

УДК 316.34

Characteristics of Social Structure in Krasnoyarsk Region

Anna V. Nemirovskaya*

Siberian Federal University

79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041 Russia¹

Received 4.11.2011, received in revised form 11.12.2011, accepted 16.03.2012

The article draws light on characteristics of Krasnoyarsk region's social structure based on its empirical research conducted in 2011. The social structure of the region is represented by means of cluster analysis and is organized as the system of ten social clusters selected on the basis of self-evaluation of the socio-economic stratum, belonging to the socio-professional structure and level of education by the respondents. Professional characteristics of the clusters and the role of education in formation of the regional social structure are closely examined.

Keywords: social structure, social stratum, social and occupational structure, cluster analysis, Krasnoyarsk region.

The survey was conducted by financial support of Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation within the frames of its research and development project № 11-03-00250a, "Characteristics of Social Structure Formation and Development of Social Capital in Krasnoyarsk Region".

Introduction

With regard to Krasnoyarsk region, one of the important areas of Eastern Siberia in the socioeconomic and socio-cultural terms, the analysis of the Krasnoyarsk region social structure is of significant practical value in its assessment as the integral socio-cultural territorial community in the context of territorial socio-cultural space in Russia. This stratification as the result of the cluster analysis allows clear reflection of socio-economic conditions and peculiarities of the labor market in Krasnoyarsk region.

The class approach and stratification approach are traditionally and validly recognized in sociology as methods of studying the society's

social structure. It should be noted that the socio-stratification approach has been widely spread in Russian sociology for the two last decades (Ilyin, 1996; Tikhonova, 1999; Radaev and Shkaratan, 1999, Shkaratan, 2009, etc.). However, it has some drawbacks, indicated in particular, by Z.T. Golenkova: «It was found out at once that despite all evident advantages, the stratification model is not entirely suitable for the society in the process of transformation. Its weak spots had roots both in methodology and in practice... The methodological weakness of the stratification model stems from conceptual foundations of its original functionalistic paradigm. This paradigm considered the society as the system where

* Corresponding author E-mail address: annanemirov@gmail.com

¹ © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

each individual took the position correspondent with his or her talents and achievements. The functionalism treated inequality as the mechanism aimed at reproduction and survival of the system. The second serious drawback of the stratification model is that it was oriented at the analysis of inequality in the sustainable society in which in most cases the higher qualification conformed to the higher income and the social mobility of the worker was the indicator of the public demand in him. In addition, the model was poorly suitable for the analysis of the society in the phase of radical transformation when old institutions of distribution are in crisis, previously acquired qualifications and skills are passing the exam to eligibility under the new conditions” (Modernization of the Russian Society’s Social Structure, 2008).

It is also difficult to disagree with V.A. Yadov’s point of view that “in terms of the stratification approach the position of researchers is unenviable because it is difficult to find the sound middle class in today’s Russia. Formally (as many researchers do) it is an easy matter to build the hierarchy of the social groups according to the amount of income and “seat” them as the higher, middle and the lowest strata. But there are two problems. The first is: the middle class by its definition is interested in stability of the given societal system, while Russian “middle” permanently complains of vulnerability and instability of the financial situation. The second problem is dispersion of the financial self-evaluation...Self-evaluation of citizens is even more doubtful in stratification terms” (Yadov, 2006). Also, T.I. Zaslavskaya reached the conclusion that out country has not “middle” but “median” class more than 10 years ago (Zaslavskaya, 2001).

At the same time the advocates of the stratification approach confirm its suitability for studying modern Russian realia. L.A. Belyeva emphasizes, «...the specialists have almost no

doubt that the middle class in Russia is being formed. The most debatable issue is criteria of its specification» (Belyaeva, 2009). O.I. Shkaratan came to the conclusion: «...our studies of social relations of the real groups have demonstrated that the stratum stratification hierarchy prevails in modern Russia as well as in the remote past and in the Soviet past». The author notices that the transition from stratification of a hierarchic type (in which the positions of the individual and social groups are determined by their place in the structure of governmental power and degree of proximity to sources of centralized distribution) to the class stratification dominated in the civilized world did not take place in Russia. As earlier, the power relations dominate over the property relations. In particular, the studies revealed that domination of hierarchic stratification system which as a rule divides the society members into 7-12 professional groups was not proven. Nevertheless, according to the author, it is reasonable to study the aspects of the modern Russian social structure which reflects the socio-industrial and consumer differentiation established by the market relations, including middle classes/strata (Shkaratan, 2009).

