

POSSIBILITIES OF FOREIGN EXPERIENCE IMPLEMENTATION OF INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES IN THE SPHERE OF INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN THE RUSSIAN CONTEXT

Yuriy G. Volkov^{1*}, Anatoly V. Lubskiy¹, I. Igor P. Chernobrovkin¹,
Andrew V. Bedrik¹, Anton V. Serikov¹

Inadequate efficiency of the national policy in Russia needs new management models, including taking into account the foreign experience of institutional practices in the field of inter-ethnic relations. Reconstruction of formal and informal institutional practices in developed countries with a complex ethno-cultural structure, such as the USA and the FRG, makes it possible to identify the possibilities of implementing this experience in Russian society, taking into account its ethno-cultural and political specifics. This will allow us to move from the administrative model of institutional practices in Russia to democratic, dialogue-based state and municipal authorities, public and ethnic organizations in solving problems of interethnic interactions in local communities.

Keywords: interethnic relations, national policy, value policy, institutional practices, formal institutional practices, informal institutional practices, solidarism institutional practices, ethnic groups, migrants, implementation of foreign experience, local communities.

INTRODUCTION

In the era of late modernity, there is an increase in such interrelated megatrends of world development as globalization and localization (Robertson, 1995). At the same time, globalization, defying national differences, is accompanied by a crisis of national identities (Huntington, 2010; Goldschmidt, 2010), and localization is manifested in the desire of various communities, primarily ethnic, to cultural and political autarchy. The increase of migration flows in developed countries with a complex ethno-cultural structure led to the search for new models of the inter-ethnic relations regulation in the context of globalization. The result of such a search was the transition in these countries to a value policy that defines the framework of “public values management” (Patrick & Margetts, 2006; Kilburn, 2009; Witesman & Walters, 2013) a new content of institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic interactions (Bedrik et al., 2016).

In modern Russia, in the context of the reconstruction of ethnic identities and the intensification of migration flows, the problem of increasing of national policies effectiveness aimed at regulating inter-ethnic relations, including (Volkov, 2016), taking into account the possibility of foreign experience of institutional practices implementation in this sphere, is also acute (Bedrik et al., 2015).

¹ Institute of Sociology and Regional Study, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia,
E-mail: ugvolkov@sfnu.ru

REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE

In Western countries interest in value politics arose in the late XX - early XXI century (Moore, 1995; Kelly, Mulgan & Muers, 2002; Stoker, 2006; Rhodes & Wanna, 2007; Alford & Hughes, 2008; Morell, 2009). At the same time, scientists who study value policy in the USA admit, that in recent years special attention has been paid to practical aspects of management activity (Hollinger, 2005). At the same time, this led to the fact that the conceptual interpretation of the value policy based on the recognition of the discussions role on public values began to lag behind the institutional practices of its implementation in the framework of the dialogue between the state and civil society (Morell, 2009; Rhodes & Wanna, 2007).

In Germany, the scientific interest attracts such aspects of value policy that are directly related to institutional practices of ethnic migrants integration in the national community. However, some researchers, drawing attention to the need to take into account the peculiarities of various groups of ethnic migrants structural integration in German society, suggest using the American model of value politics (Geißler, 2014; Rudiger & Spenser, 2003).

They also believe that the value policy in Western European countries as a whole should be based, on the one hand, on the principles of tolerant “hospitality”, and on the other hand, on dialogue with ethnic groups on the basis of equality and the preservation of the democratic heritage (Caldwell, 2009). However, other researchers believe that the country needs its own model of value policy, different from American, based on the ideas of liberal multiculturalism. In this regard, as noted by the researchers, the concept of “communitarian multiculturalism”, whose strategy aimed at the social integration of ethnic migrants, allows the establishment of cultural restrictions for them in order to preserve the foundations of the civil solidarity of German society (Achkasov & Rozanova, 2013).

