

Monitoring of economic and social processes (the case of inter-ethnic relations)*

The article highlights the importance of inter-ethnic relations monitoring in connection with the changes in the ethnic composition of population, caused by labour migration. It also points out that the study and adoption of competent managerial decisions in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations will promote peace among different nationalities living on the same territory, since ethnic conflicts pose a serious threat to the integrity of the state. The article analyzes the results of three monitorings carried out in the Komi Republic in 2008 – 2010, and it defines several topical blocks: the assessment of the residence of different ethnic groups on the same territory, the likelihood of ethnic conflicts occurrence, their causes, the attitude of the local population towards migrants (migrant workers).

Problems of inter-ethnic relations, ethnic conflicts, nationality, mixed marriages, labour migrants.



**Viktor V.
FAUZER**

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of the Department, Head of the Laboratory at the Institute of Socio-Economic and Energy Problems of the North Komi Scientific Centre of the Ural RAS Department
fauzer@iespn.komisc.ru

Defining the problem. The importance of taking managerial decisions in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations only after their thorough consideration was highlighted in Russian President V. Putin's pre-election articles, "The issue of inter-ethnic relations is, indeed, of fundamental importance for Russia with its great variety of languages, traditions, ethnic groups and cultures. Any responsible politician and public figure should be aware of the fact that one of the main conditions of the very existence of our country is the civil and inter-ethnic concord" [4].

In Russia the representatives of different ethnic groups coexisted peacefully under the single state until the 1990s. At present, the situation has changed: the subject of inter-ethnic relations is becoming a most important one and it is acquiring an explosive character. There exist three acute problems connected with inter-ethnic relations. The first one is uncontrolled migration, in which the unscrupulous employers take special interest. The second one lies in the fact that it is the natives of the regions where corruption flourished even in the Soviet period that were

* The article has been prepared with the financial support of the Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation in the framework of the RHSF scientific-research project "The impact of migration on ethnodemographical structures and employment of the population in the national regions (the case of the Republic of Komi)" (2012 – 2013, project No. 12-12-11001).

able to adapt best of all in the conditions of lawlessness and uncontrolled crime. The third problem, according to some rumors, consists in the fact that young people from the Southern regions arrive in big cities in order to beat Russians because they consider it something of a maturity test [6, p. 7].

Each country has its own way in the resolution of ethnic conflicts. But there is a common rule: “besides laws there ought to be the rules of coexistence in the civil society - the distinction between the public and private spheres. And the norms of behavior in the public sphere should be uniform for all, regardless of their cultural and religious background”. The question is how to make the “co-habitants” follow the rules?

In general, one can say that we will have to deal more and more with the representatives of other ethnic groups and cultures in our daily routine. And we will have to accept it and adapt to it.

Taking into account the circumstances stated above, the Ministry of National Policies of the Komi Republic initiated the annual monitoring of ethnic tension in the region. It was carried out for the first time in 2008 and was continued in 2009 – 2010.

The monitoring is aimed at measuring the level of inter-ethnic tensions (inter-ethnic relations) and its influence on the region’s socio-economic development. In this respect, the following tasks were to be solved: 1) people’s attitude to the environment of joint residence and to inter-ethnic marriages was revealed; 2) the relationship between different nationalities and the attitude of local population towards migrants (migrant workers) were assessed; 3) the possibility of ethnic conflicts and their nature were estimated.

Description of the sample. In 2008 – 2010, the survey was conducted in three cities and towns: Syktyvkar, Ukhta and Usinsk; in three rural districts: Izhemsky, Ust-Kulomsky and Knyazhpogostsky. At the beginning of 2011,

489,237 people lived in these cities, towns and districts, which comprised 54.4% of the total population of the republic (899,215 people): in Syktyvkar – 251,599; in Ukhta – 121,995; in Usinsk – 47,074; in Ust-Kulomsky District – 26,690; in Knyazhpogostsky District – 23,243; in Izhemsky District – 18,636 people [3, p. 5]. The sample size was more than 1% of the general population and it conformed to its basic parameters.

In 2010, 591 people took part in the survey, among which 46.8% - men and 53.2% - women. People aged up to 29 accounted for 29.1%, aged from 30 to 39 – 22.7% and older than 40 – 48.2%. More than half of the respondents were married – 53.7%, 22.1% never married, 9.2% were cohabiting. The sample includes all social groups of the society: managers – 8.7%, specialists – 23.1%, employees – 16.7%, workers – 26.4%, non-working pensioners – 8.8%, students – 8.7%, unemployed – 3.7% and housewives – 2.7%. The respondents have a high educational level: with higher or incomplete higher, including post-graduate, education – 38.9%; with secondary vocational education – 24.3%; with initial vocational education – 13.6%; with complete secondary education – 14.2; with general basic and primary education – 9.0%.

