INTRODUCTION

The life activity of urbanized communities (potentially including all the urban citizens but in reality - only those who at least from time to time voluntarily take part in solving urban problems, therefore, acquired the status of subject) in the modern, extremely unstable reality, is characterized by a contradictory interaction of two tendencies that are often defined as social conjunction and social disjunction. Russian researcher O.A. Karmadonov considers social conjunction as "a process that is ultimately focused on social reproduction, based on consistent solidarity, provided with full-fledged flows of social consolidation in all levels and structural elements of society" (KARMADONOV, 2015, p. 11). While the disjunction, according to O.A. Karmadonov, is a process of "disorder, mismatch and disintegration of integration means, accompanied by a weakening of consolidation flows and problematization of the main goal of integration, i.e. social reproduction of society" (KARMADONOV, 2015, p. 11).

The concepts of "social conjunction" and "social disjunction" in this interpretation are close to "social integration" and "social disintegration". The difference between them, if any, is subtle. In our opinion, the use of the first pair of concepts instead of the second is due to two reasons. First, a well-grounded understanding that the term "conjunction" (from the Latin 'conjunction' - union, connection) is more neutral, if only because it was used much less often than "integration" in socio-political discourse and carries less opportunistic meaning. Secondly, the no less justified desire of some researchers is to find new formulas to explain social processes.

The empirically noted signs of conjunction and disjunction are mutually exclusive processes of consolidation and autonomization. At the same time, consolidation is understood to mean a purposefully organized and regulated process of strengthening interpersonal and intergroup ties in the urban community, achieving mutual understanding regarding the solution of common problems for the city on the basis of dialogue and cooperation. Autonomization is the deliberate exclusion of an individual or group from the discussion of urban problems and making solutions thereto, associated with a demonstration of disloyalty to the local community.

In contrast to the collapse of the urban community that will inevitably become a logical consequence of autonomization, consolidation leads to the establishment of solidarity as a principle of its life. O.A. Karmadonov and M.K. Zverev emphasize that "consolidation is used to characterize the process aspects of social integration, while solidarity is used to determine the achieved state or the result of such processes" (KARMADONOV, ZVEREV, 2012, p. 120). At the same time, we understand solidarity as a principle of relationships between people, based on readiness for mutual understanding, trust, participation in dialogue on an extremely wide range of problems and responsibility for their solution.

Thus, the differences between conjunction and disjunction, on the one hand, and consolidation and autonomization, on the other, are that the first pair determines the trends in an urbanized environment, whether as a result of or irrespective of the conscious activity of people; the second pair characterizes only the conscious activity of the urban space actors.

The discrepancy between "conjunction" and "consolidation" in relation to the urban space is also manifested in the fact that the former characterizes the integration process in relation to the entire urban community, focusing on its subordination to the solution of the problem of reproduction. Consolidation can be carried out within separate groups. Some of them can...
solve corporate, destructive tasks in relation to the city. A consolidated criminal community, in particular, does not contribute to the reproduction of an urbanized society.

It is quite obvious that the vast majority of citizens, with the exception of those who are usually guided by destructive, antisystemic attitudes, prefer consolidation and integration for the development of urban spaces (in comparison with disintegration and autonomization). This is quite typical of human nature, expressed in the readiness to identify themselves with a social group, a community (and any modern city can be considered as such a community, despite the fact that megacities have “community” as blurred as possible, and the actual connections between the majority of fellow citizens are mostly mediated and impersonal) and, if necessary, protect their interests. The famous anthropologist P. Boyer states that “people are so inclined to grouping that even the smallest reasons seem to lead to collective solidarity and intergroup conflicts. A striking aspect of “communality” is the contrast between the often weak connection of group members, their actual relations and a strong desire to defend their group and attack competitors” (BOYER, 2019, p. 54).

