time unreliability, lack of responsibility and professional integrity.

The tendency to bribe officials, evade taxes and hide income, which can partly be explained by the traditional distrust and dependence on the authorities. Thus, the need to bribe officials arises in connection with formalized and cumbersome regulatory mechanisms that control entrepreneurial activity.

Western researchers [10] distinguish among Russian entrepreneurs such properties as a deep gap between managers and subordinates (this also affects human resource management), anxiety, individualism, and a desire to avoid uncertainty. The latter features are also understandable, given the specifics of the development of the market economy in post-Soviet Russia.

According to researchers, the style of Russian managers is characterized by authoritarianism and, at the same time, a desire to avoid responsibility for decision-making. The organizational culture of most Russian enterprises does not provide for the participatory approach that underlies modern theories of personnel management. This approach involves the perception of each employee as a conscious and responsible individual, considering him as a partner who can potentially have valuable ideas that are useful for improving the efficiency of the organization.

Interesting data are demonstrated by the results of a survey of Russian directors of enterprises [8]. From the point of view of the respondents:

- Western management models work only in a stable society – 58%;
- Western models can work at a different salary level – 54%;
- Western models do not correspond to Russian culture – 44%;
- Our staff is not qualified enough to implement Western models – 19%;
- Western models work with other buyers – 12%.

The survey results demonstrate not only a specific view of human resources, but also a negative attitude towards developed and effective management techniques.

Conclusion. During the post-Soviet period, Russian society has gone through a rather difficult path of reforms, as a result of which a Russian model of a market economy has developed, combining the universal features of a market economy with certain specific features due to the influence of the Soviet management model. With regard to human resource management, the sociocultural foundations laid down by the Soviet experience imply the predominance of authoritarian directive management and an attitude towards the human resources of enterprises as a material resource rather than a creative potential responsible for the effective development of a company. However, Russian society is not a static system, it is developing, and even highlighting some negative tendencies, it is necessary to remember that this is only a part of reality, and along with rather rigid management models, there are others, and there is recognition of the fact that, for effective development it is necessary to improve management practices.

Список источников

1. Белов М.Т., Васьков М.А. и др. Специфика управленческих компетенций в контексте управления персоналом образовательной организации. В кн.: Государственное управление и региональное управление в России. Проблемы и перспективы в мультикультурном регионе. сер. «Вклад в экономику». Швейцария, 2020. С. 291-298.
2. Попова А.В. Социально-философский аспект проблемы индивидуальной автономии // Общество: философия, история, культура. 2020. № 12 (80). С. 41-46.
3. Popov A.V., Rachipa A.V., Abazieva K.G., Shvets L.G., Kobysheva L.I., Goncharova S.N., Samygin S.I. Specificity of explication of the category "management decisions" and scientific-methodological approaches for their development. Revista Inclusiones. 2019. Том. 6. № 2. С. 215-224.
4. Артамонова Я.В., Гафиатулина Н.Х. Жизненный мир молодой семьи в пространстве поликультурного региона: устойчивость и риски распада // Государственное и муниципальное управление. Ученые записки. 2021. № 1. С. 233-236.

5. Belikova N.Yu., Rachipa A.V., et al. Spiritual and moral values as the sense basis and the factor of improving the quality of management of the education system. *Revista Turismo Estudos & Práticas*. 2020. No S4, p. 16.
6. Организационная культура: учебник и практикум для академического бакалавриата. В.Г. Смирнова [и др.] под редакцией В.Г. Смирновой. М., 2019. 306 с.
7. Абазиева К.Г., Гончарова С.Н., Масленникова Л.П., Стратан Д.И. Методы управления государственными финансовыми ресурсами // *Средиземноморский журнал социальных наук*. 2015. Том. 6. № 3. С. 60-70.
8. Кулапов М.Н., Лабаджян М.Г. Особенности использования стратегического подхода к управлению человеческими ресурсами в России // *Известия УрГЭУ*. 2010. № 5 (31).
9. Фернем А. Рейтинг начальника, коллеги и подчиненного // *Журнал управленческой психологии*. 2002. Том. 17. №8.
10. Ardichvili A., Kuchinke P. Leaders hip Styles and Cultural Values among Managers and Subordinates: Comparative Study of Four Countries of the Former Soviet Union, Germany, and the USA, Human Resource Development International. 2002. No 5(1).

References

1. Belov M.T., Vaskov M.A., et al. Specifics of managerial competencies in the context of managing the personnel of an educational organization. In the book: *Public Administration and Regional Management in Russia. Challenges and Prospects in a Multicultural Region*. Ser. "Contributions to Economics". Switzerland, 2020: 291-298 (In Russ.)
2. Popova A.V. Socio-philosophical aspect of the problem of individual autonomy. *Obshchestvo: filozofiya, istoriya, kul'tura = Society: philosophy, history, culture*. 2020; 12 (80): 41-46 (In Russ.)
3. Popov A.V., Rachipa A.V., Abazieva K.G., Shvets L.G., Kobysheva L.I., Goncharova S.N., Samygin S.I. Specificity of explication of the category "management decisions" and scientific-methodological approaches for their development. *Revista Inclusiones*. 2019; 6 (2): 215-224.
4. Artamonova Ya.V., Gafiatulina N.Kh. Life world of young family in space of multicultural region: sustainability and risks of disintegration. *Gosudarstvennoe i municipal'noe upravlenie. Uchenye zapiski = State and Municipal Management. Scholar Notes*. 2021; 1: 233-236 (In Russ.)
5. Belikova N.Yu., Rachipa A.V., et al. Spiritual and moral values as the sense basis and the factor of improving the quality of management of the education system. *Revista Turismo Estudos & Práticas*. 2020; S4: 16.
6. Organizational culture: textbook and workshop for academic bachelor's degree. VG Smirnova [and others] edited by V.G. Smirnova. M., 2019: 306 (In Russ.)
7. Abazieva K.G., Goncharova S.N., Maslennikova L.P., Stratan D.I. Methods of management of public financial resources. *Sredizemnomorskij zhurnal social'nyh nauk = Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2015; 6 (3): 60-70 (In Russ.)
8. Kulapov M.N., Labadzhyan M.G. Features of the use of a strategic approach to human resource management in Russia. *Izvestiya UrGEU = Izvestiya USUE*. 2010; 5 (31) (In Russ.)
9. Furnham A. Rating a Boss, a Colleague and a Subordinate. *ZHurnal upravlencheskoj psihologii = Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2002; 17(8) (In Russ.)
10. Ardichvili A., Kuchinke P. Leaders hip Styles and Cultural Values among Managers and Subordinates: Comparative Study of Four Countries of the Former Soviet Union, Germany, and the USA, Human Resource Development International. 2002. No 5(1).

Информация об авторах

А. В. Рачипа – докт. социол. наук, проф.;
 К. Г. Абазиева – докт. экон. наук, доц.;
 С. И. Самыгин – докт. социол. наук, проф.

Information about the authors

A. V. Rachipa – Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor;
 K. G. Abazieva – Doctor of Economics, Associate Professor;
 S. I. Samygin – Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor.

Вклад авторов: все авторы сделали эквивалентный вклад в подготовку публикации. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Contribution of the authors: the authors contributed equally to this article. The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Статья поступила в редакцию 06.05.2022; одобрена после рецензирования 20.05.2022; принята к публикации 23.05.2022.

The article was submitted 06.05.2022; approved after reviewing 20.05.2022; accepted for publication 23.05.2022.