

POLITICAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS

Arctic and North. 2025. No. 59. Pp. 69–83.

Original article

UDC 316.347(470.1)(045)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37482/issn2221-2698.2025.59.82>

Configuration of Dominant Identities in the North-East of Russia: Towards the Question of the Civilizational Specificity of the Russian State

Olga V. Vasileva ^{1✉}, Cand. Sci. (Polit.), Senior Researcher

¹ Institute for Humanities Research and Indigenous Studies of the North of Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, ul. Petrovskogo, 1, Yakutsk, Russia

¹ Ovasileva.igi@mail.ru ✉, ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9992-4163>

Abstract. The article publishes the results of the research devoted to the analysis of dominant identities, the position of the population in relation to civic and regional patriotism. Theoretical approaches to analyzing the problem of the relationship between the concepts of “nation” and “patriotism”, as well as the relationship between the configuration of dominant identities and the forms of state formations in the context of this idea are considered. The article presents the results of a questionnaire survey of the population conducted in the spring of 2024 in two regions of Russia — the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) and the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug. The hierarchy of identities is revealed, the results of the study showed that the Russian identity turned out to be the most significant for the population of both regions. Regional patriotism is more inherent in ethnic groups that have historically inhabited these territories; however, differences were revealed in the regions of the study. In Yakutia, the ethnic identity of respondents of Yakut nationality actualizes the importance of regional rather than ethnic identity, while in Chukotka this tendency is not manifested among Chukchi. The assumption is made that civilizations in the modern world represent a special structure of interaction between the identities of people who are part of it. The specificity of the Russian civilization is that in a multi-ethnic state the ethnic identity, which is institutionalized by the state, is dominant along with the civic identity.

Keywords: *identity, ethnicity, nation, patriotism, North-East Russia, state*

Acknowledgments and funding


The article was prepared under the project “Patriotism of the Peoples of the North-East of Russia: Big and Small Homeland in the Narratives of Residents of Yakutia and Chukotka” within the framework of the Scientific Research Program related to the study of the ethno-cultural diversity of Russian society and aimed at strengthening the all-Russian identity, 2023–2025 (instruction of the President of the Russian Federation No. Pr-71 dated 16.01.2020), supervised by Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences V.A. Tishkov.

Introduction

Russia is a unique multinational state. There are obviously other countries with a large number of ethnic groups. For example, India, Indonesia, Nigeria — these are countries where the

* © Vasileva O.V., 2025

For citation: Vasileva O.V. Configuration of Dominant Identities in the North-East of Russia: Towards the Question of the Civilizational Specificity of the Russian State. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2025, no. 59, pp. 82–99. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37482/issn2221-2698.2025.59.82>

 This work is licensed under a CC BY-SA License

number of ethnic groups is even greater than in Russia. However, it should be noted that the concept of “nationality” in its ethnic sense, which was developed in the USSR and passed to Russian practice, is not a universal, global norm. In other multiethnic countries, other classifications are much more important — racial, religious, caste. Configuration of the real multiethnic character of the Russian state and the high significance of ethnicity creates its unique identity.

In this regard, special attention is paid to the issue of the relationship between the significance of ethnic and other identities, it even acquires political significance. For example, ethnic and civic identities in Russia (civic identity in this case is understood as reflection of belonging to the state) are often assessed as competing by both domestic and foreign scientists. The fact is that the concept of civic identity is associated with the formation of nation-states and, accordingly, with a sense of belonging to a certain nation as a political entity. In turn, in Russia, both in everyday language and in public thought, the concepts of “nation” and “national” are often interpreted in the context of ethno-cultural significance.

In particular, it is ethnic significance that is attached to the concept of “nation” when it comes to the right to self-determination, as well as when we talk about Russian society as multinational one. This is the basis for the idea of competition. Indeed, it should be noted that within the framework of the Russian community of peoples united in an asymmetric federal structure, this represents a certain challenge to the state, especially in the context of the existing historical experience.

In this regard, studies that would be aimed at understanding the scope of patriotic feelings and types of loyalty to social formations among representatives of the peoples inhabiting the country, including its different parts, are of interest, since the action of the ethnic factor always has a certain territorial and spatial localization.

The purpose of this article is to identify the configuration of dominant identities based on the analysis of materials from the regions of the North-East of Russia in the context of the issue of patriotism in relation to the nation as a state and an ethnic group. In this article, we will consider the positions of the population of different ethnicities in two national regions of Russia belonging to the North-East of the country — the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) (RS(Ya)) and the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug (ChAO).

Literature review

It should be noted that in a wide range of foreign literature, the issue of nation has largely appropriated such a phenomenon as patriotism. It is called a phenomenon that legitimizes the existence of a nation. Such an opinion, for example, is held by B. Anderson. Speaking about the essence of patriotism, he notes that “nation is instilled with love, often deeply imbued with the spirit of self-sacrifice” [1]. In a broad sense, he means by patriotism a deep loyalty to the community that is created as a result of unification by a single state and culture.