Substantiating the idea that the social solidarity underlying consolidation is a meta-institute, i.e. an institute that emerges as a response to the satisfaction of the need for the reproduction of society, Irkutsk researcher G.D. Kovrigina notes that “a meta-institute emerges due to biological factors associated with the need for survival and receives motivational and psychological support in the form of a negative emotional state that requires its resolution. Any meta-institute, on the one hand, is specialized in its respective field, on the other, it is interconnected with other meta-institutes, cumulatively ensuring the possibility of the emergence and functioning of a community” (KOVRIGINA, 2020, p. 19).

Thus, the social conjunction in its typical form of consolidation and integration of urban communities has extremely deep prerequisites, consisting in the very foundations of the functioning of a person and society.

However, the development of modern cities caused additional factors to emerge that actualize the problem of social conjunction. They are associated with the intensification of the process of formation and functioning of territorial complex sociobiotechnical hybrid systems. This allowed O.N. Ianitskii to conclude that “the planet is rapidly transforming into a set of sociobiotechnical systems of various scales” (IANITSKII, 2018, p. 9).

According to the author, a modern city is an example of such a system where technical, technological, ecological, and social spheres form integrity and, which is usual for any system, new qualities alien to its individual elements. O.N. Ianitskii wrote that “the modern city is a networked metabolic organism. It is literally “suspended” on the networks supplying it with external power and resources. The person who created and lives in the city not only conflicts or negotiates, unites or differentiates. The city is a multilateral space, not limited by territory, as well as by the movement of people, information or goods. It permanently transforms matter, energy, waste, etc., which together change the city and the forms of the social organization of its life” (IANITSKII, 2013, p. 22).

The formation of an urban metabolic system should stimulate conjunctive (and, correspondingly, consolidation) processes in the urban community. However, this assumption raises the question: which areas of the urbanized environment concentrate the most significant conjunctive-consolidation potential, which is expressed, ultimately, in the acquisition by the townspeople of the ability and readiness for mutual loyalty and constructive interaction.

So far, the unique experience for Russia in the development and implementation of the Regional Solidarity Society Formation Strategy for 2011–2025 (STRATEGY, 2011) has shown to be hardly used in the socio-economic and political-administrative spheres. In the socio-economic sphere, this is hindered by the high level of social differentiation and inequality. In particular, during the public discussion of the draft Strategy, doubts were repeatedly expressed about the possibility of consolidating citizens of strata that differ significantly in their financial status and sources of income. It is noteworthy that the source of doubts was not so much the fact of socio-economic differentiation as a more or less clearly formulated and not always rationally reasoned idea of its injustice. At the same time, justice was considered as one of the most important (fundamental) prerequisites for the establishment of relations of mutual loyalty and constructive interpersonal and intergroup interaction.
In fact, this case confirmed P. Boyer’s conclusion that “the concept of justice, partly based on the ideas of John Locke,” is based on “intuitive ideas” (BOYER, 2019, p. 247). It is obvious that until the formed socio-economic system is not adequate to these ideas (which is now unlikely), the consolidation of local communities, despite its objective demand, has minimal prospects.

The formation of the conjunctive-consolidation potential is difficult for the political and administrative sphere, which is self-organizing on the basis of the principle of competition between the ruling elites. Undoubtedly, their most far-sighted representatives, as a rule, publicly recognize the importance of consolidation for the reproduction of society.

O.V. Zakharova, having analyzed the annual messages of the President of the Russian Federation to the Federal Assembly, showed that he repeatedly addressed the problem of consolidating society (ZAKHAROVA, 2016).

E.S. Savchenko, Governor of the Belgorod region, has been actively promoting this idea. In 2009, he said that “the market, competitive model of economic relations is being replaced by a new one, which must have a fair, moral content and which will have not only the goal of making a profit, but also the mission of the welfare of the employee, the group of employees, territory, and nature. And an active, cohesive, purposeful, solidary society is the only one who can accelerate the switch to a new model” (SAVCHENKO, 2010). However, in most cases, political actors treat the consolidation slogan as a tool for pursuing group interests. In addition, the distrust clearly expressed by most of the population in the politicians makes it difficult to count on broad and, most importantly, real support for the consolidation rhetoric.

