

1 Supplementary File

- 2 **Table 1.** The criteria to assess the goodness of fit of different models searching for the optimal number of latent classes
- 3 for the representative survey "Migration and family processes: representative study" (2018)

Number of classes	L ²	df	р	BIC	AIC	Entropy
1	821.567	57	.0000	9243.180	9212.477	-
2	582.683	50	.0000	8183.455	8116.932	.816
3	126.086	42	.0000	7759.522	7637.178	.854
4	64.654	35	.0017	7748.614	7610.449	.795
5	36.199	28	.1376	7769.946	7595.961	.797

4

- 5 **Table 2.** Latent class analysis coefficients for the model with four latent classes for the representative survey "Migration
- 6 and family processes: representative study" (2018)

Solidarity dimension	Solidarity types identified					
	1	2	3	4		
	Tight-knit	Intimate, but geographically distant	Obligatory	Detached		
Associational (1 = communicate frequently)	.968	.746	.877	.186		
Emotional (1 = feel emotionally close)			.403	.082		
Consensus (1 = share similar opinions)	.917	.802	.166	.062		
Structural (1 = geographically close)	.816	.419	.804	.408		
Functional inward (1 = support received)	.785	.010	.535	.021		
Functional outward (1 = support provided)	.948	.034	.810	.048		
Share of relationships by solidarity type (in %)	30.3	39.1	12.6	18.0		



- 8 **Table 3.** The criteria to assess the goodness of fit of different models searching for the optimal number of latent classes
- 9 for the quota survey "Migration and family processes: quota study" (2018)

Number of classes	L ²	df	р	BIC	AIC	Entropy
1	103.089	155	.9996	4008.227	3982.179	-
2	263.966	49	.0000	3600.788	3543.980	.799
3	111.582	43	.0000	3490.674	3403.276	.835
4	65.268	36	.0020	3488.950	3370.963	.874
5	42.485	29	.0508	3510.757	3362.180	.873
6	22.061	22	.4563	3534.921	3555.775	.877

10

- 11 Table 4. Latent class analysis coefficients for the model with four latent classes for the quota survey "Migration and family
- 12 processes: quota study" (2018)

Solidarity dimension	Solidarity types identified					
	1	2	3	4		
	Tight-knit	Intimate, but different	Intimate, but geographically distant	Detached		
Associational (1 = communicate frequently)	.966	1.000	.868	.239		
Emotional (1 = feel emotionally close)	.966	.701	1.000	.060		
Consensus (1 = share similar opinions)	1.000	.000	.786	.102		
Structural (1 = geographically close)	.844	.945	.339	.454		
Functional (1 = support received)	.733	.749	.081	.019		
Functional (1 = support provided)	.911	.979	.147	.096		
Share of relationships by solidarity type (in %)	51.0	12.5	23.6	12.9		

13