I. Wallerstein believed that the emergence of a nation-state occurs due to the peculiarities of the development of the capitalist system, within which the need for ideological justification of inequalities of the center and the periphery was formed. National self-consciousness is a product of liberal ideology, proposed to the “dangerous classes” in the 19th century, which carried racism beyond the “white” world [2, p. 239]. He considered the subsequent emergence of the concept of “self-determination of nations” to be an extension of the postulates of liberal ideology with its dominant concept of rational reformism to the level of the world system as a whole with the aim of containing “dangerous classes” already in the global south. The period of decolonization, according to Wallerstein, awakened the consciousness of the masses in order to offer them self-determination and to pave the way for prosperity in the form of national development, but this was only an illusion. Over time, it became clear that the integration of the extra-European world into the system of formal political institutions of the interstate system had no prospects for economic transformations on the periphery of the capitalist world economy, although the idea of national development remained quite attractive to the masses. In this regard, a rethinking of the role of the nation-state in the world order began.

In modern Western scientific thought, the attitude to the concept of nation has changed, and due to this, the attitude to patriotism has also changed, since the fact that “nations” and “patriotism” were related concepts remained unchanged. Over time, the position expressed by such researchers as W. Beck [3], J. Dunn, who believed that the nation is an anachronism in the modern post-national world, and patriotism is associated only with intolerance, xenophobia, militarism and aggression [4], has become more widespread. R. Brubaker, in fact, also does not distinguish between patriotism and nationalism. According to him, they represent an extremely flexible political language, a way of expressing political arguments through an appeal to the motherland, fatherland, country, nation [5, p. 120]. Thus, by consolidating the concept of patriotism in a semantic link with the national state, on the one hand, a certain contradiction was created between patriotic feelings and a form of statehood that presupposes the unification and union of many peoples, on the other hand, over time, the concept of the national state is written off in favor of formation of a transnational world with other multiple loyalties.

In Russia, even in pre-revolutionary times scientific and social thought formed such an understanding of the state structure and patriotism that would correspond to the civilizational identity. Thus, in 1914, P.B. Struve in his article “Great Russia and Holy Rus” defined Russia as a national state-empire and believed that Russia, being multinational, has national unity [6]. The emphasis was placed on the fact that the state, despite its cultural heterogeneity, can unite representatives of different cultures as equal citizens.

The Soviet period, when the understanding of coexistence of peoples within a single state as a union of sovereign nations was formed, had a great influence on the modern understanding of the problem. The collapse of the Soviet Union along ethnic lines should be interpreted as a reflection of a deep perception of the concept of national development. In this regard, the risks for

the state as an asymmetric federal structure are still visible at present, which is why there is an active research work related to the analysis of the situation, its dynamics and the formation of a new concept of the coexistence of peoples within a single state.

For example, A.V. Golovnev points out that statehood and ethnicity in Russia are two determinants of Russian society, and their relationship has always been mutually stimulating and played the role of a system of checks and balances [7, p. 11]. Based on this, he concludes that multi-ethnicity is a feature of Russian society that simultaneously acts as a national idea.

V.A. Tishkov offers a special approach to understanding the uniqueness of Russia as a state formation. His approach consists in the recognition and scientific development of two categories that do not exclude each other: the historiosophical and cultural category of “civilization” with the substantiation of its more specific features and the socio-political, normative and legal category of “nation” as co-citizenship with a common historical memory, culture and values. According to this approach, Russia is both a nation and a civilization, and the Russian people are a nation of nations [8].

The discussion of the issue of the forms of state entities and the types of loyalties and identities that they form has intensified due to the crisis of Western society and the capitalist system. Researchers from various disciplines from history to philosophy are working in this direction; one can mention such well-known authors as A.I. Miller [9], V.S. Martyanov [10], V.V. Kozlovskiy [11], etc.

Although the discussion about Russian identity has been going on for a long time, the question remains open. It should be said that there is a scientific direction that provides an opportunity to confirm hypotheses, since it studies the relationship between ethnic self-awareness and civic identity based on sociological research. The most famous scientists in this area are L.M. Drobizheva [12], Yu.V. Arutyunyan [13], and others. These studies provide an opportunity to assess empirically how identities are related to each other, as well as to understand which of them occupy dominant positions in society in the course of its historical development.

It should be noted that in the context of the question raised in this article about what identities prevail among the population of the North-East of Russia, it should be mentioned that the remoteness of the region within the Russian state has formed an ethnographic tradition of considering the peoples inhabiting these territories as stateless and even acting as antipodes of “Russianness” [14, Ssorin-Chaikov N.V.], [15, Slezkin Yu.L.]. The question arises about the specificity of their configuration of the significance of identities, as well as how the configuration of identities is connected with the modern idea and understanding of what the state is in the changing geopolitical conditions and what is the role of such concepts as “people”, “nation”, “ethnic group” in them.

Research methodology

In the period from March to April 2024, a sociological survey was conducted within the framework of the project “Patriotism of the Peoples of the North-East of Russia: Big and Small Homeland in the Narratives of Residents of Yakutia and Chukotka”. The research tools were de-

veloped by a team of ethno-sociologists from the Institute for Humanities Research and Indigenous Studies of the North of SB RAS (IHRISN SB RAS).