Considering these reasons, we believe the cultural sphere to have the most significant opportunities for the formation and growth of the conjunctive-consolidation potential in a modern city, which is due to a number of its inherent features.

First, the sphere of culture, like any other sphere, has its patterns of behavior being formed. However, in the cultural system, they have a special meaning. As T. Parsons emphasized, “cultural patterns are the center of the organization of the entire set of subsystems in the system of action. The leading role of this center distinguishes the cultural system from the social and personal systems, as well as from the behavioral organism” (PARSONS, 2002, p. 698). Due to this circumstance, conjunctively oriented action patterns proposed in the sphere of culture potentially have a powerful mobilizing effect and can act as an attractor in the development of urbanized systems.

Secondly, culture is initially focused on communication, as the latter “is the source and carrier of both the creation and the preservation of culture” (PARSONS, 2002, p. 732). But it is communication that underlies the social conjunction, and improving the communication quality, including through the multiplication of cultural samples, increases the potential of the second.

Thirdly, culture literally "permeates" all spheres of public life, and, as T. Parsons concludes, "social systems depend on cultural ones that are partially institutionalized in them..." (PARSONS, 2002, p. 737). This makes cultural examples universal and thus contributes at least to their learning.

Of course, the cultural sphere has the processes that create barriers to the formation and build-up of conjunctive-consolidation potential. They are associated with the specifics of the functioning of culture in an urbanized environment, the most essential characteristic of which is a high level of mutual alienation, leading to a decrease in the efficiency of communications. G. Simmel pointed to this feature of urban life, noting that the basis of urban life “is not only indifference but also, much more often than we realize it, some disgust, mutual alienation and remoteness, which at the first closer contact immediately turn into hatred and struggle” (SIMMEL, 2002).

Both disunity and alienation significantly reduce the conjunctive effect of cultural practices, prompting people to plan and implement them regardless of the tasks of reproducing the urban community, with an exclusive focus on themselves and the immediate environment. As a result, a model of an autonomous personality in the cultural space forms, with clear hedonistic priorities almost exclusively focused on the consumption of mass culture products. The
adoption and spread of this model is facilitated by the transformation of large cities into a kind of factories of “ impersonal spirit”, in which, according to G. Simmel, “the life of an individual is composed more and more of such impersonal content and material that seek to suppress specifically personal coloring and originality; so, to save this personal, the greatest uniqueness and peculiarity are needed. They must even be exaggerated to be heard. The atrophy of individual culture, as a result of objective hypertrophy, is the cause of the terrible hatred the preachers of extreme individualism, mainly Nietzsche, felt toward the big city; this was also the reason why the latter are so welcomed in big cities and treated by an urban citizen as the messengers and liberators of his unsatisfied grief” (SIMMEL, 2002).

A “deindividualized” and unified culture would seem to open up opportunities for interpersonal communication and thus create the basis for conjunction. However, the joint consumption of mass culture products does not mean the integration of the participants in this process, as it does not imply the aggregation of their interests.

The disjunctive vector of development of the urban community is also supported by the accompaniment of the cultural process in an urbanized environment by the mass production of “cultural waste”. According to O.N. Ianitski, it is a completely natural consequence of the metabolic development of sociobiotecnical systems, which operating cycle fits into four successive stages: accumulation of “substances”, their transformation during decomposition and simultaneous formation and consumption of complex “substances”; release of waste into the environment; and their subsequent transformation (IANITSKII, 2013, p. 21).

In this context, the definition of “cultural waste” does not have an initially negative connotation. P. Boyer uses the concept of “garbage culture” as a scientifically quite correct formula (BOYER, 2019, p. 88-90).

J. Baudrillard treats it differently, calling it socially toxic waste of human activity: “So, our culture has turned into the waste producer. If other cultures, as a result of a simple exchange cycle, used to produce a certain surplus and gave rise to a culture of surplus (in the form of an unwanted and cursed child), then our culture produces a huge amount of waste that has turned into real exchange value. People become the dregs of their own dregs, which is the characteristic feature of a society indifferent to its values, a society that pushes itself towards indifference and hatred. Our megacities, our cosmopolitan cities are a kind of pimples, delaying the emergence of larger abscesses” (BAUDRILLARD, 1997).