An important methodological role in the present survey is given to the socio-cultural approach designed by Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, RAS corresponding member N.I. Lapin (Lapin, 2009), in addition to theories and methods of multivariate analysis of the Russian society’s social stratification proposed by Doctor of Sociology, Professor L.A. Belyaeva (Belyaeva, 2009). We consider these approaches to be relevant for sociological research of the social structure of the region regarding as a specific socio-cultural phenomenon.

Methods of research

The empirical base of the present article is the data of the representative survey of population

conducted in Krasnoyarsk region in 2011 by a method of a formal interview according to the place of the respondents' residency. The survey took part in trust-based home environment in 28 settlements of the region. The sample group: stratified, multi-stage, area-specific, quota, represented by gender, age and level of education, random at stage of the respondents' selection. Its representativeness is facilitated by maintaining of ratio between population of settlements of different types (city districts, towns, little towns and rural settlements), age, gender, educational level of the adult population in Krasnoyarsk region. The sample size is 1250 people.

The data were processed with usage of application package SPSS by means of cluster and correlation analyses.

Different combination variants of the attributes which characterize the region's social structure were tested for cluster analysis in the course of the research. As the result, the system of 25 clusters turned out to be the most accurate and detailed in demonstration of the regional social structure. However, we limited the structure to 10 social clusters in view of significant difficulty in empirical description of the system. The total number of the respondents from the clusters covers 89,3 % of the sampled aggregation which

is a good indicator. The following indicators were used to form the clusters:

- Belonging to socio-professional structure («Who do you work now?»);
- Belonging to socioeconomic stratum («Which of the following statements describes the present financial situation better – yours, your family?»);
- Level of education («Your education?»).

Findings

In accordance with the method of self-evaluation of personal financial situation by region population offered by L.A. Belyaeva, six socio-economic strata were allocated in the course of the research (Table 1).

The majority of the population allocated to some socioeconomic strata by method of self-evaluation – 74 % – is referred to economically deprived groups. Only 3 % of the respondents classified themselves as the rich who can deny nothing, all other region's dwellers (except 6% who refused to answer and did not provide the information) have difficulty in purchasing an apartment, a summer house (dacha). It is evident that socio-economic aspects of the region's social structure, on the whole, define its population as the "poor".

Table 1. Self-evaluation of Standard of Living (in % from number of the respondents)

Answer options	2011	Conditional strata
The money is not enough for everyday expenses	9	«beggary»
The salary goes to everyday expenses	13	«the poor»
The money is enough for everyday expenses but clothes purchase is challenging	16	«the unsecured»
The money is predominantly enough but it is necessary to borrow money to buy expensive goods	36	«the well-warranted»
The money is predominantly enough but it is difficult to buy an apartment, a summer house (dacha)	17	«the wealthy»
Almost deny yourself nothing	3	«the rich»
Refusal to answer	6	–

Table 2. Self-evaluation of belonging to social stratum (in % from number of respondents)

Answer options	At present	5 years ago	10 years ago
Higher stratum	1	1	2
Above-average stratum	7	8	7
Middle stratum	57	55	52
Below-average stratum	22	24	25
Lower stratum	5	4	5
I do not know	8	8	9

As for social stratification, more than half of the respondents described themselves as the middle stratum (cf. data in Table 2). Moreover, its fraction in the total number of the respondents has increased from 52% to 57% during last 10 years owing to some decrease in the fraction of the “below-average” stratum representatives. With reference to this, we support L.A. Belyaeva’s opinion that the middle class in the regional social space «...may be extracted as the group of socially prepared and relatively well-warranted population which is an actor of social and economic development of Russia together with elite and pre-elite part of the society. The important characteristic of the middle class is its self-identification with the middle position in societal hierarchy which is considered by us as a criterion for its extraction and extraction of other attributes» (Belyaeva, 2009).

Extraction of strata by a socio-economic attribute describes in details the respondent’s financial situation that lets him allocate himself to any population category in a more suitable manner in compliance with his level of life. The respondents’ stratification by socio-economic strata is more logically connected with their position in socio-stratification hierarchy of the regional society.

According to the results of the mass poll, the representatives of the following social strata prevail among the “poor”:

- below-average stratum – 32 % (average fraction of this stratum in the sample is 21 %);
- lower stratum – 19 % (average fraction – 5 %).

It should be emphasized that 37% of the respondents who allocated themselves to the middle stratum (56 % of the sample) also self-identified themselves as the “poor” that is the proof of the population tendency to be classified as some “median” stratum on the ground of comparison with lives of wider public. It would be absurd to call it “the middle class”.