The research methodology in both regions is a questionnaire survey of the population using a quota sample of age and gender representative of the general population of the region. The sampling error in Yakutia with a probability of 95% does not exceed 3%, in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug the error with a probability of 95% does not exceed 5%. Accordingly, the survey covered 1,066 observation units in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), and 370 units in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug.

Characteristics of the sample population in Yakutia: 47.9% of respondents are men, 52.1% are women. Age characteristics of the surveyed population: 18 to 22 years old — 9.3%, 23 to 34 years old — 24.3%, 35 to 44 years old — 21.6%, 45 to 54 years old — 16.4%, 55 to 64 years old — 16%, over 65 years old — 12.3%. Survey implementation levels: 58.1% — urban population, 10.1% — urban-type settlement population, 31.9% — rural population. Participants in the survey were Sakha — 62.7%, Russians — 18.9%, indigenous peoples of the North — 7.7%, and others — 8.9%. 1.4% refused to answer the question about their nationality. In this sample, 8.8% of respondents indicated the presence of a second ethnic identity. It should be noted that among the respondents' answers there were also those who indicated only citizenship — 4 people called themselves Russians. Another 4 indicated themselves as Russians as a second existing nationality.

Characteristics of the sample population in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug: 49.2% of respondents are men, 50.8% are women. Age characteristics of the surveyed population: from 18 to 22 years old — 6.8%, from 23 to 34 years old — 22.2%, from 35 to 44 years old — 24.6%, from 45 to 54 years old — 20.3%, from 55 to 64 years old — 16.8%, over 65 years old — 9.5%. Survey implementation levels: 50.3% — urban population, 21.4% — urban-type settlement population, 28.4% — rural population. The survey involved Russians — 39.5%, Chukchi — 30.3%, indigenous peoples of the North — 13.5%, others — 6.2%. 10.5% refused to answer the question about their nationality. In this sample, 13.8% of respondents indicated their second ethnic identity.

The primary data were processed using SPSS software, the results are presented using descriptive statistics methods. Such an analysis tool as cross-tabulation was used for an in-depth analysis of empirical information — the significance criterion χ^2 .

Specifics of the situation in the North-East of Russia

The North-East of Russia is the easternmost and most remote part of the country from the center, located in the Far East. It covers a huge territory: it includes the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), Magadan Oblast, Kamchatka Krai, Chukotka Autonomous Okrug. This natural and geographical macro-region is extreme in its natural and climatic conditions. A significant part of it is located beyond the Arctic Circle. Despite the unfavorable climatic and natural conditions, this territory has become home to a significant number of peoples. The combination of all these circumstances had a direct impact on the historical development of the administrative-territorial structure, the func-

tions of government and management bodies and their powers within the Russian political and administrative system. In particular, it determined the significant autonomy of this macro-region in the early stages of development.

Researchers note that Russian foreign expansion was dominated by strategic foreign policy rather than economic motives. As a result, political and administrative development began first in the lands that were new to the Russian state, and only then it was the turn of economic integration [16, Dameshek L.M., Dameshek I.L.]. The overall result of the territorial expansion that began in the first half of the 17th century with Yakutia was the transformation of Russia into the largest state in the world. It should be noted that the situation with the establishment of Russian power was different in Yakutia and Chukotka. According to historians, the peoples of Yakutia voluntarily joined the Russian state, and therefore the demographic consequences of joining Russia for the Yakuts are considered to be an increase in population, as well as extensive migration due to colonization of Northeast Asia [17, Borisov A.A.]. The situation in Chukotka was very different, because the Chukchi and Koryaks resisted the establishment of Russian rule in Northeast Siberia for a long time [18, Nefedkin A.K.]. The Chukchi were accepted into Russian citizenship only in the second half of the 18th century.

An interesting question is whether the peoples inhabiting the North-East had a national consciousness at the time of the arrival of the Russian state. We cannot overturn the modern idea of national (ethnic) belonging into the past, but the awareness of certain communities still existed. Researchers see a major role for the state in the form of the national thinking of the indigenous peoples of Siberia that has developed to date. Thus, D. Anderson writes that before the appearance of representatives of the state, ethnographers, there were many intersecting identities that were used to distinguish people, but there was not a single one that a person could not change during his life [19]. He emphasizes that a different idea developed later and was largely formed by the distribution system of Soviet power. Other researchers note that the interaction of indigenous peoples with the state was specific due to the peculiarities of their way of life. For example, N. Ssorin-Chaikov describes the interaction of the indigenous peoples of the North with the state as a relationship of “avoidance and burden” [14, p. 158], their natural desire to live without state intervention; it could be assumed that this situation could influence the specific perception of their belonging to the state or other communities.

