

Social and Cultural Threats and Risks of Russia

Inna S. Shapovalova*

Belgorod State University ,308015, Russia, Belgorod, Pobedy St., 85, Russia

Oleg N. Polukhin

Belgorod State University ,308015, Russia, Belgorod, Pobedy St., 85, Russia

Vladimir M. Gerashchenko

Belgorod State University ,308015, Russia, Belgorod, Pobedy St., 85, Russia

Anastasiy V. Kisilenko

Belgorod State University ,308015, Russia, Belgorod, Pobedy St., 85, Russia

Galina I. Gozhenko

Belgorod State University ,308015, Russia, Belgorod, Pobedy St., 85, Russia

Abstract

Social and cultural security, the risks of destroying cultural and social stability are of paramount importance for discussion at the governmental and national level. The paper suggests a new instrumental system for assessing socio-cultural threats and risks of large territories. As a demonstration, an analysis of the results of the all-Russian expert survey is presented, which makes it possible to assess the existing socio-cultural threats to the environment, the likelihood of emergencies, the riskiness of Russia's socio-cultural sphere, and the effectiveness of measures to maintain social and cultural security. As a comparative analysis, empirically verified new indices are proposed for measuring the socio-cultural sphere: the index of the probability of occurrence of socio-cultural threats and emergencies, the index of socio-cultural security, the index of social impact of threats on the indicators of the quality of life, and the index of the effectiveness of measures to improve and maintain socio-cultural security. As a result of the study, the structure of threats and risks of a habitat becomes clear, the most effective countermeasures are determined.

Keywords: Habitat; Socio-cultural sphere; Habitat risks; Emergency situations; Social risks; Human dimension.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Speaking about the socio-cultural environment, its processes, phenomena and characteristics, a modern researcher faces a choice of the operationalization of this concept - what position to choose to consider such a complex, immaterial and, in fact, unlimited formation. From the standpoint of sociology and related sciences (primarily pedagogy, psychology, political science, and perhaps history), the sociocultural environment is perceived very broadly, starting with the product (producer) of the characteristics of the territory (Alisov, 2006; Soloviova, 2010), and ending with the basis for the development of spheres and social groups. Each time, perceiving the socio-cultural environment among these definitions, one can talk about different levels of analysis, producing more and more influencing factors, assumptions and trends, risks and threats. In this regard, the socio-cultural sphere of the human environment is a field of reproduction and convergence of complex risks of various scales.

The research perspective for such an object as socio-cultural risks can be made clear by analyzing scientific publications in Russia and abroad. Thus, the phenomenon of socio-cultural risks for Russia implies globalization in relation to the object and subject of research, the territorial scale, the search for methodological principles and metamodeling (Anikin, 2016; Kudrin, 2016; Kukhto, 2014; Zubok *et al.*, 2016). Foreign scholars consider socio-cultural risks in a narrowly applied aspect, as an explanation or a way of solving a particular problem in a small social or territorial locus. At the same time, the context of their research is clearly transdisciplinary (as a rule, such studies are presented in interdisciplinary journals, or on the contrary - in journals about non-social problems). For example, the content search over the past 10 years revealed studies on a comparative socio-cultural analysis of the perception of the risk of carbon storage in the European Union (Karimi *et al.*, 2016), socio-cultural factors in disaster risk management (Dalisay and De Guzman, 2016; Kasdan, 2016), the displacement of children from social communications (Morcillo *et al.*, 2015), the socio-cultural aspects of climate change in specific areas, the socio-cultural impact on HIV transmission among gays in rural China (Koo *et al.*, 2014), the study of socio-cultural factors which act as mediators, facilitate and limit the health and empowerment of refugee youth (Edge *et al.*, 2014), etc. (Gibson *et al.*, 2005; Katz *et al.*, 2013; Leaker and Dunk-West, 2011; McCarthy *et al.*, 2014; Melinder, 2007; Rimaite and Rinkevicius, 2008).

Such research concretization allows us to speak about the operational level of risk research, its perception as a set of specific factors that can be both studied and managed. Approaches to this kind of scientific convergence were All-Russian studies that allowed determining the weight of socio-cultural threats, the structure of socio-cultural risk, its impact and the reality of its onset, and to evaluate measures to prevent it.

2. Research Methods

Studies on the topic of this paper were conducted in 2015-2017 by the Center for Sociological Research of the Belgorod State National Research University. The research strategy included an all-Russian expert survey. The implementation of other tasks and comparative indicators of this study can be seen in the work by the Center team (Lomakin *et al.*, 2013; Shapovalova and Gozhenko, 2015; Shapovalova *et al.*, 2016; Shapovalova, 2017; Zubok *et al.*, 2016).

