The research of values of Krasnoyarsk university students and students of Branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts in Zhukovsky in the model of “progressive” and “static culture” was conducted. It was found out that all the values of “progressive culture”, except the values of decentralization of power and horizontality of contacts are relevant for most students. The analysis of the results obtained for each value is represented. Regional differences in students’ values, depending on geographical position of their residence and education are detected. Chances for successful modernization in Russia are evaluated.
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Introduction

The processes of globalization that take place in the world intensify the problems of competition between regions and separate countries. For many countries of the world acceleration of globalization becomes the pressing issue. In this regard, the question of readiness for various population groups in the modernizing countries positively participate in its processes and perceive the goals and objectives of modernization of their country with hope and faith in success, becomes very relevant. These general provisions are also true for Russia, which has made strenuous efforts in this direction. The key problem in these processes is the speed and willingness of different population groups to adapt to new, often rapidly changing conditions of life and professional activities. The process of people’s adaptation to the new conditions can be considered as the process of changing
a large number of values in various population groups and accepting the new set of “useful” values to renew the lifestyle in a short period of time, for vision of the future and achievement of the desired goals in a sufficiently foreseeable future.

Discussion of the nature and possible speed of modernization of Russian inhabitants’ consciousness started not a long time ago. Report on “Cultural Factors of Modernization” that first determined the priority importance of cultural values for the country modernization processes played an important role in this discussion [1]. The background of the report was Ronald Inglehart’s approach to the natural change of values in certain population groups in changing environment. From the standpoint of this approach, human values by themselves are rarities, they are always “sensible and sober” and are not constructed by ideologists, but appear naturally in response to the mass demand, to a sense of scarcity of something vital for a definite individual [2-4]. In accordance with this point of view, creation of new values happens in the period of early adulthood (from 18 to 25 years), i.e. while studying at the university [5].

In this connection the study of the value system formation processes in different groups of Russian students is of considerable interest. The paper carries out a comparative study of the views of humanist students in the universities of Krasnoyarsk and Zhukovsky branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts that are geographically located at a considerable distance from each other. The results of Krasnoyarsk humanist students opinion poll studies were previously published in the extended version in [6, 7].

Focus groups

The survey was carried out in 2011. Undergraduate humanist students and postgraduate students of five universities in the city of Krasnoyarsk and students of the branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts in Zhukovsky took part in the survey.

In Krasnoyarsk 401 undergraduate and postgraduate humanist students were polled. The number of postgraduate students is about 10 % of the total number of the respondents. Besides, 62 experts were polled. This figure includes university professors, prominent Krasnoyarsk journalists, non-governmental organizations’ leaders, managers and employees of state or municipal enterprises, entrepreneurs, famous scientists in the field of social studies, political scientists and engineers of the leading enterprises of the city. The average age of the experts was 42.5; the average age of the students was 21.

In Zhukovsky branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts 92 students (about 10 % of all the students of the branch) were polled. The majority of them (62 students) were female students and about a third (30 students) was male students. About 20 % of the branch lecturers were also polled: 14 lecturers, 8 of whom have doctors and candidates of sciences degrees, 6 – work for the educational institution, 2 are managers of state and municipal enterprises and 2 are employees of private enterprises. The average age of the expert group was 47. The average age of students was 24.

Survey results and their discussion

1. The need to modernize the country and project of the future.

For the key question of the discussion about the perspectives of modernization in Russia – “Is our country in need of modernization?” the majority gave positive answer: 82 % of students and 85.5 % of experts from Krasnoyarsk as well as 82.61 % of students and 100 % of experts from the branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts Zhukovsky. In total about 2 % of students
stated that Russia doesn’t need modernization. About 15 % of students were undecided. In general, the obtained result does not depend on geographical position and is essentially different from the existing public opinion concerning the same question, with the opinion that the country doesn’t need modernization.

Even larger number of Krasnoyarsk students (86 %) believes that our country needs the project of the future. Their opinion practically corresponds with the opinion of experts from Zhukovsky (85.71 %) and is considerably higher than poll numbers concerning the same question comparing with Krasnoyarsk experts (82 %) and students from Zhukovsky (78.26 %). Almost one in ten student of the branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts favours this position (10.87 %). The same number of the respondents was undecided. It is obvious that for the large number of the university students (one in five), the country modernization implementation is not directly connected with a project of the future in our country.