Currently, the self-awareness of the indigenous peoples of the North and the ethnic groups that gave their names to the regions is at a high level. This is noted in the publications of ethno-sociologists conducting research in this particular macro-region [20, Maklashova E.G., Osipova O.V.] and in Russia as a whole. It is important to note that in Yakutia, a high level of national self-awareness among indigenous peoples is combined with an outflow of the Russian population. During the post-Soviet period, there was a decrease in the share of Russians among the population of Yakutia — from 50.3% in 1989 to 27.8% in 2020. In the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, the situation is different; population migration did not have such a strong impact on the ethnic structure of the

population. Although in the 1990s, there was a loss of 2/3 of its inhabitants. The last census recorded that during the post-Soviet period the number of Russians in the region decreased only from 68% to 54.2%.

Dominant identities

Studies record different situations with the assessment of the significance of ethnic and civic identity in different regions of Russia, but common trends are identified. For example, it is indicated that representatives of the nationalities that give the republics their names usually have a higher ethnic identity in these regions than other ethnic groups. Another trend that has been recorded in recent years is that civic identity turns out to be more significant than all other types of identities.

The study discussed in this article also examined the issue of dominant identities. Respondents were asked to assess how important it was for them to be aware of belonging to a number of communities, among which the following formulations were proposed: “representative of a people, ethnic group, nationality”, “resident of a region”, “citizen of Russia, Russian”, “citizen of the world”.

The results of the study in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) and in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug showed that Russian identity turned out to be the most significant for the population of both regions. 96% of the population in Yakutia and 95.9% in Chukotka indicated that to some extent it is important for them to consider themselves citizens of Russia. 85.4% of the population in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug and 92% in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) indicated that ethnicity is also important for them. 83% of the population in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug and 92.9% in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) indicated that it is important for them to consider themselves residents of the region. Besides, 64.9% of the population in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug and 69% in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) indicated that it is important for them to consider themselves citizens of the world.

The analysis of the survey results by ethnic group showed that representatives of different ethnic groups in Yakutia have different assessments of the importance of ethnic ($\chi^2 = 34.580$, $p < 0.000$), regional ($\chi^2 = 61.328$, $p < 0.000$), and Russian identity ($\chi^2 = 14.719$, $p < 0.023$). It should be noted that for the Yakuts in Yakutia, ethnic and civic identities are of high importance in approximately equal measure (see Table 1). In Chukotka, the significance of ethnic ($\chi^2 = 22.392$, $p < 0.001$) and regional identity ($\chi^2 = 57.332$, $p < 0.000$) are assessed differently, and there are no statistically confirmed differences in the assessment of the significance of Russian identity ($\chi^2 = 8.083$, $p < 0.232$) among representatives of different ethnic groups. For the Chukchi in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, with a high significance of ethnicity, Russian identity turned out to be more significant (see Table 2).

Table 1

Significance of ethnic and Russian identities in the context of respondents' ethnicity in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)

Nationality of respondent	Ethnic identity			Civic identity		
	Very important	Im- portant	Not im- portant	Very important	Im- portant	Not im- portant
Yakuts	52.4	41.5	6.1	53.2	43.6	3.2
Russians	38.3	44.4	17.3	56.4	35.9	7.7
SIPN	56.3	38.8	5	46.8	51.9	1.3
Others	50	45.7	4.3	56.4	38.3	5.3

This trend of increasing significance of Russian identity has been recorded in recent years. For example, in the 2000s (2002), according to surveys, Russian identity was inferior to ethnic identity in terms of prevalence and intensity [21, Drobizheva L.M.]. By 2011–2012, Russian identity became the most widespread and most significant identity for the majority in regions with a predominantly Russian population. Currently, Russian identity has established itself as the most important in some national regions and has the greatest significance in the hierarchy of identities. Perhaps this was the result of a noticeable increase in the solidarity of Russians on a civic basis against the backdrop of the aggressive policies of Western countries. At the same time, it should be noted that the Yakuts (Sakha) in the Sakha Republic (Yakutia) more often noted the position “very important” not for civic or ethnic identity, but for regional identity — 55.8% of them gave this answer.

Table 2

Significance of ethnic and Russian identities in the context of respondents' ethnicity in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug

Nationality of respondent	Ethnic identity			Civic identity		
	Very important	Im- portant	Not im- portant	Very important	Im- portant	Not im- portant
Chukchi	53.6	39.3	7.1	70.5	27.7	1.8
Russians	37.0	43.2	19.9	62.3	31.5	6.2
SIPN	60	38	2	78	18	4
Others	30.4	56.5	13	69.6	30.4	0

At the same time, it is noteworthy that in both regions, the Russian population indicated that ethnic and civic identities are not important more often than representatives of other ethnic groups. In addition, 4.8% of Russians in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug and 5.5% in Yakutia did not choose any of the 4 proposed identities as important. Among representatives of different ethnic groups, this indicator of the lack of importance of identities is the highest among the Russian population. Since identity is considered as identifying oneself with a community, these data can be perceived from the point of view of the spread of individualistic ideas, which in modern society require a person to refuse to choose a stable identity and the responsibility that it imposes.