The total number of experts participating in the expert survey was 120 people. Criteria for the selection of experts were the scope of activities, experience in the field, the ability (competence) to assess the situation and predict its development. Characteristics of the expert group - profile specialists of sectoral organizations, administrative workers and civil servants, employees of relevant departments of higher educational institutions and research institutes, experts of public organizations.

As the survey territory, 10 regions were selected and distributed into groups with different levels of environmental risk based on data from the EMERCOM Directorate of Russia. The regions of the Russian Federation with the maximum and minimum levels of environmental risk were identified: Adygea, Karachay-Cherkessia, Krasnodar Krai, Amur, Bryansk, Kirov, Kostroma, Nizhny Novgorod, Saratov and Tver regions.

3. Results and Discussions

A general analysis of expert opinion on the likelihood of threats associated with socio-cultural emergencies showed their most typical distribution across the analyzed territories. Thus, in the opinion of experts, the most frequent risks arise from the loss of historical memory by certain groups of the population (26.7%). Separate manifestations of threatening situations are most often recorded in the zone of vandalism (70%) and the destruction of moral norms among the population (63.3%) (table 1, columns 1, 2, 3). The calculation of the index of the probability of occurrence of sociocultural threats allows their ranking (see Table 1, columns 5, 6). The three most likely to occurrence of sociocultural threats include the destruction of moral values among the population (0.70), loss of historical memory (0.64) and loss of cultural traditions (0.61). According to experts, the least likely situations are associated with unauthorized demolition of historical monuments (0.27). Thus, according to experts, one can expect the emergence of sociocultural violations from the mental orientations of Russian citizens, rather than from effective positions such as vandalism, the destruction of cultural objects, the creation of informal associations, etc.

Table-1. Expert evaluation of socio-cultural threats of Russia

Emergency situations	No threat, %	Individual manifestations of threat, %	Widespread threat, %	Probability of occurrence index	Rank by probability of occurrence	Socio-cultural security index	Socio-cultural security rank	Social impact index	Social influence rank
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Destruction of historical and cultural sites in the region	26.7	56.7	16.7	0.59	4	0.40	8	0.69	3
Acts of vandalism, abuse of historical monuments	30.0	70.0	0	0.52	5	0.51	4	0	9
Unauthorized demolition of monuments	66.7	23.3	10.0	0.27	10	0.42	7	0.67	5
Loss of historical memory in various populations	23.3	50.0	26.7	0.64	2	0.55	3	0.69	3
Change or loss of cultural traditions	26.7	50.0	23.3	0.61	3	0.63	1	0.66	6
The threat of a crisis of cultural identity in various population groups	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.50	7	0.38	9	0.73	2
The threat of the destruction of the cultural bases of the national-ethnic and religious identity of the population	36.7	46.7	16.7	0.51	6	0.40	8	0.78	1
Destruction of moral values and standards among the	13.3	63.3	23.3	0.70	1	0.58	2	0.68	4

population										
Manifestations of discrimination, violation of the rights and freedoms of citizens based on national and religious differences	36.7	53.3	10.0	0.49	8	0.46	6	0.54	8	
The emergence of informal countercultural associations	50.0	43.3	6.7	0.39	9	0.48	5	0.60	7	

Assessing the ratio between the permissible level of socio-cultural security and the economic opportunities to achieve it, 56.7.0% of experts considered it more likely acceptable, and only 10% indicated full acceptability. In total, 33.3% of experts noted in one way or another an unacceptable level of sociocultural security. The calculation of the sociocultural safety index for specific emergency situations allows us to single out the groups of sociocultural situations that are the most dangerous from the point of view of the frequency and acceptability of their risk and rank the situations according to this indicator (Table 1, columns 7, 8).

According to the index indicators, none of the situations proposed by the experts can meet the really acceptable level of security, the index value rises above 0.6 only in the case of a situation of change or loss of cultural traditions. In most cases, the indicator drops below 0.5, which indicates the real danger of such situations as the threat of a crisis of cultural identity in various population groups (0.38), the destruction of historical and cultural objects and the threat of the destruction of the cultural basis of the national-ethnic and religious identity of the population (0.40).

For each threat of the socio-cultural sphere, there are risks. The most significant of them were scored by experts from 5 to 7 points. The risk factor clouds of emergencies in the sociocultural sphere are presented in Table 2. Its extreme column presents an indicator of the risk-related dependence index, calculated as a share of the cumulative effect of risks from the maximum possible risk-related effect.¹ The last line presents the status (risk force) on a seven-point scale.