Of a special interest are the figures representing the share of various nationalities in the sample. The respondents include the Komi – 35.3%, the Russians – 47.1%, the Ukrainians – 6.9%, the Tatars – 3.7%, the Chuvashes – 1.2%, the Belarusians – 1%, the Germans – 0.8%, the Moldovans – 0.8%, other nationalities – 3%.

The respondents were also asked about the nationality of their spouse. The answers showed quite a diversity of nationalities: the Russians – 48.1%, the Komi – 36.9%, the Ukrainians – 7.6%, the Tatars – 2.3%, the Belarusians – 1.3%, the Chuvashes – 1.3%, the Germans – 0.5%, the Moldovans – 0.2%, other nationalities – 1.8%. The greatest share of

monoethnic marriages is found among the Russians – 70% the Komi account for 68.7%, the Tatars – 28.6%, the Ukrainians – 26.7%. The data on the distribution of inter-ethnic marriages are presented in *table 1*.

According to their native place of birth, 45.8% of respondents are natives of the area where the survey was conducted, and 54.2% are natives of other territories. The respondents, who were non-natives of their residence area, answered to the question “How long have you been living in this settlement?” as follows: less than 2 years – 8.3%, from 3 to 5 years – 9.9%, from 6 to 9 years – 8.1%, from 10 to 19 years – 19.5%, more than 20 years – 54.2%. The former places of residence of the respondents were: the cities, towns and urban-type settlements of the Komi Republic – for 16.3% of respondents, the rural areas of the republic – for 27.9%, 29.8%

came from urban areas and 11% – from the villages of Russia, 14.7% – from CIS countries, 0.3% – from the far abroad countries. The important characteristics of the sample also include the reasons for the respondents’ arrival in the place of their present residence (*tab. 2*).

While speaking about the migration characteristics of the population, one should dwell on such reasons for leaving as “the comfort and security of living in the region”, since they determine the migration attitudes of the population. At the time of the survey 37% of respondents were not going to leave the Republic of Komi, 42.3% were going to leave, and 20.7% hadn’t decided yet for the next few years. Everything will depend on the state of the external and internal social environment in the republic. This is what forces people to think about leaving or, on the contrary, to continue to

Table 1. Distribution of respondents by the nationality of the spouse, %

Nationality of respondents	Nationality of the respondent's spouse					
	Komi	Russian	Ukrainian	Tatar	Belarusian	Other
Komi	68.7	19.1	5.3	1.5	2.3	3.1
Russian	19.0	70.0	6.8	1.6	0.5	2.1
Ukrainian	26.7	43.3	26.7	0.0	0.0	3.3
Tatar	28.6	35.7	0.0	28.6	0.0	7.1
Belarusian	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
Other	32.0	48.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0

Table 2. Distribution of answers to the question: “Why have you chosen this settlement as the place of residence?”, %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
Wanted to get higher wages	9.6	15.2	3.8	14.9	20.2	7.8	11.8	16.4	6.8
Hoped to find a job for myself or my family members	6.6	7.6	5.6	11.8	12.3	11.1	10.5	14.4	6.2
Wanted to improve housing conditions	5.2	5.8	4.7	4.5	5.4	3.3	4.8	4.6	5.1
Arrived here in order to study, to provide the children with education	12.4	22.8	1.4	7.9	13.3	0.6	5.9	10.2	1.1
Was placed here on a job	13.7	8.9	18.8	8.7	5.4	13.1	12.3	7.7	17.4
Moved here with my parents	14.7	18.7	10.3	19.4	25.6	11.1	25.5	30.3	20.2
Returned to my parents or other relatives	17.4	5.4	30.0	9.8	1.0	21.6	10.5	4.1	17.4
Got married or divorced	12.4	8.0	16.9	19.4	12.3	28.8	13.1	7.7	19.1
Other reasons for settling here	8.0	7.6	8.5	3.6	4.5	2.6	5.6	4.6	6.7

live here. As the survey shows, the main reasons for leaving are: for 29.3% – “the desire to change their place of residence, from the North to the South or the Central Russia”, 25.0% of respondents think that “the settlement, where I live, is unpromising, because production is not developing there”, 14.9% would like to leave because “there are no opportunities to provide for the family, etc. (tab. 3).

Results of the monitoring. The analysis of the information from the mass media, the speeches of the region’s leaders and the reviews of external experts shows that over a long period of time the Republic of Komi has been a region, where the representatives of virtually all the nationalities of Russia and the countries of near and far abroad live peacefully together. The presence of different peoples with different cultures can lead to different behavioral strategies. One can have a positive or negative attitude to the representatives of other ethnic groups. The monitoring revealed that for the majority of citizens in the republic

the neighborhood of people of a different nationality doesn’t bother them. From 2008 to 2009 the share of respondents for whom “the national composition of the inhabitants does not matter” increased from 47.1% to 49.6%. It decreased by 0.8% in 2010 as compared with 2009 and amounted to 48.8%. In 2010 the share of respondents, for whom the monoethnic composition of the population in the place of their residence is desirable, was 29.5%, which is 2% more than in 2008 and 3.8% more than in 2009. (tab. 4).