The weak importance of ethnic self-awareness for Russians is also noted in other studies. Researchers, explaining this phenomenon, associate it with the long-term absence of social institutions involved in ethnic socialization. It is noted that the decentralization of cultural policy, which has been enshrined in the regulatory framework of the Russian Federation and its subjects, has

actually recognized the ethnic specificity of the republics, but pays virtually no attention to the problems of Russian culture in these regions [22, Luchsheva L.V.].

Ethno-sociological studies have noted that the level of solidarity in the republics is higher among representatives of the nationality that gives the region its name. This is indeed true: in the survey regions the position “A modern person needs to feel part of his nationality” is chosen by 50.5% of Russians and 70.5% of Yakuts (Sakha) in the Sakha Republic (Yakutia) and 49.3% of Russians and 73.2% of Chukchi in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug. However, it should be noted that, in comparison with the results of studies in the 1990s, the indicator of ethnic consolidation among Russians in Yakutia has noticeably increased — in 1994 it was only 37.4%, while among Yakuts, on the contrary, it slightly decreased from 73.9% to 70.5% [23, Ignatyeva V.B., Abramova S.V., Pavlov A.A., p. 152].

Based on lower rates of ethnic consolidation, it is usually concluded that ethnic identity is not expressed by Russians. However, a different view will be formed if we pay attention to the way researchers explained the low rates of ethnic consolidation of Russians previously. They linked them to the fact that Russians equated ethnic and civic identities. If we follow this logic, then at present, among other reasons, we can assume that these two identities have become separated both in the minds of Russians and in the minds of representatives of other ethnic groups inhabiting Russia. Over the past decade, Russia’s national policy has paid much attention to the fact that Russia is a multinational state. In this regard, this version has a right to exist, if we take into account that “Russians”, like the “Soviet people” before, are a mental construct that is primarily associated with citizenship, a common historical path, and the formation of a common cultural field.

However, we should not ignore other factors, including the outflow of the Russian population from Yakutia and changes in the ethno-social structure of society. Such fluctuations in the ethnic composition of the population may affect the self-perception and perception of the need for consolidation along ethnic lines.

In general, it should be noted that the high level of significance of civic identity indicates the stability of the situation and the cohesion of the multi-ethnic society of the North-East of Russia. It can be argued that ethnic identity in modern conditions does not hinder Russian identity, while at the same time ethnic identity affects the level of significance of regional identity.

Civic and regional patriotism of the population

Next, let us consider the issue concerning the patriotic feelings towards the country and region. Its study is important for several reasons: firstly, it will demonstrate the validity of the thesis about the assertion of civic identity as dominant in the consciousness of the population. The fact is that only a high level of patriotic consciousness in the country allows resisting the imposed cult of material values, the culture of consumption — the simplest, but also the most effective tool for the decomposition of national self-awareness [24, Tovanchova E.N., Kashina A.A., p. 142]. Sec-

only, based on the analysis of the population's opinion on civic and regional patriotism, it will be possible to analyze the relationship between ethnicity and feelings of attachment to a certain territory within the country.

The first thing to note is that there is a rather high percentage of the population declaring a patriotic position towards Russia (see Tables 3 and 4). The difference in the answers of respondents of different ethnic backgrounds was small both in Yakutia ($\chi^2 = 8.208$, $p < 0.513$) and in Chukotka ($\chi^2 = 6.210$, $p < 0.400$), the differences are not statistically significant. The influence of the region of residence on the answers of respondents is revealed to a greater extent. Respondents of the ChAO more often declared their patriotic position towards Russia than residents of Yakutia. As the study shows, the historical features of the inclusion of peoples in the Russian state do not affect the current situation. To a greater extent, the current situation is associated with the features of the general political agenda in the region, the socio-economic situation of the population, the socio-political discourse, the influence of the discourse of the ethnic intelligentsia, etc.

Table 3

Distribution of answers to the question "Are you a patriot of Russia and the region?" in the ethnic cross-section in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), %

Nationality of respondent	Patriotism towards Russia				Patriotism towards Yakutia			
	Yes	No	Difficult to answer	No answer	Yes	No	Difficult to answer	No answer
Yakuts	75.4	5.7	17.7	1.2	84.0	3.9	11.5	0.6
Russians	75.6	6.0	16.4	2.0	57.7	12.4	27.9	2.0
SIPN	69.5	6.1	23.2	1.2	74.4	6.1	17.1	2.4
Others	77.9	4.2	13.7	4.2	63.2	6.3	26.3	4.2

In the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), patriotism towards the country and the region as a whole in the sample was approximately at the same level — 75.2% and 76.5%. But if we consider these figures in the projection of the ethnic identity of the respondents, we will see that regional patriotism is inherent in representatives of different ethnic groups to an unequal extent ($\chi^2 = 76.678$, $p < 0.000$). In other words, while civic patriotism is indeed characteristic of all ethnic groups to an equal extent, regional patriotism is observed to a greater extent among Yakuts (Sakha) — 84%, and among representatives of the indigenous peoples of the North — 74.4%. It is worth noting that in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), the level of regional patriotism among the Yakuts and representatives of the indigenous peoples of the North is even higher than the level of civic patriotism. The same trend is recorded by other studies [25, Tomaska A.G.].