The situations associated with unauthorized demolition of monuments (risk index vulnerability index 0.82), discrimination, violation of citizens' rights and freedoms based on national and religious differences (0.8), destruction of historical and cultural sites in the region (0.79) are mostly due to sociocultural risk factors. The least associated with exposure to external risk factors are acts of vandalism (0). It is worth noting that, apart from the latter group, all situations in the sociocultural sphere are highly associated with risks and have a pronounced dependence on external factors.

Table-2. Emergency vulnerability risk index in the socio-cultural sphere

Risks of socio-cultural environment	Associated with the change in time properties of cultural objects	Associated with the emergence of new cultural sites	Associated with the lack of information	Human factor	Insufficient governmental attention	Lack of attention to identity	Weak educational work at school	Propagation of samples of immorality	The influence of the technical sphere	The influence of natural factors	The state of legal and legislative framework	RISK DEPENDENCE INDEX
Emergency socio-cultural situations												
Change or loss of cultural traditions	4.43	3.71	4.00	4.57	4.43	2.86	4.14	3.86	2.71	3.14	3.14	0.65
Destruction of moral values and standards	3.71	3.86	4.71	5.00	4.86	3.43	5.00	4.43	3.00	3.14	3.71	0.71
Loss of historical memory in various populations	3.88	3.75	4.25	4.88	5.25	3.63	4.75	4.38	3.25	3.63	3.13	0.70
Acts of vandalism, abuse	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
The emergence of informal countercultural associations	2.50	5.50	3.50	5.50	3.00	3.50	5.00	4.50	2.50	3.50	2.00	0.65
Manifestations of discrimination, violation of the rights and freedoms of citizens	4.33	3.33	6.00	5.33	6.00	6.00	5.67	4.67	3.00	2.67	4.00	0.8
Unauthorized demolition of monuments	5.67	4.00	4.33	4.67	5.67	4.67	4.00	5.33	5.00	4.67	4.00	0.82
Destruction of historical	5.20	4.20	4.60	5.00	5.40	4.40	4.80	4.20	4.20	4.00	4.00	0.79

¹Based on the identified 9 risk factors, the maximum risk-related vulnerability may be equal to 63 in a point equivalent (equal to unit in fractional equivalent).

and cultural sites in the region												
The threat of the destruction of the cultural bases of the identity of the population	3.00	4.20	4.40	5.20	4.40	4.00	4.80	4.60	3.00	3.20	3.00	0.69
The threat of a crisis of cultural identity in various population groups	3.83	4.50	4.83	5.33	5.33	4.67	5.17	4.50	2.83	3.67	3.17	0.76
RISK STATUS	3.65	3.70	4.06	4.54	4.43	3.71	4.81	4.04	2.65	3.16	3.01	

Assessing the effectiveness of measures to ensure and improve the level of socio-cultural security in Russia's regions, experts identified the improvement of methods of managing sociocultural risks in the region as the least used measure (expressed by 23.3%). Most often, the most effective measures are the following: education of a cautious attitude towards the cultural heritage among high school students (60.0%), propaganda of tolerant, friendly attitude towards people of different nationalities and religions (44.8%), strengthening of public control at all stages of implementation of cultural policy (43.3%) and increased economic sanctions against enterprises that violate socio-cultural security (40.0%). The introduction of market mechanisms for regulating the socio-cultural sphere is often not mentioned as effective (46.7%).

In order to obtain more reliable data on the effectiveness of the measures proposed for the evaluation, data were indexed and then ranked (Table 3).

Table-3. The effectiveness of measures for improving and ensuring environmental safety

Measures to reduce environmental risks	The measure has not been applied, %	Ineffective, %	Partially effective, %	Completely effective, %	Efficiency index	Ranking measures by degree of effectiveness
Adoption of new laws that increase the official responsibility for violations of socio-cultural security	16.7	16.7	53.3	13.3	0.61	10
Improvement of law enforcement practice under existing legislation	3.3	20	56.7	20	0.64	8
Strengthening of economic sanctions against organizations and institutions and their leaders that violate socio-cultural security	10	16.7	33.3	40	0.70	5
Strengthening of economic sanctions against violators	10	26.7	26.7	36.7	0.62	9
Toughening of administrative sanctions	3.3	26.7	40	30	0.62	9
Strengthening of public control at all stages of cultural policy implementation	10	13.3	33.3	43.3	0.73	4
Enhancing the role of artistic councils	16.7	20	40	23.3	0.62	9
Improvement of socio-cultural risk management	23.3	13.3	40	23.3	0.65	7
Introduction of market mechanisms for regulating the socio-cultural sphere	16.7	46.7	30	6.7	0.77	3
Cultivating respect for the cultural heritage among high school students	0	6.7	33.3	60	0.90	1
Propaganda of a tolerant, benevolent attitude among the population towards people with different national and religious cultures	0	10.3	44.8	44.8	0.78	2
Informing the public about the level and causes of sociocultural risks	13.3	13.3	50	23.3	0.67	6