Currently, the researchers, focusing on the impact of migratory flows on the change in the ethnic structure of the FRG (Geißler, 2014; Meier-Braun & Weber, 2014; Meier-Braun, 2002; Seifert, 2009), focus on the characteristics of these flows, which differ in the objectives of immigration and the rules for the adoption of settlers by the country of destination (Geißler, 2014; Worbs et al., 2013; Fischer-Les-cano & Kocher, 2012). In the context of the migration flows, management, some researchers propose, on the one hand, to take into account the degree of marginalized ethnic migrants and the diversity of the problems and conflicts between local residents and migrants, on the other hand, in combining interethnic conflicts, combine competing and accommodative strategies (Fijalkowski, 1993).

Russian scientists, studying value policy as a special kind of managerial activity in foreign countries, draw attention to the fact that this policy, particularly in the US and FRG, is based primarily on civil-state partnership, ensuring the real participation of civil society in the regulation of inter-ethnic relations (Bedrik et

al., 2016). At the same time, the researchers admit that the sharp increase in migration flows in the FRG generates conflicts between local residents and migrants, the initiators of conflicts, sometimes escalating into social unrest, are more often become local residents, who are perceived, that migrants' behavior is deviant and showing aggressive intolerance towards their residence in the country. In these conflicts, certain social groups, with the support of the local population, resort to punitive self-help, and their tactics range from the presentation of lawsuits to reprisals and demolition. Such conflicts take place in all countries of the world, encompassed by flows of free and forced migration, including Russia (Volkov, 2016).

In this regard, the reconstruction of the implementing institutional practices experience in the field of inter-ethnic relations in developed countries with a complex ethno-cultural structure makes it possible to use this experience in Russian conditions. However, at the same time, scientists emphasize the need to establish political and socio-cultural opportunities for such implementation, due to the national specifics of Russia (Volkov, 2015).

METHODOLOGY

In the foreign literature, the term "institutional practices" usually refers to typical forms that have become habitual, combining social and structural integration (Giddens, 1984). In the Russian scientific tradition, some researchers consider institutional practices as interactions between actors that consistently reproduce accepted and collectively meaningful rules of behavior in a given social group in typical situations (Panov, 2011). Other researchers under institutional practices imply the implementation of institutional agreements in a particular institutional environment. At the same time, the institutional environment is viewed as a set of formal and informal rules and sanctions that form the legal and social framework for interactions between people. Institutional agreements are treated as contracts (contracts) between individuals with respect to additional restrictions (Patrushev, 2011).

A holistic study of institutional practices in the field of interethnic relations presupposes the development of a multidimensional methodological construct of interdisciplinary scientific research based on the synthesis of structure-constructual (Bourdieu, 1976), structural (Giddens, 1984), ethnomethodological (Garfinkel, 1967) theories of social practices on the one hand (Kaldybaeva, 2012), as well as theories of background and "revealing Character" of the practitioner. On the other hand, on the synthesis of normative and cognitive concepts of social institutions, within which institutions are interpreted as formal and informal rules and norms of social interaction (North, 1990) or as cognitive entities that underlie social action (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). In addition, the methodological construct of interdisciplinary scientific research of institutional practices in the field of interethnic

relations is based on the notion that not only institutions define practice, but practice also transforms (or generates) institutions. Such representations are aimed, on the one hand, to overcome the understanding of institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations between oppositions of objective / subjective and normative / activity, on the other, to the understanding that institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations are not Only the actions caused by formal and informal institutions, but also the institutions generated by the practices of interethnic interaction.

In general, the multidimensional methodological construct of interdisciplinary scientific research is based on the notion that institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations are: 1) actions conditioned by institutions as formal and informal norms of ethnic interaction; 2) actions related, first, to the internalization of institutions by interpreting them (translating institutions as norms into institutions as cognitive entities that underlie ethnic interactions), and secondly, with the implementation of institutions as cognitive constructs in action, third, with reinterpretation of institutions as cognitive entities in the process of ethnic interactions; 3) actions related to the externalization of institutions as cognitive entities that generate the transformation of old institutions or the formation of new informal (and, possibly, formal) institutions as norms for ethnic interaction. At the same time, from the methodological point of view, it is important to single out formal and informal institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations, as well as instrumental practices of coercion, consent and solidarity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