The representatives of the following social strata are among “the poor”:

- middle – 42 % (56 % on an average in the sample);
- below average – 34 % (correspondingly, 21 %);
- low – 13 % (5 %).

Among “the unsecured” are prevailed the representatives of:

- middle stratum – 53 % (56 %);
- below-average stratum – 30 % (21 %).

Among “the well-warranted” are prevailed the representatives of:

- middle stratum – 66 % (56 %);
- below-average stratum – 21 % (21 %).

The “wealthy” respondents quite often refer themselves to the following social strata:

- above-average stratum – 17 % (17 %);

– middle stratum – 69 % (56 %).

Among “the rich” are prevailed the representatives of:

- below-average stratum – 17 % (7 %);
- middle stratum – 41 % (56 %);
- below-average stratum – 43 % (21 %).

To sum up, we have a complicated picture in collective consciousness of the respondents who live in Krasnoyarsk region. It is logical to assume that the same situation may be observed in the number of other regions of the country. People do not relate their real social status to their financial situation. Notably, the latter is often subjectively evaluated higher than it is in reality. In particular as it was shown, the amount of “rich” respondents who self-classified themselves as belonging to “lower social stratum” was two times more than on average in the sample!

Moreover, usage of correlation and regression analysis has shown lack of notable correlations between almost all indicators of the social, socio-demographic, socio-economic structure of the region. Only some weak and less informative relations were revealed. For example, they testify that people who refer themselves to “the rich” have somewhat better health; belonging to retirees is clearly connected with the being in “beggary” class.

In the meantime it should be stressed that almost all respondents in Krasnoyarsk region who referred themselves to the middle position in societal hierarchy at the same time described themselves as economically deprived strata. Therefore it is reasonable to speak about the specifics of the middle class in the given region which was revealed by means of cluster analysis in the course of the research within the project “Characteristics of Krasnoyarsk Region’s Social Portrait” in 2010 (Nemirovskiy and Nemirovskaya, 2010)¹. It is representative that the fraction of the respondents with specialized secondary education, incomplete higher education

and higher education with academic degree in Krasnoyarsk region is substantially lower than on an average in Russia. It may be assumed that the respondent’s financial situation is more important in formation of the middle class in Siberian region than in the country. In other words, the level of income (not the level of education) in Krasnoyarsk region acts as a social lift to enter the middle class. Paradoxically, people referred to the middle class at change of a job are more often ready to have a small but solid earnings and confidence in the future, less frequently – earn a lot without any special guarantees for the future than the region’s dwellers.

More often compared to other social groups, the regional middle class include workers of service sector; commercial workers; engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff; personnel of armed-forces and law-enforcement bodies; students and schoolchildren, apparently, children of the representatives of these socio-professional groups. Herewith, many representatives of the regional middle class work at joint-stock companies non-par the state, the number of people working at private enterprises or owners of the private companies, i.e. entrepreneurs, is significantly lower.

It is characteristic that the middle class representatives in the region are less likely to engage in social protest in comparison with other respondents in the region. It is not random: they feel full protection from bureaucratic arbitrary actions and persecution for political beliefs to a much greater extent than the representatives of all other strata.

We can assume that the middle class in our region includes those people who must not display special entrepreneurial, political or market activity by the nature of their occupation. On the contrary, they must manifest loyalty to the authorities. In other words, as a rule, they are employees of joint-stock companies from different

spheres or civil servants. They are united by self-identification with the middle class, presence of higher or specialized secondary education and the correspondent income (Nemirovskiy and Nemirovskaya, 2010).

As we see, clear social subsystems in the Krasnoyarsk region's social structure through which elements of social capital responsible for the region's social mobility could be realized and developed, in fact, do not exist. The society is fallen into social microclusters whose members are related by close interpersonal and kinship ties. The accumulated social capital is realized with the help of microclusters by means of either ascent of the microcluster in a social status hierarchy or improvement of the financial situation among leading representatives of the present cluster.

It is necessary to mention that with considerable difficulty we were able to form a cluster social structure of the region with the help of different indicators and variants of the cluster analysis. In the result it is still may be assumed that social microclusters combine into bigger clusters-modules. It will be shown below that we extracted only 25 of them. However, we can talk about their inner instable structure, lack of clear channels of vertical social mobility into clusters with higher societal status and economic situation, which obviously implies difficulty in formation and realization of the region's social capital.