Table 4

Distribution of answers to the question "Are you a patriot of Russia and the region?" in the ethnic cross-section in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, %

Nationality of respondent	Patriotism towards Russia			Patriotism towards Chukotka		
	Yes	No	Difficult to answer	Yes	No	Difficult to answer
Chukchi	89.3	3.6	7.1	78.6	6.3	15.2
Russians	88.4	2.1	9.6	59.6	17.1	23.3
SIPN	82.0	8.0	10.0	90.0	4.0	6.0
Others	95.7	0	4.3	73.9	8.7	17.4

A slightly different situation is observed in Chukotka (see Table 4). Among the Chukchi, civic patriotism is expressed more strongly than regional one. The highest rates of regional patriotism can be observed in the group uniting other representatives of the indigenous peoples of the North living in Chukotka — Eskimos, Evens, Yukaghirs, Chuvans, etc. Nevertheless, if we consider the obtained results in the ethnic section, a statistically significant difference in the answers of representatives of different ethnic groups is recorded ($\chi^2 = 22.709$, $p < 0.001$).

In managerial practice, regional (local) patriotism is evaluated as a significant managerial resource, as a factor of development and promotion of the small homeland in the social space. Local patriotism can serve as an impetus for various transformations, a basis for the initiation of socially significant projects and actions by authorities, the population, and civil institutions that transform the social space [26, Shchukina R.I., Vyatkina N.V., p. 105]. Patriotic sentiments of ethnic groups should be taken into account as a potential for civic participation in the active transformation of the social environment and the enhancement of the socio-economic development of territories. Examples of successful activities of local communities associated with a conscious attitude to their place of residence and responsibility for its development already exist in Russian practice [27, Breslavsky A.S.].

At the same time, a balance of participation in internal migration of representatives of different nationalities should be observed here. The fact is that a person's migration experience, while reducing his or her attachment to a specific territory, expands the idea of the homeland as a territory of the country as a whole, and forms a more conscious mental connection with the country as a whole. It is known that even in Soviet times, Russians, being the most mobile in terms of migration [28, Kulichenko M.I.], shared the Soviet identity to a greater extent. In these circumstances, when managing migration movement, it is important to create not only material incentives for the population, but also conditions for people to realise their ties with the territory, positive identification with the locality and region.

According to other studies conducted by the IHRISN SB RAS, the Russian population of Yakutia is, as a rule, much less attached to the region. Only about one third of the population positively assessed their attitude to their place of residence. The majority of the population, answering the question: "What feelings do you have towards Yakutia?", feel both positive and negative aspects. The percentage of responses (16.8%) of respondents of Russian nationality who indicated a lack of emotional attachment to the region is noteworthy. Apparently, a similar situation is observed in Chukotka. In this regard, it is possible to predict the continuation of the trend towards migration outflow of the Russian population [29, Maklashova E.G., p. 75].

Thus, regional patriotism is more inherent in ethnic groups historically living in these territories. It seems that it should be considered not only in the context of the territorialization of ethnic identity, but also as a reflection of the fact that the process of population rooting, the "germination" of individuals in a certain territory is long and difficult. This is associated with the need to

study the factors that motivate the population to migrate, as well as the subjective motives and intentions reflecting these factors.

Discussion

In general, the idea that representatives of ethnic groups belonging to the indigenous peoples of the North-East of Russia have a different position on patriotism from the Russian population of these regions should be noted. There is no statistically confirmed difference in opinions here, despite the fact that the significance of ethnic identity is indeed more pronounced among these groups of respondents. This situation, apparently, is a reflection of modern national policy aimed at supporting cultural diversity and strengthening civic identity. Managing this process is not an easy task and in the new geopolitical conditions, it requires special attention. At the same time, the question of how attitudes towards the significance of certain identities and forms of state structure will change in the context of the crisis of the capitalist system and the growing contradictions within it is becoming more relevant.

It should be noted that the formation of nation-states was the result of the transition from a traditional society to a modern society within the framework of the capitalist world system. The process of destruction of old social structures was accompanied by an explosion of new identities that fragmented society, focusing on private and special interests as opposed to the general [30, Martyanov V.S., p. 253]. Keeping society from final disintegration required the creation of common socio-cultural collective “self” in the form of nations and the suppression of other forms of loyalty, which include regional, religious, ethnic and other. Therefore, the period of formation and development of national states was largely associated with the cultural unification of the population within these political entities. Researchers quite accurately use the image of painting the territory in a single color in order to describe this constant and persistent desire for unification, obscuring differences, neglecting local particularisms [31, Filippova E.I., p. 88].

As A.V. Golovnev points out, Russia in its historical path did not seek to eliminate cultural differences; on the contrary, the statehood of the country was understood on the basis of cultural diversity. At the same time, there was a pendulum shift of two trends: during periods of crisis of power, ethnicity was activated and the number of peoples grew, and in times of prosperity of centralism, their number decreased in favor of civil unity [8, p. 11]. The alternation of periods of a “strong” and “weak” state and their influence on ethno-cultural processes is emphasized in the works of M.S. Mikhalev. He notes a rather democratic, compared to other countries, position of the Russian state with regard to the manifestation of ethnic diversity [32].