The survey was also aimed at revealing what is the main factor that brings people of different nationalities together. The answers show that it is their “common language” (in 2008 – for 59.9% of respondents, in 2009 – for 65.7%, in 2010 – for 58.7%), “national customs and traditions” (in 2008 – for 50.6%, in 2009 – for 46.6%, in 2010 – for 49.2%). For the village dwellers “living together in one place” is also important (in 2008 – for 50.7%, in 2009 – for 55.4%, in 2010 – for 50.2%) (tab. 5).

Table 3. Distribution of answers to the question: “If you decide to leave, then what are the reasons that make you think about leaving?”, %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
I have no opportunity to provide for the family	13.5	10.2	17.3	18.2	8.5	28.1	14.9	9.2	20.1
There exists a chance of losing the job and there are no opportunities for finding another one	11.7	10.2	13.6	15.8	8.2	23.4	11.7	8.8	14.2
The children lack the opportunity to receive education and afterward find a job in the place of their residence	14.9	9.4	21.2	14.4	8.5	20.5	11.3	4.4	17.8
The settlement, where I live, is unpromising, because production is not developing there	18.6	13.7	24.2	19.0	10.1	28.1	25.0	11.9	37.3
The desire to return to my native region, to my parents, relatives	8.2	11.3	5.3	12.3	19.0	5.6	10.0	13.2	6.6
Because of my health condition	4.2	5.6	2.8	6.4	6.5	6.3	2.5	2.0	3.0
For family reasons (divorce, marriage, absence of the opportunity to create a family, etc.)	3.2	4.0	2.5	4.9	4.2	5.6	4.6	5.1	4.0
The desire to change the place of residence, from the North to the South or the Central Russia	27.1	43.0	11.4	30.0	49.3	10.6	29.3	42.4	15.8
Other reasons	2.3	3.0	1.7	1.0	1.6	0.3	2.7	3.0	2.3

The majority of the inhabitants in the republic (54.6%, in 2008 – 50.4%, in 2009 – 52.5%) don't care about the ethnic composition of their children's classmates. Only 21.2% of the respondents (in 2008 – 22.2%, in 2009 – 21.0%) would like all their children's classmates or their majority to belong to the same nationality (*tab. 6*).

Continuous living in a multi-ethnic environment formed the positive attitude of the population toward inter-ethnic marriages. When choosing a spouse, the people are

guided by a simple principle: "It is the heart that matters". Only 3.6% of the respondents in 2009 considered the inter-ethnic marriage undesirable (*tab. 7*). However, the events of the last years (much publicized divorce cases involving the issues of granting custody of the children to the mother and father of different nationalities) can change the attitude to contracting such marriages. The 2010 survey showed the increase in the share of the respondents, who consider an inter-ethnic marriage undesirable, up to 8.0%.

Table 4. Distribution of answers to the question: "In your opinion, what kind of settlement is the best to live in?", %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
Where everyone or the majority of the residents belong to the same nationality as myself	27.5	28.0	27.0	25.7	21.4	30.1	29.5	28.1	30.8
Where the population is multi-ethnic and there are people of the same nationality as myself	15.5	16.4	14.5	16.4	18.1	14.7	13.4	9.3	17.4
The national composition of the inhabitants does not matter	47.1	42.9	51.4	49.6	50.6	48.5	48.8	53.7	44.1
It is difficult to answer	9.9	12.7	7.1	8.3	9.9	6.7	8.3	8.9	7.7

Table 5. Distribution of answers to the question: "What, in your opinion, is the main factor that brings people of one nationality together?" %*

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
Living on the same territory	44.1	37.6	50.7	48.9	42.5	55.4	44.7	38.0	50.2
Common language	59.9	56.5	63.3	65.7	59.5	71.9	58.7	53.6	62.4
National customs and traditions	50.6	54.0	47.2	46.6	48.4	44.9	49.2	49.5	47.9
National literature, art	16.0	16.9	15.1	16.9	16.0	17.8	11.8	10.2	13.2
Likeness of appearance, character, behaviour	17.2	21.8	12.7	20.2	21.9	18.5	16.8	18.0	15.2
Religious denomination	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.3	16.9	5.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	1.4	1.0

*Respondents could pick several answer options.