Despite the subjectivity of the philosopher’s position, and since we consider it possible to include not only destructive products but also products of cultural activity that are simply not in demand in a particular situation, into the composition of “cultural waste”, it is quite true that urban culture is characterized by both conjunctive and disjunctive quality. The relationship between them changes in the specific conditions of the implementation of cultural practices. The set of these conditions can be defined as a dynamically developing urban (urbanized) social reality. At present, it is a complexly structured, "multi-layered" phenomenon. Its layers are:

- intersubjective reality - the phenomena of the inner spiritual life of a person, which are often no less authentic and significant for him than external phenomena and processes;
- virtual reality, which is a sensually perceived computer-generated three-dimensional environment;
- physical or "true" reality, which is "the whole set of objects and events as objects of everyday consciousness of people" (SCHUTZ, 1994, p. 485);
- augmented reality, which is intermediate between physical and virtual. This is a hybrid reality, in which, due to the widespread introduction of gadgets and technologies, according to a fairly accurate definition of V. Budanov, chief researcher of the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, “technological pockets of reality” are created (ANTHROPOLOGICAL TRANSITION, 2021, p. 8), mediating both a person's vision of the surrounding world and self-perception. Augmented reality does not take the subject into the world of virtual simulacra yet but already significantly changes the assessment criteria for reality, as well as self-assessment. Thus, the world
perceived through a smartphone is no longer an exact copy of the world perceived by traditional senses.

The characteristics of augmented social reality that influence interpersonal and intergroup interaction, in our opinion, are:

- technical and technological saturation and, in some cases, redundancy;
- a combination of the availability of communicants with the mediation of interaction;
- the emergence of new technical and technological dependencies of social actors;
- a high level of information transparency;
- a combination of simulative communication practices with traditional ones.

"Gadgetized" and technologized cultural processes acquire characteristics in additional reality rarely inherent in traditional cultural activities. Moreover, gadgets and technologies literally require its subjects to modify their usual practices, to search for new forms that are adequate (or seem to be adequate) to the changing socio-cultural environment.

**METHODS**

We tried to assess some of the ongoing changes in urban culture due to augmented reality during the sociological research "Sociocultural Consequences of the Formation of Urbanized Sociobiotechnical Systems". It was carried out in the cities of the Belgorod region in January 2020 and included:

- a questionnaire survey of the urban population using the quota sampling method (500 residents of 3 cities of the Belgorod region, the main parameters of the quota: sex (male - 46.2%, female - 53.8%); age (18-24 years old - 5.8%; 25-39 years old - 29.4%; 40-59 years old - 32.8%; 60 years old and older - 32%); place of residence (Belgorod - 78.6%, Gubkin - 17.4%, Novy Oskol - 4%). Statistical error was to be no more than 2%;
- an expert survey (30 experts, which included scientific and pedagogical workers of universities of Belgorod, Kursk, Orel, Kostroma, Moscow; inclusion criteria: minimum research experience in cultural sociology - 10 years; scientific publications on the problems of sociology of culture and sociology of the city);
- three focus group study following a previously prepared scenario (guide). The first participants were urban youth aged 18-29; the second were mass media workers, who publish materials on cultural issues; the third were employees of cultural institutions. The total number of participants is 31 people, the age range is 20-58 years old, the sex composition is 25 women and 6 men.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The study showed no stable representation of the positive and negative characteristics of urban culture among the respondents (participants in the mass survey). The first group most often referred to accessibility (31.8% of respondents), orientation towards the interests of an “ordinary” person (28.6%) and a variety of forms (27.8%). Among the negative ones are the commercialization of culture (27%), a low aesthetic level (25.4%), the dominance of pop music (23.4%) (Fig. 1a, b).
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Fig. 1a: Distribution of answers of urban citizens to the question: “What do you like most in modern urban culture?” (choose max. 3 answer options)
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Source: Search data.