If we consider the results of the research we have undertaken in the context of these ideas, we should conclude that at the present time there is a process of strengthening centralism, which causes an increase in the importance of civic identity in society against the background of other loyalties. However, we do not observe a strong decrease in the importance of ethnicity. Moreover,

ethnic identities largely determine the territorial development of Russia, due to the increase in the importance of regional identity.

It can be assumed that at present the state has gradually developed a modern understanding of the coexistence of the peoples of Russia, while, importantly, the idea of multinationality remains its basic element and is expressed in the implementation of national policy, understood as the development of the ethno-cultural environment in Russia. It seems that the reduction in state control in the area of manifestation of certain ethnic cultures, which is uncharacteristic for the stage of centralization of power, should be considered not as an ideological weakness of the Russian state, but as a strategy for the soft involvement of ethnic groups in the general socio-cultural field of the country, as well as in the process of strengthening statehood. Patriotism in this context becomes the binding basis of interaction. The effectiveness of this strategy is confirmed by both the results of sociological research and the active involvement of representatives of ethnic groups in the all-Russian agenda.

These facts lead to the need to revise the established idea of the influence of historical and cultural factors on the development of society and stimulate the recognition of the existence of different forms of statehood, the specificity of civilizations and the hierarchies of identities formed by them.

It can be assumed that civilizations in the modern world represent a special structure of interaction of the identities of the people who are part of it. The specificity of Russian civilization is that in a multi-ethnic state, ethnic identity, which is institutionalized by the state, is also dominant along with civil identity. The latter distinguishes the social situation in Russia from the rest of the world.

In the era of modernity, which largely unified different societies and individualized them, the ethnic dimension of Russian society is one of the key characteristics of Russian civilization. This feature acted as a certain barrier to extreme individualization (which Western society followed), coupled with the goal-setting associated with it, which underlies the decisions that are made in areas of vital importance for the existence of society.

Conclusion

Patriotism in Russia contains the idea of belonging to a country that unites many peoples, a unique multi-ethnic and multi-confessional situation. This is the peculiarity of Russia as a state-civilization. The idea of one's own state accumulates the idea of all peoples, their unique spiritual culture. All this stimulates the scientific search for approaches to understanding the social space in which a person lives, as well as the ways of its development. The high level of significance of civic identity indicates the cohesion of the multi-ethnic society of the North-East of Russia. It seems that patriotic feelings can be a factor in reducing the effectiveness of external information influence aimed at the growth of ethnic conflicts in Russia. State authorities should pay attention to the processes of managing the distribution of labor resources of the country, maintaining a bal-

ance between the formation of regional identity among representatives of different ethnic groups of Russia, as well as to issues of scientific study and popularization of the history of the peoples inhabiting Russia in the context of all-Russian historical processes.