Table 6. Distribution of answers to the question: "It would be preferable for you if your children studied..?", %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
In a class where all the children or the majority belong to one nationality	22.2	22.7	21.8	21.0	20.2	21.7	21.2	18.9	23.5
In a multi-national class	21.0	19.4	22.6	17.3	14.4	20.3	18.0	18.9	17.1
It doesn't matter to me	50.4	49.4	51.2	52.5	54.6	50.3	54.6	56.6	52.7
It is difficult to answer	6.4	8.5	4.4	9.2	10.8	7.7	6.2	5.6	6.7

Table 7. Distribution of answers to the question: “What is your attitude toward inter-ethnic marriages?”, %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
Such marriage is desirable	10.7	8.6	12.8	15.2	6.6	23.9	10.5	6.6	14.2
It would be better if my son/daughter chose a partner of our nationality, but I have nothing against the inter-ethnic marriage	19.0	24.2	13.8	18.0	22.6	13.3	18.5	13.2	23.5
The nationality doesn't matter, it is the personality that does	59.0	51.9	66.1	54.6	57.7	51.5	54.4	59.4	49.7
Such marriage is undesirable	6.3	9.1	3.5	3.6	4.3	3.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
It is difficult to answer	5.0	6.2	3.8	8.6	8.8	8.3	8.6	12.8	4.6

Table 8. Distribution of answers to the question: “What is your attitude toward inter-ethnic marriages?” – according to the nationality of respondents, %

Nationality	Such marriage is desirable	It would be better if my son/daughter chose a partner of our nationality, but I have nothing against the inter-ethnic marriage	The nationality doesn't matter, it is the personality that does	Such marriage is undesirable	It is difficult to answer
2008					
Komi	11.6	15.8	66.9	3.4	2.3
Russians	10.5	19.4	55.6	7.7	6.8
Ukrainians	5.3	21.0	55.3	13.1	5.3
Tatars	12.0	24.0	40.0	12.0	12.0
2009					
Komi	18.9	20.6	50.0	2.1	8.4
Russians	13.0	15.2	58.7	3.4	9.7
Ukrainians	13.3	16.7	60.0	3.3	6.7
Tatars	8.7	30.4	43.5	4.4	13.0
2010					
Komi	12.0	21.6	55.8	5.3	5.3
Russians	8.3	16.2	53.1	9.8	12.6
Ukrainians	9.8	17.1	65.8	4.9	2.4
Tatars	13.6	18.2	50.0	9.1	9.1

The respondents of different nationalities were also asked a question concerning their attitude toward inter-ethnic marriages. In this regard we can point out the following. The year 2010 faced the decrease in the share of the Komi and the Russians, who consider that “the nationality doesn't matter, it is the personality that does”, the figures were 55.8% against 66.9% in 2008 and 53.1% against 55.6%, respectively; other nationalities show a positive dynamics in this respect. The negative aspects identified in 2010 include the increase among the representatives of all nationalities of the share of those who “consider inter-ethnic marriages undesirable”, and the decrease in the

share of “those who consider such marriages desirable” (exception – the Tatars, among which this share has increased from 8.7% to 13.6%), while in 2009 the situation was reverse as compared with 2008 (*tab. 8*).

Similar answers were received to the question about the ideal marriage partner's nationality. For the majority of respondents (60.3%) the nationality of the spouse doesn't matter (*tab. 9*).

The answers to the question: “Do you sometimes feel or don't feel anger or hostility toward the people of one or another nationality?” require careful assessment. The monitoring shows that the majority of the

Table 9. Distribution of answers to the question: "Of what nationality should your ideal spouse be and what would you advise your children in this respect?", %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
Definitely of the same nationality as myself	14.6	17.1	12.1	9.8	11.5	8.0	13.4	13.8	13.0
The same nationality as myself is preferable but not obligatory	28.3	29.8	26.7	29.8	32.2	27.4	26.3	21.2	31.1
The nationality of my spouse doesn't matter to me	55.7	51.5	60.1	60.4	56.3	64.6	60.3	65.0	55.9

Table 10. Distribution of answers to the question: "Do you sometimes feel or don't feel anger or hostility towards the representatives of one or another nationality?" %

	Answer option		
	Feel anger or hostility	Don't feel anger or hostility	It is difficult to answer
2008			
All residents	26.9	57.2	15.9
Urban residents	33.3	50.6	16.1
Village residents	20.4	63.8	15.8
2009			
All residents	27.8	55.6	16.6
Urban residents	37.3	48.2	14.5
Village residents	18.3	63.1	18.6
2010			
All residents	32.7	51.5	15.8
Urban residents	34.3	47.5	18.2
Village residents	31.2	55.2	13.6
For reference: data of the Public Opinion Foundation			
April 2002	32.0	65.0	3.0
September 2006	28.0	66.0	6.0
June – July 2007	25.0	69.0	6.0
December 2010	24.0	69.0	7.0
February 2011	19.0	76.0	5.0

inhabitants in the republic (51.5%, in 2008 – 57.2%, in 2009 – 55.6%) don't feel irritation or resentment toward the representatives of other nationalities, but from year to year their share is decreasing; rural dwellers are more tolerant of the persons of other nationalities – 55.2% (in 2008 – 63.8%, in 2009 – 63.1%). However, it should be pointed out, that about one-third of the respondents feel hostility towards the representatives of other nationalities, and their share has increased considerably – from 26.9% in 2008 to 32.7% in 2010; urban dwellers show a more "aggressive" attitude (34.3%).