Fig. 1b: Distribution of answers of urban citizens to the question: “What do you dislike most in modern urban culture?”
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Source: Search data.

A significant part of the interviewed experts quite clearly records the processes associated with the technologization and hybridization of culture. 40% of respondents noted the massive use of information technology and gadgets as the most noticeable changes in this area, and 23.3% - the formation of hybrid areas of culture (Fig. 2).
At the same time, focus group participants predicted further intensification of this process (“development towards informatization, digitalization” - Aleksandr, student, 20 years old). Participants of the mass survey did not come to a common opinion in assessing the impact of information technology and gadgets on the cultural process. 36.6% said the gadgets made the culture more in demand, 43.4% adhere to the opposite point of view. The most optimistic were young people: 51.7% associated the growth in demand for culture with the use of technical means (Fig. 3).

**Fig. 2.** Distribution of experts' answers to the question: “How do qualitative changes, if any, in urban culture manifest themselves?” (choose max. 2 answer options)

| Option                                                                 | Percentage |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Commercialization of culture                                           | 20.0%      |
| Blurring of the norms of cultural activity                             | 13.3%      |
| "Hybrid" (at the interface of culture and other...)                    | 23.3%      |
| Culture is pushed aside to the periphery of public life                | 3.3%       |
| The cultural process is implemented through the...                     | 40.0%      |
| Cultural activities are increasingly taking on a...                    | 36.7%      |
| Massification of culture                                               | 16.7%      |
| Cultural practices are increasingly becoming virtual                   | 26.7%      |
| Social dynamics of culture increases                                   | 3.3%       |
| New subcultures emerge                                                 | 23.3%      |
| The gap between mass and elite culture is growing                      | 10.0%      |

**Source:** Search data.

The respondents who admit the positive influence of technical means and technologies on the cultural process in the city (almost half of them - 48.2%), associated this mainly with an increase
in the availability of cultural values (66.8%), providing an opportunity to directly discuss and evaluate the results of cultural activities (34.0%), the emergence of new types of art based on information technology (34.0%) (Fig. 4).

**Fig. 4.** Distribution of answers of urban residents to the question: “In your opinion, what are positive consequences of the use of information technologies and gadgets in culture?”

| Positive Consequence                                                                 | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Cultural values become more accessible                                              | 66.8%      |
| Opportunity for discussing and evaluating directly the results of cultural activities | 34.0%      |
| New forms of IT-based art are emerging                                              | 34.0%      |
| The quality of culture and art “products” is improving                               | 15.8%      |
| Difficult to answer                                                                  | 2.9%       |

**Source:** Search data.

The share of respondents who negatively assess the impact of technical means and technologies on the cultural process in the city was almost equal to those who gave positive assessment (44.0%). The main argument was the fact that technologization leads to the growing volumes of low-quality and unreliable information - “cultural waste” (58.2%). The following negative consequences were also referred to: degradation of traditional forms of creation and consumption of cultural values (33.6%); transformation of culture into a commodity (30.5%). Approximately one of four pointed to the spread of “piracy” that infringes on copyright, as well as difficulties in adapting to information technology for some categories of citizens (Fig. 5).

**Fig. 5.** Distribution of answers of urban residents to the question: “In your opinion, what are negative consequences for the culture of mass use of information technologies and gadgets?”

| Negative Consequence                                                                 | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Difficult to answer                                                                  | 0.9%       |
| Culture is turning into commodity                                                    | 30.5%      |
| Copyright infringing “piracy” is spreading                                           | 23.6%      |
| Certain categories of citizens have difficulties in adaptation to information technologies | 23.6%      |
| Traditional forms of creation and consumption of cultural values is taking place are degrading | 33.6%      |
| Volumes of low-quality and inaccurate information and cultural “waste” are growing | 58.2%      |