In general, the obtained results demonstrate that the largest number of students who took part in the survey, regardless of geographical location have explicit need for active self-realization in the national project devoted to formation of the country’s future, and, consequently, it is possible to assume that they have high readiness to accept the values of progressive development and for innovative activity.

The same result was obtained in the other student focus groups in [8].

2. Attitude towards the values of “progressive” and “static” culture

Prominent researcher of cross-cultural phenomena Lawrence E. Harrison [9] has recently came up with a list of values of the countries with “progressive and static culture” that in the last decades accomplished or didn’t accomplish successful modernization. These lists were introduced in the form of the special values matrixes that can be used in the corresponding surveys. In the study that we carried out, each respondent had to express his/her attitude towards two contrast values of one or another cultural matrix. The list of values used is given in [10]. The results obtained are represented in Tables 1. and 2. The values in the tables are ordered according to the value significance in the cultural matrix.

The examples of countries with domineering “progressive culture” values are, first of all, four “Asian tigers”: Japan, Republic of Korea, Singapore and Taiwan.

Table 2 contains the results of students and experts’ poll concerning their attitude towards the values of static culture that doesn’t contribute to modernization of the country’s culture. Mexico is a typical country with such a culture type [11].

The most contrast results in these tables are in bold type.

3. General analysis of the students’ values.

From tables 2 and 3 it is obvious that in general, most students share the values of “progressive development”, students from the branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts in a greater degree than students of Krasnoyarsk universities. Corresponding average numbers of “progressive development” values support for all the ten values among the students constitutes almost two-thirds (65.65 %), for Krasnoyarsk students this index is 61.85 %. The values of “static culture” in general are significant for one in five university students who took part in the survey. Conspicuous is the fact that Krasnoyarsk and Zhukovsky experts’ support of “progressive development” values is considerably larger (10-12 % more) than students'.

Students from both cities mostly approve positive attitude towards work, good education,
Table 1. Students and experts’ attitudes towards the “progressive culture” values (as %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire questions</th>
<th>Krasnoyarsk Students</th>
<th>Zhukovsky Students</th>
<th>Krasnoyarsk Experts</th>
<th>Zhukovsky Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future basis</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work as the main condition of achievements in life, financial standing and self-respect</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy as a way to prosperity</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69.57</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good education as a necessary condition of success in life</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>89.13</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal merits as a key factor for advancement and success</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69.57</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism as a high degree of identification of people with high solidarity with their country, nation and profession</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54.35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict ethical norms that exclude theft and bribery</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>71.74</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict law enforcement and justice</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization of power and horizontality of contacts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority of inner faith (gentilesse)</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>54.35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average numbers for 10 values</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td>65.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Students and experts’ attitudes towards the “static culture” values (as %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire questions</th>
<th>Krasnoyarsk Students</th>
<th>Zhukovsky Students</th>
<th>Krasnoyarsk Experts</th>
<th>Zhukovsky Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The search of problems or good days in the past, survival in the present</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is an annoying necessity to live</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extravagance and/or equality in poverty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education should not necessarily be good</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts, profitable connections, clanism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of oneself with the family, acquaintances, fellow-countrymen, limited readiness for altruism and charity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical norms can be not strict</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and justice are secondary, circle of friends and acquaintances and offered sum of money are primary</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized and vertical power</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong influence of religion on everyday life</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average numbers for 10 values</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strict ethical norms, “social lift” based on personal merits, strict law enforcement and justice, future basis and genteel manners. It should be noted that these very values were declared and had high degree of public recognition in the USSR. It is possible that nowadays to a certain extent their public significance is the result of previous cultural stereotypes, although to a greater extend it can be connected with the recent life experience of the respondents.