At the same time, the share of those who find it difficult to answer remains practically unchanged: 15.9% in 2008, 15.8% in 2010. Consequently, the share of people faced with inter-ethnic problems has increased over the past three years (*tab. 10*).

When comparing these figures with the data of the Public Opinion Foundation polls conducted in 2002 – 2011, we can note two points [1]. In general, the answers given by the residents of the republic and those of all the country are similar: the majority of them don't feel irritation or resentment toward the representatives of other nationalities.

The difference in the answers lies in the fact that from year to year in Russia in general the dynamics of this indicator is positive (the increase from 65% in 2002 to 76% in 2011); in the Republic of Komi this dynamics is negative. The share of the respondents feeling hostility toward the representatives of other nationalities in the Republic of Komi is increasing. In Russia, on the contrary, it is gradually decreasing. So, if 32% of the respondents admitted their dislike of the representatives of other nationalities in 2002, then in 2007 this figure was 25% and in 2011 – 19%.

Our study can be complemented by the data of the Russian Public Opinion Research Center survey “Ethnic sympathies and dislikes of the Russians”. The initiative all-Russian poll was conducted on 1 – 2 May 2010. 1600 people in 140 settlements in 42 oblasts, krajs and republics of Russia were interviewed. The survey showed that 56% of the respondents treat the representatives of all ethnic groups equally. But 35% have negative attitudes toward the representatives of certain nationalities.

Our fellow citizens have the greatest sympathy toward the Russians (36%). And for the previous year the respondents stated it more often (from 29 to 36%). The Belarusians rank second (10%) and the Ukrainians – third (9%) in the list. The Russians also have good feelings toward the Europeans and the representatives of all the Slavic peoples (8%). The latter started to arouse positive emotions among the respondents more often (from 3 to 8%). The representatives of other peoples in the rating of sympathies are much more rare and they took up no more than 1 – 2%. 8% of the Russians don't have national preferences (a year ago – 20%).

Most often, it is still the peoples of the Caucasus that arouse negative emotions among the fellow citizens (29%). The dislike of immigrants from Central Asia is expressed more rarely (6%). 3% of the respondents dislike the Chinese and the Jews.

However, the majority of the respondents express positive attitude toward all peoples and nationalities (56%).

Every second respondent can't give specific reasons for the rejection of the representatives of other peoples and nations. The rest usually talk about their anxiety over the threat of terrorist attacks (13%) and over the unwillingness of newcomers to comply with the norms and customs, accepted in Russia (11% and 9% in 2004). Each of the following factors: appearance, behavior of migrants, the low cultural level and control in certain areas of business irritates 6% of the respondents. The negative attitude is least of all caused by the belief that immigrants take away jobs from local population (4%) [8].

In the course of the survey the respondents were asked the question: “Is it possible, in your opinion, that ethnic conflicts will take place in your settlement?” The answers were as follows: 45.0% (in 2008 – 40.9%, in 2009 – 46.4%) believe that it is unlikely, 37.9% (in 2008 – 39.6%, in 2009 – 30.1%) of the respondents believe that it is possible, for 17.1% it was difficult to say. A clearly positive dynamics observed in 2009 deteriorated in 2010. It should be noted that 55.1% of the urban residents think that the cases of ethnic conflicts in the place of their residence are possible; in the rural areas this share is 21,4%, which is 2.6 times lower (*tab. 11*).

In this respect, it is necessary to make the following note. The poll conducted by Yu.P. Shabayev in 1996 showed that only 15.9% of the respondents believe in the likelihood of inter-ethnic conflicts in the Komi Republic; 65% consider them unlikely and 18.3% exclude such a possibility at all. Among the Komi the share of people who consider ethnic conflicts possible was slightly higher than among other ethnic groups of the population [7]. In 2010 the share of people who consider ethnic conflicts possible, was the greatest among the Tatars (50%; *tab. 12*).