Such a significant number of clusters that describe the region's social cluster, to some extent, indicates the tendency toward its "atomization". This tendency is a serious obstacle for effective generation and realization of the population's social capital.

Due to complexity of the system's empirical description we use the reduced structure consisting of 10 social clusters. Let's describe main characteristics of the clusters centres with account of the following indicators.

Cluster 1:

- retirees, not village-dwellers;
- the salary goes to everyday expenses – «the poor»;
- incomplete higher education.

The fraction in the clustered sample is 5,3 %.

Cluster 2:

- engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff;
- the salary goes to everyday expenses – «the poor»;
- incomplete higher education.

The fraction in the sample is 10,0 %.

Cluster 3

- doctors;
- The money is predominantly enough but it is necessary to borrow money to buy expensive goods – «the well-warranted»;
- incomplete higher education.

The fraction in the sample is 18,4 %

Cluster 4

- students;
- The money is predominantly enough but it is necessary to borrow money to buy expensive goods – «the well-warranted»;
- incomplete higher education.

The fraction in the sample is 10,1 %

Cluster 5

- engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff;
- The money is enough for everyday expenses but clothes purchase is challenging – «the unsecured»;
- specialized secondary education.

The fraction in the sample is 5,5 %

Cluster 6

- retirees, not village-dwellers;
- The money is predominantly enough but it is necessary to borrow money to buy expensive goods – «the well-warranted»;
- incomplete higher education.

The fraction in the sample is 3,5 %

Cluster 7

- retirees, not village-dwellers;
- The money is enough for everyday expenses but clothes purchase is challenging – «the unsecured»;
- secondary education.

The fraction in the sample is 5,8 %

Cluster 8

- workers of civil sector;
- the salary goes to everyday expenses – «the poor»;
- initial professional education.

The fraction in the sample is 6,8 %

Cluster 9

- engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff;
- The money is predominantly enough but it is necessary to borrow money to buy expensive goods – «the well-warranted»;
- incomplete higher education.

The fraction in the sample is 23,7 %

Cluster 10

- commercial workers
- The money is predominantly enough but it is necessary to borrow money to buy expensive goods – «the well-warranted»
- incomplete higher education.

The fraction in the sample is 10,9 % A large-scale base of the Krasnoyarsk region's social structure, according to self-evaluation of the respondents' living standards, are the clusters with the "well-warranted" centering – cluster 9 (23,7 % of the respondents) + cluster 10 (10,9 %) + cluster 6 (3,5 %) + cluster 4 (10,1 %) + cluster 3 (18,4 %) = 66,6 %. «The unsecured» are combined into two clusters: cluster 7 (5,8 % of the respondents) + cluster 5 (5,5 %) = 11,3 %. «The poor»: cluster 8 (6,8 % опрошенных) + cluster 2 (10,0 %) + cluster 1 (5,3 %) = 22,1 %.

In summary, the regional social structure extracted on the base of cluster analysis

from position of the respondents' belonging to the certain socio-economic stratum may be represented in the form of a three-layer pyramid. Its lowest wider layer consists of the clusters with "prosperity" centering; the highest layer includes slightly more than one fifth of the respondents – cluster «the poor». A little more than one tenth of the respondents who referred themselves to the "unsecured" is located between these layers.

Consequently, two thirds of the respondents sharply are included into clusters with financial "prosperity" centering. They constitute the "base" of the conditional pyramid of the social structure of Krasnoyarsk region's population. This proves that the level of living standard in the region at present is quite acceptable.

Thereby, the central indicator of the respondents' education level is "incomplete higher education" in six out of ten extracted clusters. Nevertheless, as the cross-table analysis shows, each of the clusters have considerable, sometimes even prevailing fraction of people with higher professional education. Hence we may draw conclusion that the presence of higher education among the residents of Krasnoyarsk region (also in some other, mainly neighbouring regions from where the migrants came) does not play an important role in generation of the region's social structure. In other words, it does not perform at least two of its most important social duties – a function of a social lift and a function of professional retraining (the question of to what extent it performs these functions at the moment, requires further research). Abundance of the indicator "incomplete higher education" as the centre of the clusters proves non-obligation of the higher education for performance of many types of professional activities at the existing regional labour market. Exactly people with incomplete higher education (those who quit universities or

still study – it is known that nowadays many students start working early) are the most active actors in social interaction.