At the beginning of the XXI century in the conditions of intensification of the “vertical of power”, an authoritarian model of accommodative institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations emerged in the Russian Federation. This model, based on the use of an administrative resource and complementary to regulatory control, contributed to a reduction in inter-ethnic tensions in the society that emerged in the 1990s of the last century in Russia. However, the authoritarian model, characterized by a unidirectional administrative and regulatory impact on interethnic relations in the country, did not imply the use of the civil potential of solidarity practices to harmonize interethnic interactions based on trust and partnership.

In the context of the problem actualization of national policies increasing effectiveness and institutional practices in the field of inter-ethnic relations in Russia, a need has arisen for a transition to a democratic model of accommodative institutional practices complemented by administrative-power opposition to destructive ethno-political forces. The democratic model, which assumes an equal dialogue between government and society in solving national problems, relies primarily on solidarity institutional practices in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations.

The beginning of the transition to a democratic model of institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations in Russia can be considered the adoption in 2012 of the “Strategy of the State National Policy of the Russian Federation for the period until 2025”, focusing on the civil integration of Russian society, the ethno-cultural and ethno-cultural development of the peoples of Russia (Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 1666, 2012). The adoption of the “Strategy” approved by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation was preceded by a discussion of its draft in both chambers of the Legislative Assembly of the Russian Federation, in the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, as well as representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Muslim Spiritual Administrations. The “Strategy” project was also sent to all Russian regions, where it became the subject of discussion among experts, leaders and activists of civil and ethnic associations and ethno-cultural associations. As a result, the final version of the “Strategy” project, taking into account the opinions expressed, was made, as the researchers note about 3.5 thousand amendments (Zorin & Astvatsaturova, 2015).

The democratic model of institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations in Russia, the transition to which has not yet been fully achieved, corresponds, first of all, to the interests of the population of its polyethnic regions. This is evidenced by the fact that a large part of this population, negatively related to xenophobia, violation of civil rights and discrimination in ethnic sphere, ethnic competition, uncontrolled migration, political extremism, positively refers to the participation of public associations in solving interethnic problems (Volkov, 2016).

At the same time, a number of factors make it difficult to implement a democratic model of institutional practices in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations in the Russian regions. First of all, the lack of readiness of regional and municipal authorities to dialogue with the public and the lack of the necessary consolidation of civil, ethno-cultural and religious associations involved in various areas of inter-ethnic interaction in the regions.

In the Russian regions, the traditions of the authoritarian model of interaction between government and society are still strong, including in the sphere of interethnic relations. Virtually without constant feedback from public associations, regional and municipal authorities, relying on the tacit consent of the local population, limit themselves to publicly informing them of the decisions taken. This creates organizational barriers to the mobilization of public associations and makes it difficult for them to participate in solving problems of interethnic interaction.

The traditions of the authoritarian model of accommodative institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations in Russia also reduces the effectiveness of the functioning of such mediated channels of dialogue communication, such as regional public chambers, public councils, print media,

expert communities, and such direct channels as reception offices for executive bodies, television and Internet. Moreover, these channels, as the researchers admit, function not systematically, and are used situationally, primarily in cases of conflict incidents (Volkov, 2016).

As well as the institutionalization of dialogue and solidarity institutional at the regional level occurs in confrontation with corporatist and asymmetric systems of interest groups. These systems, aimed at lobbying the interests of these groups in government bodies, accompanied by illegal actions, also block the participation of public associations in solving problems in the field of inter-ethnic relations. In polyethnic regions, such systems have an additional dimension connected with the fact that competing ethnic elites in the struggle for power use corrupt clans, a nationalist-oriented part of the intelligentsia in ethno-cultural associations, and representatives of ethnic extremism and religious fundamentalism. Intensification of the fight against corruption and ethnic corporatism accelerates the establishment of a pluralistic and symmetrical system of interest groups. This system has a wide representation of particular interests and supports inter-group cooperation and seeks an equitable dialogue with regional and municipal authorities.