**Source:** Search data.

Participants of focus groups were also asked to evaluate the way the modern information and digital technologies and gadgets change the cultural process in the city; they also often had opposite opinions. Among the positive trends, in particular, were the activation of the cultural process, the facilitation of obtaining information about cultural events, an increase in the coverage and attractiveness of certain events. Negative were the devaluation of communication. “The main disadvantage is that we are moving into the virtual world, with less live communication. We express our opinion in the comments on social networks. In real life, people become more closed, with fewer friends” (Diana, student, 20 years old).
At the same time, the majority of the media representatives participating in the focus group interviews agreed with the opinion that “the use of gadgets and digital technologies make this process more widespread, more accessible but more individual” (Nikita, media worker, 27 years old). Many participants took a compromise position, believing that new technologies complement rather than replace traditional cultural products. The following opinions have become quite typical: “It seems to me this is a stereotype that because of social networks, we now have less personal communication. It’s just that people have such a huge number of very diverse means of communication, which are not necessarily worse than reality” (Olga, media worker, 25 years old); “Provincial population has a very great need to see and be seen, plus communication, of course” (Tatiana, media worker, 30 years old); “Many people have a very great need to be “in the mix”, which is also a necessity, a social interaction. Even if we digitize everything as much as possible, people will not stop visiting real events, as there is still a need for live communication” (Anastasia, media worker, 32 years old).

An indicative fact was that during a focus group interview, which was conducted after the cancellation of coronavirus-related restrictive measures, cultural workers mainly noted only positive aspects of introducing modern technologies and gadgets into the cultural process: “During the pandemic, new technologies made it possible to make online concerts, virtual tours” (Svetlana, 35 years old, cultural worker); “They make it easier to inform the potential audience about upcoming cultural events, introduce the public to the content of the events, and buy tickets to cultural events online” (Natalya, cultural worker, 42 years old); “There is an integration of information technologies into public life, when the main public places and their work are automated, which improves the quality of life of citizens, optimizes the urban environment” (Viktoria, cultural worker, 34 years old).

The majority of participants believed that culture in a modern city is becoming more accessible, especially emphasizing the ability of online technologies during the quarantine period to meet the cultural needs of the population. At the same time, the accessibility of culture, according to focus group participants, does not automatically make it more in demand. In particular, they emphasized that culture remains in demand in its “living”, non-mediated form:

“No matter how much you promote it online, it will be only an ersatz, a surrogate. A person comes to a performance, a concert, an exhibition hall to get lively emotions, to experience a meeting with a work of art at spot. No broadcast, even the highest quality one, can give these emotions, especially when it comes to a play or a concert, where everyone feels the breath of their neighbor in the auditorium, feels the energy of the performers” (Natalia, cultural worker, 42 years old);

“The introduction of information technologies in all spheres of life, including culture, has made lots of things more accessible. How could an on-line excursion be an alternative to visiting a museum and viewing masterpieces of artists? Or skimming scientific papers on the Internet instead of their reading in a library, even if they are open and accessible? For an educated and developing person, cultural institutions will always be in demand” (Viktoria, cultural worker, 34 years old).

During the study, the experts were asked to express their attitude to the problem of “cultural waste”. 73.3% of them recognized it urgent and admitted it possible to use this concept in relation to some products of cultural activity in the city. At the same time, only 36.7% noted that at present there are more or less clear criteria that make it possible to distinguish it in the composition of urban culture. Experts suggested as such criteria: low aesthetic content of products (63.6%), destructive impact on society (45.5%), and inability to ensure the reproduction and development of personality (45.5%) (Fig. 6). Consequently, they define the phenomenon of “waste” quite similar to J. Baudrillard.
Fig. 6. Distribution of answers of urban citizens to the question: "What criteria can be used to separate urban culture from "cultural waste"? (choose max. two answer options)

- **Difficult to answer**: 9.1%
- **Destructive impact on society**: 45.5%
- **Failure to ensure the reproduction and development of personality**: 45.5%
- **Low aesthetic content**: 18.2%
- **Lack of demand by most of the urban community**: 63.6%

Source: Search data.

Participants of the focus group shared the same opinion. The following assessment was quite typical here: “If we consider culture as something good, then it should bring this good. If it is destructive, it is cultural rubbish, a dubious culture” (Aleksandr, student, 20 years old).