According to the results of indexation and ranking of measures, “raising a respect for the cultural heritage among secondary school students” can be attributed to the group of the most effective ones (index 0.9); less effective but quite significant are “propaganda of tolerant, benevolent attitude among the population towards people with different national and religious culture” (0.78), "the introduction of market mechanisms for regulating the socio-cultural sphere” (0.77).

The least effective measures are “adoption of new laws that increase official responsibility for violations of socio-cultural security” (0.61), “toughening administrative sanctions”, “strengthening economic sanctions against violators” and “enhancing the role of artistic councils” (0.62, respectively).

In conclusion of the all-Russian expert survey, the impact of each threat to the sociocultural sphere on the quality of life of Russians and its social indicators was assessed. According to the results of expert evaluation, the social impact index was calculated, which allowed determining the most significant threats to the sociocultural sphere, those emergency situations that most likely cause the implementation of social risks of reducing quality of life, increasing protest activity, increasing migration and unemployment, etc. (Table 1, columns 9, 10). According to calculations, emergency situations have the greatest impact on the occurrence of social risks associated with threats of the destruction of the cultural foundations of the national-ethnic and religious identity of the population (0.78) and threats of a crisis of cultural identity in various population groups (0.73). The least affected are acts of vandalism and abuse of historical monuments (0.0). The overall index of the influence of the socio-cultural environment on social risks can be characterized as a value above the average (0.60).

4. Conclusions

As a result of the study, we come to understanding of the structure and significance of the existing threats to the socio-cultural sphere in Russia. Thanks to the proposed and calculated analytical indices, it becomes possible to determine the perspective of managerial search and tasks in the socio-cultural sphere, in the context of managing its risks and increasing the level of socio-cultural security.

Thus, the first task facing the administrative structures of Russian territories is to reduce the frequency of emergencies such as the destruction of historical and cultural objects in the region, the loss of historical memory in various population groups, the change or loss of cultural traditions, the destruction of moral values and moral standards among the population.

The second, no less important task is to increase the level of social security, to ensure a quick response to the eradication of the threat in the event of such situations as the destruction of historical and cultural sites in the region, the threat of destruction of the cultural bases of the national-ethnic and religious identity of the population, and the threat of a crisis of cultural identity in populations.

The third challenge of managing the social and cultural sphere is related to regulating the level of social influence, preventing a decline in the quality of life, social tension and dissatisfaction in the event of such social and cultural threats as destruction of historical and cultural objects in the region, loss of historical memory in various population groups, the threat of a crisis of cultural identity in various groups of the population, the threat of the destruction of the cultural foundations of national-ethnic and religious identity of the population.

The fourth task can be designated as risk adjustment and management, especially in relation to such situations as manifestations of discrimination, violation of the rights and freedoms of citizens, unauthorized demolition of monuments, destruction of historical and cultural sites in the region. Control over risks that have a high status of influence and provoke the emergence of socio-cultural threats requires special focus. In terms of status, we attributed thereto the human factor, insufficient state attention, and weak educational work at school.

The fifth challenge is to form effective programs to improve the socio-cultural security of the Russian regions, to take advantage of such measures as fostering respect for the cultural heritage of middle school students, promoting a tolerant, benevolent attitude to people with different national and religious cultures, and introducing market-based regulatory mechanisms for sociocultural sphere and strengthening of public control at all stages of the implementation of cultural policy.

There is simultaneously a need to improve the effectiveness of the following measures: the adoption of new laws that increase official responsibility for violations of sociocultural security; increased economic sanctions against violators; improvement of law enforcement practice in the framework of existing legislation.

The conducted examination of the social and cultural environment of Russia, the revealed significance of its threats, risks and consequences of emergency situations, leads us to an understanding of the importance of managing the risk field, creating a risk map of Russian regions.