In the Russian regions, where a pluralistic and symmetric system of interested groups has not yet emerged, informal quasi-solidarity practices of exchange transactions have spread. These practices are characterized by the following points: first, the fulfillment by the public organization of the accommodation function is preceded by an appeal to the regional authorities with requests for material assistance; secondly, regional authorities choose their loyal public organizations as partners, using them in the implementation of their own tasks. The lack of independence and dependence of ethnocultural associations and associations from regional authorities limits their solidarity potential in inter-ethnic relations. Due to this, some associations adhere to the dependent attitude towards the authorities, while others, using the status of national-cultural associations, try to lobby the interests of certain ethnic groups in the economic sphere. In this case, ethno-cultural associations and associations act as a resource of ethnic entrepreneurship, and not as an institution for harmonizing inter-ethnic relations, and therefore only sporadically participate in solving inter-ethnic problems in the region. The emerging vacuum of solidarity practices in polyethnic Russian regions is filled with politicized ethnic organizations that use tactics of confrontation, rather than dialogue with the authorities. This tactic is intensified if the authorities themselves oppose the institutionalization of new associations, supposing that the representation of one ethnogroup at the expense of several subjects of civil society is redundant. In turn, this leads to intra-ethnic rifts, undermines the legitimacy of associations in the eyes of the ethnic community, neutralizing their mediatorial potential.

A problem area of institutional practices is also the partnership of regional authorities and the expert community in the area of regulation of inter-ethnic

relations in Russia. The dominative inclination to rely solely on administrative control in this sphere is accompanied by an underestimation of expert proposals related to the solution of interethnic problems. Therefore, in the relationship between the expert community and regional authorities, asymmetrical informal practices dominate, generating occasional demand for expert development, the lack of equal cooperation, and the imperative tendency to minimize criticism.

The potential of solidarity institutional practices of public associations also reduces the inefficiency of migration legislation in Russia, the main drawbacks of which are the absence of laws on the integration of migrants. An additional source of inter-ethnic tension is the uncertainty of the legal status of ethnic minorities, separated by ethnic boundaries. The experience of informal practices of benevolence towards migrants and representatives of ethnic minorities in the regions is not always complemented by the protection of their human and civil rights.

In the Russian regions with increased uncontrolled migration, which are characterized by a low level of solidarity among local public associations, asocial informal practices are widespread. These practices are expressed in the fact that entrepreneurs interested in multiplying profits start to use the labor of illegal immigrants. This is accompanied by a decrease in the level of wages, corruption, crime, increased discontent of local residents with living conditions of life, and growing ethnic conflict. At the same time, it should be noted that the work of illegal immigrants is also used by the elites of ethnic communities, by the leaders of formal and informal ethno-cultural associations in the region, which, on the one hand, reduces their solidarity potential, and on the other, increases the distance with the local population.

In order to accelerate the transition from authoritarian institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations to a democratic one, man can turn to the experience of the USA and Germany in this area, identifying the possibilities for its implementation under Russian conditions. The political and ethnocultural specifics of these conditions do not allow copying the foreign experience of institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations. However, the similarity of the political and ethnocultural specifics of these conditions do not allow copying the foreign experience of institutional practices in the sphere of interethnic relations. However, the similarity of the problems of interethnic interaction in Russia and in these countries makes it possible to draw some ideas from this experience and implement the most effective institutional practices aimed at harmonizing inter-ethnic relations problems in Russia and in these countries makes it possible to draw some ideas from this experience and implement the most effective institutional.