Table 11. Distribution of answers to the question “Is it possible, in your opinion, that ethnic conflicts will take place in your settlement?”, %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
I believe it is unlikely	40.9	29.6	52.4	46.4	37.5	55.5	45.0	28.9	60.5
It is possible	39.6	50.8	28.3	30.1	39.8	20.3	37.9	55.1	21.4
It is difficult to answer	19.5	19.6	19.3	23.5	22.7	24.2	17.1	16.0	18.1

Table 12. Distribution of answers to the question: “Is it possible, in your opinion, that ethnic conflicts will take place in your settlement?” – according to the nationality of respondents, %

Nationality	I believe it is unlikely	It is possible	It is difficult to answer
Komi	58.8	26.0	15.2
Russians	37.2	45.1	17.7
Ukrainians	31.7	43.9	24.4
Tatars	36.4	50.0	13.6
Belarusians	50.0	33.3	16.7
Germans	20.0	40.0	40.0
Chuvashes	57.1	14.3	28.6
Moldovans	60.0	20.0	20.0
Other	44.4	50.0	5.6

The construction of a balanced national policy and avoiding ethnic conflicts to the extent possible requires the knowledge of their reasons. In the course of the survey, the respondents named eight reasons that may cause ethnic conflicts. In 2008, 2009 and 2010, the respondents named three reasons most commonly: “bad manners, lack of culture, stupidity, lack of self-control, mutual misunderstanding” (48.9%); “there are too many newcomers, their defiant behavior, oppression of the native residents” (42.5%); “poverty, disorderly life, a huge gap between the rich and the poor, envy for those who are wealthier” (33.2% in 2010).

Such reason as “wrong internal policy, it is the authorities that ought to be blamed for this, it is the result of corruption and disregard of the law” (23.9%), ranking 5 in 2009, shifted to the 4th position in 2010. Of equal importance are the following reasons: “differences in views, traditions, and religion” (22.8%); “economic competition, clash of monetary interests, competition in the labour market” (20.6%; *tab. 13*).

One of the consequences of the demographic crisis and migration outflow of the population from the republic was the inflow of labour force from the countries of CIS and far abroad. According to the Department of the Federal Migration Service of Russia for the Republic of Komi, over the last 7 years (except 2006 and 2010) the number of officially registered labour migrants has been increasing. 5.5 thousand foreign citizens from 37 countries, including 10 CIS countries, arrived in the Republic of Komi in 2010. The main flow of migrants, 46.7% of the total number of migrants, came from Ukraine, 21.6% – from Uzbekistan. The share of Armenians (11.9%) in the total number of migrants remains consistently high [2, p. 79].

In 2010 22.9% of migrant workers were engaged in construction, 17.0% - in agriculture and hunting, 13.8% - in the real estate sphere and services sector. In the total number of the registered labour force, working in the republic’s economy, men accounted for 96.8%. One third of the foreign workers (32.6%) were at the age of 18 to 29, the citizens aged 30 – 39 accounted for 26% (*tab. 14*).

Table 13. Distribution of answers to the question: "What, in your opinion, may be the reasons for inter-ethnic conflicts?", %*

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/ town	Village	Total	City/ town	Village	Total	City/ town	Village
There are too many newcomers, their defiant behavior, oppression of the native residents	42.3	43.8	40.7	47.3	47.1	47.5	42.5	48.1	36.0
Wrong internal policy, it is the authorities that ought to be blamed for this, it is the result of corruption and disregard of the law	22.9	24.7	21.0	21.8	22.5	21.1	23.9	21.7	25.4
Poverty, disorderly life, a huge gap between the rich and the poor, envy for those who are wealthier	34.9	31.5	38.3	33.0	25.2	40.9	33.2	22.4	42.9
Bad manners, lack of culture, stupidity, lack of self-control, mutual misunderstanding	46.8	46.8	46.9	49.3	57.2	41.3	48.9	50.2	46.5
Economic competition, clash of monetary interests, competition in the labour market	21.0	21.2	20.8	24.5	22.2	26.7	20.6	17.6	23.1
Chauvinistic sentiments, activities of radical nationalistic groups and movements, skinheads	17.2	22.8	11.6	19.0	29.1	8.9	13.0	18.0	7.9
Race for power, for influence and control over the territory of residence	14.0	15.1	12.9	15.3	17.6	12.9	16.1	18.0	13.9
Differences in views, traditions, and religion	19.1	21.5	16.7	21.8	26.5	17.2	22.8	24.7	20.5
Other	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.5	1.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0

* Respondents could pick several answer options.

Table 14. The number of labor migrants working in the Komi Republic in 2004 – 2010, persons

Year	Total number of working migrants	Including by sex		Including those who arrived		
		men	women	from CIS countries	from other countries	stateless persons
2004	1358	1322	36	1183	175	-
2005	4050	3944	106	3762	288	-
2006	2961	2884	77	2845	116	-
2007	4377	4299	78	4178	199	-
2008	5840	5766	74	5572	267	1
2009	6329	6201	128	6058	271	-
2010	5537	5358	179	5277	258	2

In the course of the survey the respondents were asked a question: "What is your attitude toward the fact that the number of employees from the near and far abroad countries at the enterprises of the Komi Republic is increasing?" The attitude of 46.8% of the respondents is "indifferent", 34.2% consider this situation "negative" and only 11.8% view it as "positive". Among village dwellers, 39.3% of the respondents stated their negative attitude toward migrant workers, this is due to the fact that it is quite difficult to find a job in rural areas, and, to make things worse, the newcomers (foreigners) are becoming competitors on the labour market (*tab. 15*).