References

1. Anderson B. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Moscow, Kuchkovo Pole Publ., 2016, 416 p. (In Russ.)
2. Wallerstein I. *After Liberalism*. Moscow, Editorial URSS Publ., 2003, 256 p. (In Russ.)
3. Beck U. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Moscow, Tsentr issledovaniy postindustrial'nogo obshchestva Publ., 2008, 340 p. (In Russ.)
4. Dunn J. *Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future*. Cambridge University Press, 1979, 120 p.
5. Brubaker R. In the Name of the Nation: Reflections on Nationalism and Patriotism. In: *Myths and Misconceptions in the Study of Empire and Nationalism*. Moscow, Novoe Izdatelstvo Publ., 2010, pp. 110–130. (In Russ.)
6. Struve P.B. Great Russia and Holy Russia. *Russkaya mysl'*, 1914, vol. 12, pp. 176–180.
7. Golovnev A.V. Multinationality of Russia: A View from the North. *Etnografia*, 2022, no. 4 (18). Pp. 6–32. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31250/2618-8600-2022-4\(18\)-6-32](https://doi.org/10.31250/2618-8600-2022-4(18)-6-32)
8. Tishkov V.A. *The Nation of Nations: On Approaches to Understanding Russia*. Moscow, IEA RAS Publ., 2023, 69 p. (In Russ.)
9. Miller A.I. *Nation or the Power of Myth*. Saint Petersburg, EUSP Publ., 2016, 146 p. (In Russ.)
10. Martianov V.S., Rudenko V.N. The Magic of the White Progressor: From Global Cargo Cult to a New Political Normality. *The Journal of Political Theory, Political Philosophy and Sociology of Politics Politeia*, 2022, no. 1 (104), pp. 24–49. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30570/2078-5089-2022-104-1-24-49>
11. Kozlovskiy V.V., ed. *Russian Society: Architectonics of Civilizational Development*. Moscow, Saint Petersburg, FCTAS RAS Publ., 2021, 340 p. (In Russ.) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19181/monogr.978-5-89697-375-1.2021>
12. Drobijeva L.M. The Russian and Other Ethnic Identities: Compatibility or Otherwise. *Rossiya reformiruyushchayasya*, 2002, no. 2, pp. 213–244.
13. Arutyunyan Yu.V. Russians: Problems of National-Civil Identity Formation in the Light of Ethno-sociological Data. *Social Sciences and Contemporary World*, 2009, no. 4, pp. 91–97.
14. Ssorin-Chaikov N.V. Hobbes in Siberia: On the Social Life of the State. *Sociology of Power*, 2012, no. 4–5, pp. 155–187
15. Slezkin Yu.L. *Arctic Mirrors. Russia and the Small Peoples of the North*. Moscow, Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie Publ., 2008, 512 p. (In Russ.)
16. Dameshek L.M., Dameshek I.L. National Outskirts in the System of Internal Policy of the Russian Autocracy of the XVI–XX Centuries. In: *Asian Russia: Problems of Socio-Economic, Demographic and Cultural Development (XVII–XXI Centuries): Proc. of the Intern. Sci. Conf.* Novosibirsk, Parallel Publ., 2017, pp. 381–387.
17. Borisov A.A. Historical and Demographic Problems of the National Outskirts of the Russian Empire in the 17th — Early 19th Centuries. In: *Northeast Siberia in the Context of Russian History. XVII–XX Centuries: Proc. of the All-Russ. Sci. Conf. Dedicated to the 75th Anniversary of Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor V.N. Ivanov*. Yakutsk, Prodizayn Publ., 2012, pp. 54–61.
18. Nefedkin A.K. *Military Affairs of the Chukchi (Mid-17th—Early 20th Centuries)*. Saint Petersburg, Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie Publ., 2003, 352 p. (In Russ.)
19. Anderson D. G. *Tundroviki: The Ecology and Identity of the Taimyr Evenkis and Dolgans*. Novosibirsk, SB RAS Publ., 1998, 272 p. (In Russ.)
20. Maklashova E.G., Osipova O.V. State National Policy in Conditions of Russian Ethnic Federalism: Sociological Cross-Section (Case Study of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)). *Theory and Practice of Social Development*, 2015, no. 12, pp. 28–34.
21. Drobizheva L.M. Russian, Ethnic, Regional Identity: Longitudinal Study of 1993–2012 Years. *Bulletin Russian Foundation for the Humanities*, 2014, no. 2 (75), pp. 71–83.

22. Luchsheva L.V. Identity and Self-Consciousness of the Russians of the Republic of Tatarstan. In: *Ethnosociology in Russia: Scientific Potential in the Process of Integration of a Multiethnic Community: Proc. of the Intern. Sci. and Pract. Conf.* Kazan, Marjani Institute of History of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences Publ., 2009, pp. 221–226.
23. Ignateva V.B., Abramova S.V., Pavlov A.A., et al. *Ethnosocial Development of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia): Potential, Trends, Prospects*. Novosibirsk, Nauka Publ., 2000, 273 p. (In Russ.)
24. Tovanchova E.N., Kashina A.A. Socio-Cultural and Ethno-National Identification of Patriotism in the Context of Modern Globalization Processes. *Science and Education: Economy and Financial Economy; Entrepreneurship; Law and Management*, 2023, no. 9 (160), pp. 141–145.
25. Tomaska A.G. The Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) Population Identities. *Herald of Anthropology*, 2023, no. 4, pp. 37–50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33876/2311-0546/2023-4/37-50>
26. Shchukina R.I., Vyatkina N.V. Regional Patriotism as a Factor of Territorial Development. *Bulletin of Prikamskiy Social Institute*, 2022, no. 3 (93), pp. 103–109.
27. Breslavsky A.S. Territorial Public Self-Government in Contemporary Buryatia: Factors of Sustainable Development. *Russian Peasant Studies*, 2021, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 79–98.
28. Kulichenko M.I. *The Rise and Rapprochement of Nations in the USSR*. Moscow, Mysl Publ., 1981, 444 p. (In Russ.)
29. Maklashova E.G. Strengthening Traditional Spiritual and Moral Values in the System of Public Assessment of the Social Position of the People (Based on Yakutia's Material). *Etnosocium (Multinational Society)*, 2023, no. 12 (186), pp. 66–79.
30. Martianov V.S. *Political Project of Modernity. From World Economy to World Politics: Russia's Strategy in a Globalising World*. Moscow, ROSSPEN Publ., 2010, 359 p. (In Russ.)
31. Filippova E.I. *Territories of Identity in Modern France*. Moscow, Rosinformagrotekh Publ., 2010, 300 p. (In Russ.)
32. Mikhalev M.S. *Great Eastern Limitrof: Transboundary Peoples in the State Policy of Russia and China*. Moscow, IFES RAS Publ., 2022, 295 p. (In Russ.)

*The article was submitted 19.06.2024; approved after reviewing 04.07.2024;
accepted for publication 02.08.2024*

The author declares no conflicts of interests