The institutional practices in the field of inter-ethnic relations are of particular importance due to the complexity of the ethnic structure of society caused by the intensifying migration flows in the USA. American traditions of constitutional guarantees of individual rights and democracy predetermine the predominance in

the sphere of interethnic relations, first of all, formal institutional practices. These practices, including the “mechanisms” of the basic values of civil liberties and legal equality, are aimed at overcoming the syndrome of ethno-sovereignty and ethnopolitics, preventing ethno-nationalization and ethnodiscrimination. The liberal principles of human rights, which deny all forms of ethnorrational discrimination, stipulate the antidiscrimination nature of formal institutional practices in all areas of interaction between ethnogroups - settlement, educational, labor, and political. These practices, based on anti-discrimination legislation and judicial control, prohibit direct discrimination against members of ethnic minorities and migrants. The American experience of anti-discrimination legislation, judicial control, and formal institutional practices of a human rights solidarity movement will be useful in Russia, since formal practices of administration in inter-ethnic relations and antisocial practices of ethnic discrimination remain a source of inter-ethnic tensions in society. In particular, in the Russian context, the American experience of accepting and implementing protective programs for assistance to ethnic minorities and migrants in the spheres of labor, education and housing is quite acceptable. Informal practices in the adoption and implementation of these programs by regional and municipal authorities, together with public associations, have a positive impact on inter-ethnic relations in American society.

Reconstruction of the US experience in the field of inter-ethnic relations related to anti-discrimination legislation and judicial control shows that formal institutional practices do not solve the problem of structural discrimination of ethnic minorities and migrants, primarily at the level of local communities. This is due to the fact that at the local level there is a social opposition to the legal equality of ethnic minorities and migrants. Therefore, protective programs to help ethnic minorities and migrants to overcome their structural discrimination. As the experience of implementing these programs shows, their effectiveness depends to a large extent on how much they contribute to the growth of cooperation and trust of the ethnic minority and the majority of the population and oppose isolationism of ethnic groups.

The American experience of informal practices of dispersed civil support, neighborhood participation, dialogue of diasporas, joint civil actions deserves attention, which also makes it possible to strengthen the effectiveness of existing formal institutional practices, is also worth of our attention in terms of developing inter-ethnic trust and cooperation in the Russian context.

A certain similarity of ethnic problems in Russia and Germany allows implementation in the Russian conditions of the German experience in institutional practices that have developed in the framework of the liberal-democratic model. This experience is interesting, firstly, the fact that the program-target method of implementation of “The Russian Federation State National Policy Strategy” provides a constant dialogue of government and public organizations throughout

all levels. Secondly, the German experience shows that institutional practices in the field of inter-ethnic relations, providing for their mandatory monitoring and informal support of civil initiatives in this area, can not be limited only to the formation of a civil identity aimed at overcoming ethnocentric orientations in society. That's why programs for harmonization of inter-ethnic relations, carried out with the financial support of regional authorities and private funds, should include activities related to the structural integration of ethnic minorities and migrants, denying all kinds and forms of ethnic discrimination and aimed at education and ensuring an acceptable level of their employment. These programs should also include activities related to social integration aimed at expanding social contacts between migrants and the host community, the participation of ethnic minorities representatives of in public associations. In this regard, the implementation of the German experience of institutional practices can help to unblock direct and indirect channels of communication in inter-ethnic relations, to overcome formal conciliation practices and quasi-solidarity practice of exchange transactions, and to coordinate regional and municipal authorities, to increase solidarity and cooperation of public associations in the sphere of interethnic relations.

The experience of FRG in the field of formal institutional practices related to the rather effective work of labor courts in Germany aimed at preventing ethnic discrimination in the sphere of employment and protecting the rights of representatives of ethnic minorities and migrants is also worthy of note. In Germany, there are the Federal Labor Court, the Federal Social Court, 94 first-instance labor courts and 19 land-based labor courts (Orobets, 2015). The necessary conditions for the creation of a system of labor courts in Russia is to strengthen control over unorganized migration, combat corruption, and increase the authority of law enforcement agencies.

The similarity of the problems of inclusion of migrants in the host society in Germany and Russia reveals the possibilities of implementing the legislative experience of Germany (Zuwanderungsgesetz, 2004) in the Russian conditions in the form of the adoption of the federal law of the Russian Federation on the adaptation and integration of immigrants consistent with the Russian Constitution. Adoption of such a law, taking into account the opinions expressed in the process of preliminary public discussion of its draft, will mean the emergence of an integrated normative framework for the application of formal institutional practices in the field of integration of immigrants into Russian society and intensifying control over illegal immigration.