**CONCLUSION**

The obtained data allow us to state as follows:

- at present, at least medium and small towns show dynamic equilibrium between conjunctive and disjunctive trends in the development of urban culture;
- implementing their cultural needs in augmented reality, urban citizens quite clearly imagine both the arising opportunities, associated mainly with the expansion of the communicative environment, and the limitations that lie in the individualization of cultural practices and their increasingly mediated nature;
- technologization and "gadgetization" can both increase the conjunctive-consolidation potential of urban culture and enhance disjunctive trends; at the same time, the choice of the trajectory of development depends on the dispositions of the subjects, who in many cases have not defined their preferences;
- uncertainty was especially evident in relation to the qualification of the phenomenon of "cultural waste", which is recognized as an indisputable fact, while its related phenomena have no clear identification.
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Cultura urbana em realidade social aumentada: conjunção versus disjunção

Resumo
O objetivo é avaliar o papel da cultura urbana na formação e crescimento do potencial de consolidação conjuntiva de uma cidade moderna no contexto da realidade social aumentada. A base do artigo foi um estudo sociológico realizado pelos autores em 2020 em três cidades da região de Belgorod (Belgorod, Gubkin, Novy Oskol), que incluiu: a) um inquérito por questionário à população urbana (N = 500) com base em uma cota (por sexo e idade), amostragem zoneada e multistágios; b) pesquisa de especialistas (N = 30 especialistas); e) três grupos focais (jovens urbanos, funcionários de instituições culturais e profissionais da mídia). Com base no estudo, os autores revelaram um equilíbrio dinâmico entre tendências conjuntivas e disjuntivas no desenvolvimento da cultura urbana. A esfera da cultura urbana tem oportunidades significativas para a formação e construção do potencial de consolidação conjuntiva, que se expressa na aquisição da capacidade e prontidão dos cidadãos urbanos para a lealdade mútua e interação construtiva.

Palavras-chave: Conjunção social. Disjunção social. Consolidação social. Cultura urbana. Comunidade urbanizada.

Abstract
The objective is to assess the role of urban culture in the formation and growth of the conjunctive-consolidation potential in a modern city in the context of augmented social reality. The basis for the article was a sociological study conducted by the authors in 2020 in three cities of the Belgorod region (Belgo-rod, Gubkin, Novy Oskol), which included: a) a questionnaire survey of the urban population (N=500) based on a quota (by sex and age), zoned and multistage sampling; b) expert survey (N=30 experts); and c) three focus groups (urban youth, employees of cultural institutions, and media workers). Based on the study, the authors revealed dynamic equilibrium between conjunctive and disjunctive trends in the development of urban culture. The sphere of urban culture has significant opportunities for the formation and build-up of conjunctive-consolidation potential, which is expressed in the acquisition of urban citizens’ ability and readiness for mutual loyalty and constructive interaction.
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Resumen
El objetivo es evaluar el papel de la cultura urbana en la formación y crecimiento del potencial de consolidación conjuntiva en una ciudad moderna en el contexto de la realidad social aumentada. La base del artículo fue un estudio sociológico realizado por los autores en 2020 en tres ciudades de la región de Belgorod (Belgorod, Gubkin, Novy Oskol), que incluyó: a) un cuestionario de encuesta de la población urbana (N = 500) basado en una cuota (por sexo y edad), muestreo por zonas y por etapas; b) encuesta de expertos (N = 30 expertos); y) tres grupos focales (jóvenes urbanos, empleados de instituciones culturales y trabajadores de los medios de comunicación). Con base en el estudio, los autores revelaron un equilibrio dinámico entre las tendencias conjuntivas y disyuntivas en el desarrollo de la cultura urbana. El ámbito de la cultura urbana ofrece importantes oportunidades para la formación y el desarrollo de un potencial de consolidación conjuntiva, que se expresa en la adquisición de la capacidad y disposición de los ciudadanos urbanos para la lealtad mutua y la interacción constructiva.

Palabras-clave: Conjunción social. Disyunción social. Consolidación social. Cultura urbana. Comunidad urbanizada.