Let's address to socio-professional characteristics of the emphasized clusters. The centres of three clusters are engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff: cluster 9 (23,7 % of the respondents) + cluster 5 (5,5 %) + cluster 2 (10,0 %) = 39,2 %. It is seen that together they constitute a significant proportion of Krasnoyarsk region's respondents. In two of the three clusters the indicator «incomplete higher education» serves as a centre, one has the indicator «specialized secondary education» in the centre. However, all these clusters differ in a central attribute which characterizes the self-evaluation of the respondents' financial situation: cluster 9 – «the well warranted», cluster 5 – «unsecured», cluster 2 – «the poor». Therefore all these clusters – constituting almost a quarter of the respondents – each of them having an indicator “engineering staff, civil servants and middle managerial staff” as one of the centres – differ in gradation of other central indicator – prosperity. It may be assumed that exactly the income level is one of the important criteria of the regional social structure and a most significant factor of formation and development of the population's social capital.

The presence of retirees (not the village dwellers) as the centre of the three extracted clusters should not be ignored: cluster 1 (5,3 % of the respondents) + cluster 6 (3,5 %) = cluster 7 (5,8 %) = 14,6 %. Apparently, the representatives of this social group play an important part in functioning of the system of social interactions in the regional population structure, therefore, in shaping and development of their social capital which looks at least strange at first sight. However, the following should be taken into account: many city retirees in reality are actively involved in business or have a steady income

from other earlier established sources. Besides, one should not underestimate the fact that the significant part of the retirees keep on working and render financial, organizational or other assistance to their children, in particularly in upbringing of their grandchildren. They, they perform a traditionally important role in shaping and realization of the region population's social capital.

In the capacity of a positive fact, the absence of lumpenized layers in Krasnoyarsk region's social structure as centres of the formed clusters should be noted. Similarly, law-enforcement bodies which in some regions of the country, especially in the capital, have an important role in shaping and functioning of the social-distributive system are not shown up.

Let's examine socio-professional characteristics of the extracted clusters.

Cluster 1

12,5 % – other;

26,9 % – I do not work, I do not study;

45,7 % – retirees (not village-dwellers);

27,3 % – other village-dwellers, including retirees.

Cluster 2

48,2 % – workers in industry, transport, communications;

42,0 % – engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff;

1,8 % – executives of government enterprises and joint-stock companies;

8,0 % – entrepreneurs.

Cluster 3

31,2 % – accountants, economists, bank clerks;

10,2 % – doctors;

50,7 % – teachers, workers in culture sphere;

7,9 % – lawyers.

Cluster 4

5,3 % – workers of service sector;

5,3 % – armed-forces personnel, personnel of law-enforcement bodies;

86,7 % – students, schoolchildren;

2,7 % – executives in agriculture, village intelligentsia.

Cluster 5

62,3 % – workers in industry, transport, communications;

24,6 % – engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff;

9,8 % – entrepreneurs;

3,3 % – accountants, economists, bank clerks.

Cluster 6

10,3 % – other;

15,4 % – I do not work, I do not study, I am not a retiree;

46,2 % – retirees (not village-dwellers);

23,1 % – other village-dwellers, including retirees;

5,0 % – executives in agriculture, village intelligentsia.

Cluster 7

4,6 % – other;

20,0 % – I do not work, I do not study, I am not a retiree;

49,2 % – retirees (not village-dwellers);

23,1 % – other village-dwellers, including retirees;

3,1 % – executives in agriculture, village intelligentsia.

Cluster 8

14,5 % – Housing Services and Utilities workers;

22,4 % – commercial workers;

28,9 % – workers of service sector;

5,3 % – armed-forces personnel, personnel of law-enforcement bodies;

28,9 % – students, schoolchildren.

Cluster 9

25,3 % – workers in industry, transport, communications;

57,4 % – engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff;

4,9 % – executives of government enterprises and joint-stock companies;

12,4 % – entrepreneurs.

Cluster 10

0,8 % – lawyers;

17,4 % – Housing Services and Utilities workers.

30,5 % – commercial workers;

46,3 % – workers of service sector;

5,0 % – armed-forces personnel, workers of law-enforcement bodies.

According to the given data, seven out of ten extracted clusters include engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff, armed-forces personnel, workers of law-enforcement bodies, lawyers, accountants, economists, bank clerks. However, the centres of the three clusters, as it was already mentioned, are engineering staff, civil servants, and middle managerial staff. These clusters differ in the financial situation of the included respondents. Armed-forces personnel and workers of law-enforcement bodies were not extracted as the centres of the revealed clusters. It may be assumed that they do not play the main role in the regional social structure.