It is also possible to implement, in particular, the experience of the institutional practices of Brandenburg and Saxony to indigenous peoples separated by administrative boundaries at the regional level in Russia. The existence of such peoples often engenders interethnic tensions that turn into ethnic conflicts in our country. The experience of Brandenburg and Saxony in this sphere is characterized

by the following formal and informal institutional practices, which are expressed, firstly, in the similarity of the federation subjects legislation in the cases of indigenous peoples that do not contradict federal legislation and the state's international obligations; secondly, in the legislative definition of administrative areas relating to places of traditional settlement of indigenous small-numbered peoples; thirdly, in legislative guarantees for the education of representatives of indigenous peoples in their native languages; fourthly, in the use of a proportional system of elections to local and regional authorities for the participation of citizens - representatives of indigenous communities - in legislative activities; fifthly, there are institutional guarantees for the realization of the rights of indigenous peoples in the form of "Councils for Indigenous Minorities" under the parliaments of the subjects of the federation, commissioners for indigenous minorities, the Union of Indigenous Minorities; sixthly, in the informal exchange of experience of regional parliaments, councils and commissioners for indigenous minorities, associations of indigenous small-numbered communities, issuing methodological recommendations on the implementation of legislation on indigenous small-numbered peoples, and promoting cultural ties between their communities.

The municipal and rural government of Russia and the Federal Republic of Germany are also experiencing similar problems related to the scope of their powers and resources in the implementation of programs in the field of inter-ethnic relations. In the Russian context, it is possible, first of all, to implement the experience of the municipal authorities of Germany in the development and implementation of such programs, the effectiveness of which is directly related to the professionalism of the leaders and employees of municipalities. In this case, informal institutional practices in Germany include: 1) participation of the civil society, ethnic and religious associations in the preparation and adoption of municipal programs; 2) public initiatives to improve the quality of programs; 3) training of municipal workers in humanitarian technologies in the field of inter-ethnic relations; 4) the creation of a municipal system to promote inter-ethnic integration, supported by regional budgets and charitable foundations; 5) organization of the municipal network of harmonization of inter-ethnic relations and the use of a transparent monitoring system. The formal institutional practices in the FRG include the definition of the basics of programs in the field of inter-ethnic relations and indicators of their effectiveness (Zukunft in Vielfalt, 2014). In connection with the tendency of management decentralization of interethnic relations in Russia, it is possible to experimentally organize the development and implementation of municipal integration projects in several constituent entities of the Russian Federation.

CONCLUSION

The transition from the authoritarian model of institutional practices in the field of interethnic relations to the democratic one remains incomplete and is characterized

by mixed application of such practices in the Russian regions. The predominance of formal institutional practices related to legal control and administration in interethnic relations creates barriers to the solidarity mobilization of public associations and leads to the dissemination of formal conciliation practices that do not involve the feedback of public authorities and the public. Informal institutional practices of dialogue between authorities and public associations, including expert communities, are used sporadically, situationally, primarily in cases of conflict incidents in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations.

The lack of independence and resource dependence of ethno-cultural associations generates informal quasi-solidarity practices of exchange transactions in the Russian society that reduce public participation in solving inter-ethnic problems. Reduced solidarity activity is observed, first of all, in regions with uncontrolled migration and ethnic minorities, separated by administrative borders.

In these regions, asocial practices of discriminatory interaction with migrants and ethnic minorities are dominating, accompanied by local ethnic conflict.

In order to overcome formal administrative practices in the field of interethnic relations and antisocial practices of ethnic discrimination in Russia, it is possible to implement elements of American experience in this area, such as: 1) strengthening judicial control in conjunction with formal institutional practices of a solidarity human rights movement; 2) development and implementation of protective programs for assistance to ethnic minorities and migrants in the spheres of labor, education and housing, adopted by the regional authorities together with public associations. For the development of inter-ethnic trust and cooperation in Russia, the American experience of informal practices of dispersed civil support, neighborhood participation, dialogue of diasporas, joint civil actions also deserves attention. The implementation of this experience will help to strengthen civilian commitment to constitutional values and norms in Russian society, as well as to overcome ethnocentric tendencies in the sphere of interethnic interactions.