The key value for the “progressive development” matrix – future basis, has lower level of support among Krasnoyarsk students (64.9 %) than among Zhukovsky students (78.26 %). The larger number of Krasnoyarsk students than their peers in Zhukovsky (28 % in comparison with only 6.28 %) identify themselves only with bounded groups of people (family, acquaintances, fellow-countrymen), that, according to Harrison’s data, limit development of modernization processes in society. Above all, such values as “common case”, solidarity with their country and people, what is usually called patriotism, contribute to progressive development. About a half of Krasnoyarsk students (49 %) and more than a half of Zhukovsky students (54.35 %) consider this value important. Many students were undecided. On the one side it demonstrates that in public conscience of students from Krasnoyarsk and Zhukovsky success of modernization and renovation processes is not connected with this broader than it is now understanding of “patriotism”. On the other hand, the results obtained raise question about necessity of new educational modules and programmes for students [12]. Renovation of educational environment in the country can also increase importance of this high-priority for the country value.

The conducted study didn’t identify any significant orientation of students to the important role of religion as the value relevant for everyday life. Only 16 % of the respondents uphold this position, large number of the respondents (22 %, i.e. one in four polled students) was undecided. Almost two thirds of students (62 %) share the value of secular society that, in general, may contribute to modernization processes. Humanist students from Krasnoyarsk and Zhukovsky share opinions (60.4 and 54.35 % correspondingly) about the priority of inner faith (gentilesse).

According to tables 1. and 2. the only value of “positive culture” with minimal students’ support is decentralization of power. This value is relevant only for 19 % of Krasnoyarsk students and even less relevant for the students from the branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts in Zhukovsky (13.04 %). This index is much less than experts’ support of the value. More than third of the students were undecided with this question. Almost half of the students and experts consider the value of “centralized and vertical power” that, according to Harrison’s theory is one of the values of “static culture”, as a rule, preventing modernization of a country, to be the most relevant.

4. Perception of “progressive development” values and real-life practice

In general, the obtained results of the survey are encouraging, indicating that humanist students have positive values, targeting at renovation and modernization of the country. Naturally, the question to what extent the students follow these values in their real life, arises. The conducted research demonstrates that more than a half of students in Krasnoyarsk and Zhukovsky (58 and 56.52 % correspondingly) follow them always and about 40 % follow them in most cases. The result is surprising as, according to the public opinion, there is different evaluation of the
student-age population values and readiness of most students to follow positive values. Thus, the conducted research bears evidence that it is possible to apply Inglehart’s hypothesis in the Russian Federation.

The obtained results show that the number of students who accept and use “progressive development” values in their lives, regardless of geographical position, significantly exceeds well-known 20 % critical rate of active people who, according to Pareto principle[13], do 80 % of necessary work. Thus, it is possible to state that our universities provide sufficient number of youth with positive values for modernization development of our country.

This is evident from the results of the research devoted to possible chances of successful modernization in our country. 15-13 % of university students from Krasnoyarsk and the Branch of Moscow State University of Culture and Arts in Zhukovsky consequently believe that the chances are high, and there is necessary number of people for modernization in the country. More than a half of students from these universities (61.2 and 58.7 % correspondingly) believe that there are chances for successful modernization, what is necessary is to change conscience of many people. And only one in four (23-24 % correspondingly) doubt it and believe that modernization process will be quite long as there are not enough people to carry it out.

Conclusion

The conducted research of Krasnoyarsk and Zhukovsky students and experts’ opinions allowed obtaining several important results. In contrast to existing opinions about unpreparedness of the country’s population to modernization, the results obtained have different facts. It was found out that the largest number of humanist students, regardless of geographical position, share the “progressive culture” values of the countries that accomplished successful modernization and follow them in their practical activities. In general, positive values of most students contribute to their need in renovation and modernization of the country, form ideas about high chances for successful modernization of Russia and importance of public conscience modernization processes to implement these chances.
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Проведено исследование ценностных установок студентов университетов Красноярска
и студентов филиала Московского государственного университета культуры в городе
Жуковском в модели «прогрессивной» и «статической» культуры. Установлено, что для
большинства студентов значимы все ценностные установки «прогрессивной» культуры,
кроме ценности децентрализации и горизонтальности связей. Дан анализ полученных
результатов по каждой из ценностных установок. Выявлены региональные отличия
ценостных установок студентов в зависимости от географии проживания и учебы.
Представлены оценки шансов успешной модернизации в России.
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