Conclusion

On the basis of the conducted research in terms of affiliation of the respondents to a certain socio-economic stratum the current social structure of Krasnoyarsk region may be represented as a three-layered pyramid. The wider lowest layer consists of clusters with the “security” centres which include exactly the two thirds of the respondents. The upper layer including a little over one fifth of the respondents comprise clusters of “the poor”. A thin layer of “the unsecured” including approximately one of ten respondents is located between the upper and lowest layers. Therefore, the “well-warranted”

constitute the “foundation” of the conditional pyramid of the social population structure of Krasnoyarsk region. Consequently, the level of material well-being is an important factor in shaping of the region’s social structure. Moreover, we can talk about an acceptable level of living in the region under current socio-economic conditions.

An important role in shaping of the regional social structure is given to education of the respondents. More precisely, the attribute “incomplete higher education”: it is central in six out of ten extracted clusters. Consequently, the system of higher education in the Siberian region is not among the leading factors of vertical social mobility.

In general, three clusters centred the attribute “engineering staff, civil servants, middle managerial staff” comprise about 40% of the Krasnoyarsk region’s respondents. These clusters differ in the central attribute which expresses the self-evaluation of the respondents’ material

well-being: cluster 9th – «the well-warranted», 5th – «the unsecured», 2nd – «the poor». That’s why it is possible to say that the level of income is one of the important criteria of the region’s social structure and a fairly significant factor in shaping and development of the population’s social capital.

Thus, the social structure of Krasnoyarsk region which may be identified by sociological methods is basically defined by belonging to the management sphere (first of all, state management), status of a retiree, up to some extent – level of material well-being in its “median” indicators: “the poor”, “the unsecured”, “the well-warranted”. Social polar groups extracted by level of material well-being (“the poor”, “the well-warranted” and “the rich”) are outside the dominant social context. They are distributed within the clusters of different socio-professional groups or strata. This indicates the prevalence of some “median” (according to T.I. Zaslavskaya’s term) socio-economic stratum.

¹ The survey was conducted by financial support of Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation, project № 10-03-00001a.

References

- Belyaeva L.A. Problems and opportunities of multivariate analysis of social stratification in Russian society // *Regions in Russia: socio-cultural portraits of regions in Russian context* / composed and edited by N.I. Lapin and L.A. Belyaeva. – Moscow, 2009. – P. 57.
- Zaslavskaya T.I. Sociostructural aspect of transformation of the Russian society // *Sociological Research*. – Moscow, 2001. – № 8. – P. 3-11.
- Ilyin V.I. State and social stratification of Soviet and post-Soviet societies. 1917 – 1996. – Syktykvar, 1996;
- Lapin N.I. Socio-cultural approach to studies of evolution of Russia and its regions // *Regions in Russia: socio-cultural portraits of regions in Russian context*. – Moscow, 2009. – P. 15-40.
- Modernization of social structure of Russian society / ed. by Z.T. Golenkova. – Moscow, 2008. – P. 10-11.
- Nemirovskiy V.G., Nemirovskaya A.V. Krasnoyarsk region’s socio-cultural portrait. – Krasnoyarsk, 2010. – P. 166-171.
- Radaev V.V., Shkaratan O.I. Social stratification. – Moscow, 1996;
- Tikhonova N.E. Factors of market stratification under conditions of transition to the market economy. – Moscow, 1999;

Shkaratan O.I., et al. Socio-economic inequality and its reproduction in modern Russia. – Moscow, 2009. – P. 18 – 19.

Yadov V.A. Modern theoretical sociology as a conceptual studying base of Russian transformations. – Saint-Petersburg, 2006. – P. 39-40.

Особенности социальной структуры Красноярского края

А.В. Немировская

*Сибирский федеральный университет
Россия 660041, Красноярск, пр. Свободный, 79*

В статье представлены особенности социальной структуры Красноярского края на основе эмпирического исследования в регионе в 2011 г. С помощью кластерного анализа социальная структура региона представлена системой из десяти социальных кластеров, выделенных на основании самооценки респондентом его социально-экономического слоя, принадлежности к социально-профессиональной структуре и уровня образования. Детально рассмотрены профессиональные характеристики выделенных кластеров и роль образования в формировании социальной структуры региона.

Ключевые слова: социальная структура, социальный слой, социально-профессиональная структура, кластерный анализ, Красноярский край.

Исследование выполнено при финансовой поддержке РГНФ в рамках научно-исследовательского проекта РГНФ «Особенности формирования социальной структуры и развития социального капитала в Красноярском крае», проект № 11-03-00250а.