The use of a normative-purpose approach in the field of inter-ethnic relations in the FRG will help unlock the direct and indirect channels of constructive ethnic communications in Russian society, overcome formal conciliation practices and quasi-solidarity practice of exchange transactions, and strengthen coordination of regional and municipal authorities, increase solidarity and cooperation Public associations in solving ethnic problems.

In order to counteract ethnic discrimination and to increase the protection of the ethnic minorities representatives' rights and migrants in Russia, it is possible to implement the experience of the FRG, related, first, to the formal institutional practices of labor courts; secondly, with the adoption of the federal law on the adaptation and integration of immigrants with a preliminary public discussion of the project; third, with the application of formal institutional practices for determining the legal status of the small-numbered peoples of Russia, separated

by administrative boundaries, and informal solidarity practices of their integration into Russian society.

Taking into account the tendency of management system decentralization in the sphere of interethnic relations in the Russian context, it is possible to implement municipal experience in the FRG, related to the development and implementation of programs aimed at harmonizing interethnic relations, determining indicators of their effectiveness; professional training of municipal workers in special technologies in the field of inter-ethnic relations management; dialogue participation of public associations in the preparation and implementation of municipal programs supported by charitable foundations; the creation of a municipal network of interethnic integration and the application of a transparent system for monitoring interethnic interactions in local communities.

Acknowledgments

The article was implemented within the framework of the grant of the Russian Science Foundation No. 15-18-00122 “Institutional practices and value policy in the field of harmonization of interethnic relations in economically developed countries with a complex ethno-cultural structure: comparative analysis and modeling of implementation under Russian conditions”.

References

- Achkasov, V. & Rozanova, M. (2013). Migrant’s Adaptation and Cultural Integration into Urban Multicultural Society: a Case Study of St. Petersburg. *OMNES*, 4(1): 1-31.
- Alford, J. & Hughes, O. (2008). Public Value Pragmatism as the Next Phase of Public Management. *American Review of Public Administration*, 38(2): 130-148.
- Bedrik, A.V., Chernobrovkin, I.P., Degtyarev, A.K., Serikov, A.V. & Vyalykh, N.A. (2015). The Management of Inter-Ethnic Relations in Germany and the United States: The Experience of the Theoretical Comprehension. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4): 87-92.
- Bedrik, A.V., Chernobrovkin, I.P., Lubskiy, A.V., Volkov, Y.G. & Vyalykh, N.A. (2016). Value Policy: Conceptual Interpretation of Research Practices. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(5). URL: <http://www.indjst.org/index.php/indjst/article/view/87598/67641>
- Bourdieu, P. (1976). Le sens pratique. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 2(1): 43-86.
- Caldwell, C. (2009). *Reflections on the revolutions in Europe*. London: Allen Lane.
- Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 1666 from December 19, 2012. (2012). *The Strategy of the State National Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Until 2025*. URL: http://pravo.gov.ru/proxy/ips/?docbody&link_id=0&nd=102161949.
- DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fijalkowski, J. (1993). *Aggressive Nationalism, Immigration Pressure, And Asylum Policy: Disputes In Contemporary Germany. Paper 9*. Washington: German Historical Institute.
- Fischer-Les-cano, A. & Kocher E. (2012). *Arbeit in der Illegalität: Die Rechte von Menschen ohne Aufenthaltspapiere*. Berlin: Campus Verlag.

- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Geißler, R. (2014). Sozialer Wandel in Deutschland. Bundeszentrale fuer politische Bildung (Hg.). Bonn.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goldschmidt, P. (2010). Europe's Identity Crisis. *The New York Times*. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/06/opinion/06iht-edgoldschmidt.html>.
- Hollinger, P. (2005). *Post-ethnic America: Beyond multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Huntington, S. (2004). *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Integrationskonzept der Hansestadt Rostock: «Zukunft in Vielfalt»*. (2014). Hansestadt Rostock. Presse- und Informationsstelle. URL: http://rathaus.rostock.de/sixcms/media.php/1068/Integrationskonzept_HRO.pdf.
- Kaldybaeva, O.V. (2012). *Conceptualization of the concept of "practice" in the social sciences*. URL: <http://repository.enu.kz/handle/123456789/4271>.
- Kelly, G., Mulgan, G. & Muers, S. (2002). *Creating Public Value. An Analytical Framework for Public Service Reform*. London: Prime Minister's Strategy Unit.
- Kilburn, W.H. (2009). Personal Values and Public Opinion. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(4): 868-885.
- Meier-Braun, K. (2002). *Deutschland Einwan-derungsland*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Meier-Braun, K. & Weber, R. (2014). *Deutschland Einwan-derungsland. Begriffe – Fakten – Kontro-versen (bpb-Schriftenreihe, Bd. 1389)*. Stuttgart.
- Moore, M. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Morell, K. (2009). Governance and the Public Good. *Public Administration*, 87(3): 538-556.
- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orobets, V.M. (2015). Specialized labor courts: foreign experience and Russian legislation. *Legal virtual club "Ex-jure"*. URL: <http://ex-jure.ru/law/news.php?newsid=484>.
- Panov, P.V. (2011). *Institutions, identities, practices: a theoretical model of the political order*. Moscow: The Russian Political Encyclopedia (ROSSPEN),
- Patrick, D. & Margetts, H. (2006). New Public Management Is Dead – Long Live Digital-Era Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3): 467-494.
- Patrushev, S.V. (2011). Institutional Political Science in the Russian Perspective. *Political Concept*, 4: 144-145.
- Rhodes, R. & Wanna, J. (2007). The Limits to Public Value, or Rescuing Responsible from the Platonic Guardians. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(4): 406-421.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In: *Global Modernities* (25-44). London: Sage Publications.
- Rudiger, A. & Spenser, S. (2003). Social Integration of Migration and Ethnic Minorities. Policies to Combat Diskrimination. *Conference Joinly Organized by The European Commission and the OECD*. Brussels. URL: <http://www.oecd.org/migration/mig/15516956.pdf>.

- Seifert, W. (2002). *Berufliche Integration von Zuwanderern in Deutschland. Gutachten fuer die «Unabhaengige Kommission fuer Zuwanderung»*. Duesseldorf: Bundesministerium fuer Inneres.
- Stoker, G. (2006). Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(2): 41-57.
- Volkov, Y.G. (ed.) (2016). *National policy in Russia: the possibility of implementing foreign experience: monograph*. Moscow: Social and Humanitarian Knowledge.
- Volkov, Y.G. (ed.) (2015). *Value policy and institutional practices in the field of interethnic relations in economically developed countries with a complex ethno-cultural structure: Monograph*. Rostov on Don: Fund of science and education.
- Witesman, E. & Walters, L. (2013). Public Service values: a new approach to the study of motivation in the public sphere. *Public Administration*, 92(2). URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/padm.12000/pdf>.
- Worbs, S., Bund, E., Kohls, M. & von Gostomski, B. (2013). *Spät-Aussiedler in Deutschland. Eine Analyse aktueller Daten und Forschungsergebnisse*. Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.
- Zorin, V.Yu. & Astvatsaturova, M.A. (2015). *The Strategy of the State National Policy of the Russian Federation: Traditional Methods and Innovative Approaches for Realization at the Present Stage*. Fund for the Development of National and Federative Relations "Convergence". URL: <http://fond-sblizhenie.ru/strategiya-gosudarstvennoj-nacionalnoj-politiki-rf-tradicionnye-metody-i-innovacionnye>.
- Zuwanderungsgesetz, ZuWG*. (2014). Pressemitteilung. URL: www.aufenthaltstitel.de/stichwort/zuwg.html.