References

- Alisov, D. A. (2006). *Administrativnye centry zapadnoj sibirj, gorodskaya sreda i social'no-kul'turnoe razvitie administrative centers of Western Siberia, the urban environment and socio-cultural development*. Publishing house of OmSU: Omsk. 100
- Anikin, V. A. (2016). Krizis i natsional'noye samosoznaniye rossiyan crisis and russian national identity. Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya: ekonomicheskoye i sotsial'nyye peremeny monitoring of public opinion, Economic and social changes. (5): 203-32.
- Dalisay, S. N. and De Guzman, M. T. (2016). Risk and culture, the case of typhoon haiyan in the Philippines. disaster prevention and management. *An International Journal*, 25(5): 701-14.
- Edge, S., Newbold, K. B. and McKeary, M. (2014). Exploring socio-cultural factors that mediate, facilitate, & constrain the health and empowerment of refugee youth. *Social Science & Medicine*, 117: 34-41.
- Gibson, N., Cave, A., Doering, D., Ortiz, L. and Harms, P. (2005). Socio-cultural factors influencing prevention and treatment of tuberculosis in immigrant and aboriginal communities in Canada. *Social Science & Medicine*, 61(5): 931-42.

- Karimi, F., Toikka, A. and Hukkinen, J. I. (2016). Comparative socio-cultural analysis of risk perception of carbon capture and storage in the European union. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 21: 114-22.
- Kasdan, D. O. (2016). Considering socio-cultural factors of disaster risk management. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 25(4): 464-77.
- Katz, I. T., Ybarra, M. L., Wyatt, M. A., Kiwanuka, J. P., Bangsberg, D. R. and Ware, N. C. (2013). Socio-cultural and economic antecedents of adolescent sexual decision-making and HIV-risk in rural Uganda. *AIDS care*. 25(2): 258-64.
- Koo, F. K., Chow, E. P., Gao, L., Fu, X., Jing, J., Chen, L. and Zhang, L. (2014). Socio-cultural influences on the transmission of HIV among gay men in rural China. *Culture, health & sexuality*. 16(3): 302-15.
- Kudrin, V. S. (2016). *Socio-cultural conditions for preventing youth extremism as a social risk. Author's abstract*. Candidate of Pedagogics: Kazan.
- Kukhto, L. K. (2014). Sociocultural risks of the demographic potential of belarus. *bulletin of polotsk state university. series e: pedagogical sciences*. (7): 101-04.
- Leaker, M. and Dunk-West, P. (2011). Socio-Cultural risk? Reporting on a qualitative study with female street-based sex workers. *Sociological Research Online*, 16(4): 1-10.
- Lomakin, V. V., Shapovalova, I. S., Lifirenko, M. V., Asadullaev, R. G. and Reznichenko, O. S. (2013). Decision support system for the expert assessment of social risks.
- McCarthy, J., Chen, C., López-Carr, D. and Walker, B. L. E. (2014). Socio-cultural dimensions of climate change: charting the terrain. *Geo Journal*, 79(6): 665-75.
- Melinder, K. (2007). Socio-cultural characteristics of high versus low risk societies regarding road traffic safety. *Safety Science*, 45(3): 397-414.
- Morcillo, C., Ramos-Olazagasti, M. A., Blanco, C., Sala, R., Canino, G., Bird, H. and Duarte, C. S. (2015). Socio-cultural context and bullying others in childhood. *Journal of child and family studies*, 24(8): 2241-49.
- Rimaite, A. and Rinkevicius, L. (2008). Socio-cultural construction of risk perceptions: theoretical approaches and the shaping of public discourse concerning genetically modified organisms. *Filosofija-Sociologija*, 19(2): 86-96.
- Shapovalova, I. S. (2017). The technosphere of Russia, development problems and risks based on all-Russian research. *Bulletin of IS RAS*, (3): 112-38.
- Shapovalova, I. S. and Gozhenko, G. I. (2015). The structure of modern habitat: an ontological and a factor model.
- Shapovalova, I. S., Zakharov, V. M., Shmigirilova, L. N., Kisilenko, A. V. and Gozhenko, G. I. (2016). Social Risks of Human Habitat. *The Social Sciences*, 11(10): 2416-20.
- Soloviova, T. S. (2010). Socio-cultural environment of the region as a factor in the formation of intellectual potential. *problems of territory development*. (4): 49-57.
- Zubok, I. A., Chuprov, V. I., Shapovalova, I. S. and Kisilenko, A. V. (2016). *Risks of the transforming habitat, the problem of research and management, monograph*. Epitsentr: Belgorod.