Today, the problem of inflow of people of other religious denominations and nationalities is so acute in the republic, as it may be in other regions. This is due to the fact that since 1930s the Komi region had been a place of political exile, special settlements and labour camps. The Komi people got used to and adapted to a multicultural environment. The difference between the present days and the past "black period of history" lies in the fact that at that time migrants were exiled for political or criminal reasons and they aroused sympathy and compassion. Today the situation is different: migrants come to live and work in the republic due to economic motives and

Table 15. Distribution of answers to the question: "What is your attitude toward the fact that the number of employees from Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova and other countries of the near and far abroad at the enterprises of the Komi Republic is increasing?", %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
Positive	13.7	13.5	13.9	10.8	11.2	10.4	11.8	13.7	10.0
Indifferent	51.3	58.1	44.4	47.8	59.1	36.4	46.8	48.2	45.4
Negative	26.5	20.3	32.7	32.1	18.8	45.5	34.2	28.9	39.3
It is difficult to answer	8.5	8.1	9.0	9.3	10.9	7.7	7.2	9.2	5.3

Table 16. Distribution of answers to the question: "How would you evaluate the relations developing between the native residents and people who arrived here to work?", %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
The relations between the native residents and migrants are stable and trouble-free	30.8	30.4	31.2	33.3	32.0	34.7	31.0	27.7	34.1
These relations are characterized by a certain degree of tension	31.4	37.0	25.7	28.0	35.0	20.7	30.8	33.0	28.7
Considerable tension that may provoke conflicts is evident	4.8	5.0	4.7	2.5	3.3	1.7	4.5	6.3	2.7
It is difficult to evaluate these relations	33.0	27.6	38.4	36.2	29.7	42.9	33.7	33.0	34.5

their behaviour is different here. Gradually it can change from adaptation to local socio-economic and political conditions toward aggression and offense.

The results of the monitoring show a negative tendency: the share of the respondents who consider that there are tensions between the immigrants and the native population exceeds the share of those who believe otherwise (35.3% against 31.0%). A high percentage of those, who found it difficult to answer, is also noteworthy. A thorough search for the causes of such an answer often proves that people just haven't faced this problem directly or can't express their attitude, but they admit that the problem exists and when the situation changes, they may change their attitude (*tab. 16*).

The poll revealed that it is the school and student youth that is more intolerant toward the persons of other nationalities, the working young people are less intolerant. The negative attitude to the representatives of other nationalities is found least of all among older people, brought up under the Soviet ideology. The

middle-aged population is also tolerant toward other nationalities. We can conclude that the older the people, the more tolerant they are towards the representatives of other ethnic groups (*tab. 17*).

In 2009 a new question was included into the survey: "How would you assess the role of the state and municipal authorities in the solution of inter-ethnic issues?" The following answers were obtained in 2010: "positive" – 22.9% (in 2009 – 27.7%), "negative" – 27.2% (in 2009 – 21.1%), "difficult to answer" – 49.9% (in 2009 – 51.2%). Such distribution of answers can be explained by the fact that this question should be addressed more likely to experts, and not just to the residents of the republic. Therefore, if we exclude from the calculations those who found it difficult to answer, then in 2009 the assessment of the role of the state and municipal authorities in the solution of inter-ethnic issues would be more positive: 56.8% of the respondents estimated it as "positive" and 43.2% – as "negative". In 2010, the "positive" assessment was given by 45.7% and the "negative" – by 54.3%.

Table 17. Distribution of answers to the question: "Who is currently most likely to feel intolerance toward the persons of other nationalities?", %

Answer option	2008			2009			2010		
	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village	Total	City/town	Village
School youth	34.6	33.6	35.6	34.8	33.0	36.6	31.6	36.9	25.7
Student youth	40.8	39.5	42.0	35.0	33.0	37.0	37.4	39.3	34.7
Working youth	21.5	25.5	17.5	23.5	20.9	26.1	22.5	18.0	26.4
Middle-aged people	11.6	13.2	10.0	14.4	14.1	14.9	15.2	13.6	16.5
Elderly people	8.5	9.9	7.0	8.5	11.4	5.6	9.5	10.2	8.6
It is difficult to answer	22.6	22.6	22.6	28.2	31.0	25.4	24.9	21.0	28.1

According to the results of the monitoring it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

1. Half of the population of the republic has no negative feelings toward the neighborhood of the people of other nationalities, and in 2011, as compared to 2008, their number increased from 47.1 to 48.8%, or by 1.7 p.p., and in relation to 2009 it decreased by 0.8 p.p. There has been an increase in the percentage of respondents for whom the monoethnic composition of population is important: from 27.5% to 29.5%, or by 2.0 p.p. as compared with 2008, and by 3.8 p.p. as compared with 2009.

2. It is the "common language" that brings people together in the first place – 58.7%, it is followed by "national customs, traditions" – 49.2%, "living together in the same area" – 44.7%. From 2008 to 2010, the rating of these reasons has not changed. We should note only that the reason "national customs, traditions" was replaced by "living together in the same area" in 2009. In 2010 11.3% of the respondents chose a new answer option - "religious denomination".

3. The majority of the inhabitants in the republic don't attach great importance to the nationalities of their children's classmates (54.6%; in 2008 – 50.4%; in 2009 – 52.5%). The last years witnessed the decrease in the share of the respondents, who would like to have their children educated in a monoethnic environment (from 22.2% to 21.0% in 2009 and to 21.2% in 2010).

4. In the issues of marriage, the population of the republic is guided by the personal traits of the partner, and not his/her nationality – 54.4% (in 2008 – 59.0%, in 2009 – 54.6%); 18.5% of the respondents believe that it is better to marry someone of the same nationality as themselves, but they have nothing against inter-ethnic marriages (in 2008 – 19.0%, in 2009 – 18.0%).

5. Less than half of the respondents (44.8%) stated that their siblings weren't married to a person of another nationality, whereas in 2008 and 2009 the situation was quite the opposite (55.5 and 54.6%, respectively).

6. Some concern is caused by the fact that quite a few respondents (37.9%) consider that there is a possibility of arising ethnic conflicts in the place of their residence (in 2008 – 39.6%, in 2009 – 30.1%); a considerable share of the respondents (45.0%) believe that ethnic conflicts in the place of their residence are unlikely (in 2008 – 40.9%, in 2009 – 46.4%); one in five didn't answer.

7. Three main reasons of possible interethnic conflicts can be considered most important: "bad manners, lack of culture, stupidity, lack of self-control, mutual misunderstanding" – 48.9%; "there are too many newcomers, their defiant behavior, oppression of the native residents" - 42.5%; "poverty, disorderly life, a huge gap between the rich and the poor, envy for those who are wealthier" – 33.2%.

8. One should note that the share of those who dislike the representatives of other

nationalities, has significantly increased: from 26.9% in 2008 to 32.7% in 2010. The share of those, who find it difficult to answer, remained practically unchanged: in 2008 – 15.9%, in 2010 – 15.8%. The share of those, who don't have such a dislike, has been reducing – from 57.2% to 51.5%. Consequently, over the past three years there has been an increase in the share of people who faced with inter-ethnic problems.

9. It was revealed that the school youth (31.6%) and student youth (37.4%) feel greater intolerance towards the persons of other nationalities; the working youth is more tolerant in this regard (22.5%). A negative attitude to the representatives of other nationalities is manifested least of all among older people (9.5%), brought up under the Soviet ideology. The middle-aged population (15.2%) is also tolerant toward the people of other nationalities.

References

1. Inter-ethnic conflicts in Russia. Public Opinion Foundation. Available at: <http://bd.fom.ru/report/map/projects/dominant/dom1050/d105016> (Accessed 18 January 2011).
2. Migration of the population of the Komi Republic: Statistical Bulletin. Komistat. Syktyvkar, 2011.
3. On the change of the number of population in the municipalities of the Komi Republic in 2011: informational and analytical bulletin No. 48-59-50/1 / Komistat. Syktyvkar, 2011.
4. Putin V. Russia: the national issue "Self-determination of the Russian people – the multi-ethnic civilization, united by the Russian cultural core". *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*. 2012. No. 1.
5. Romodanovsky K. The problem is not that they (migrants) are numerous, but that we (Russians) are scarce. *Migration. The 21 century*. 2010. No. 2. P. 3-6.
6. Russia – for whom? Elimination of the national republics... Or are there any other ways to save the country? *Arguments and facts*. 2011. No. 7. P. 6-7.
7. Shabayev Yu.P. Ethnodemographical development of the Komi Republic in the context of demographic processes among the Finno-Ugric peoples of the Russian Federation: brochure. Syktyvkar, 2005.
8. Ethnic sympathies and dislikes of the Russians. Russian Public Opinion Research Center. Available at: <http://wciom.ru/index.php?id=268&uid=13515> (Accessed 18 January 2011).
9. The echo of the events of 11 December in Manezhnaya Square. Public Opinion Foundation. Available at: <http://bd.fom.ru/report/map/projects/dominant/dom1050/d105016> (Accessed 18 January 2011).