
FEW WORDS ON THE HIGH LEVEL OF SOCIAL DISTRUST AMONG THE RUSSIAN YOUTH: CIVIL SERVANTS' SOCIAL IMAGE*

I.V. Trotsuk, E.A. Ivlev

Sociology Chair
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
Miklukho-Maklaya St., 10/2, Moscow, Russia, 117198

Based on the empirical data of the repeated surveys conducted by the Sociological Laboratory of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, the authors consider the student youth typical answers to quite simple questions on the political interest and awareness as well as on the level of social trust in the most general interpretation of the term. According to the surveys data, since 2007 we cannot identify the students' value orientations as political apathy (which is typical for the Russian media), political unawareness or electoral ignorance. Moreover, the Moscow student youth consider themselves patriots and identify as grounds for their national pride the historical past, natural resources, cultural heritage and sports achievements, though not the development of the economic and social spheres, respect for human rights and freedoms, activities of the public authorities, and general standards of living. The authors believe that such pessimistic evaluation of the situation in the country is connected (if not determined) by the low level of social trust (or high level of social distrust), especially to the public administration and the officials of all kinds in general. The authors conducted an exploratory online opinion poll to reconstruct the social image of the civil servant in the Russian public opinion to explain the low level of social trust in the society and the stable proportion of young respondents claiming that the Russian state represents and defends the interests of the rich and the civil servants. The questionnaire consisted of the questions on the obligatory ethical principles that should be guiding for all state/municipal employees, on the grounds for considering the behavior of civil servants as unethical, on the requirements to the applicants for the public administration positions, on the appropriate ways to deal with cases of unethical behavior in the public administration bodies, on the social image of the civil servant and its determinants, etc. Although the youngest group (18—24-year-olds) proved to be the most optimistic one, it also easily reconstructs the negative image of the civil servant, who does not meet the professional and ethical requirements to this social-professional group, which does not consist of the most intelligent, talented and competent people in the country, not to mention the most honest, conscientious and descent ones.

Key words: social trust; social distrust; Russian student youth; civil servants; public administration; public opinion polls; social image of the civil servant/municipal employee; ethical principles and professional competence standards; state official.

Over the past ten years, the Sociological Laboratory of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia has conducted a number of thematically differing surveys of the student youth in cooperation with our Chinese, Czech, Serbian, and Kazakhstan colleagues to reveal the dominant values orientations of the younger generations and to understand the priorities of their worldview. One of the key thematic blocks of the questionnaire applied in all countries, though in a slightly modified format due to the social, political, cultural and other specific features of every society, consisted of quite simple questions on the political interest and awareness of the student youth, and on the level of social trust. Already in 2007, we found out on the Moscow sample in 1070 students

* The research was supported by the Russian Foundation for Humanities. Grant №15-03-00573.

that 70% of the respondents were interested in the political issues in one way or another (either “always tried to be aware of political events in the country and in the world” or “could not say he/she was indifferent, however not particularly eager to be aware of everything”). Every tenth student refused to include political topics in the scope of his/her interests mainly due to the lack of free time (about every second in this group) or to the evaluation of political interest as completely senseless, perhaps, because of not being able to influence the situation or for considering politics a dirty business.

About a quarter of the respondents did not participate in the elections being quite confident that their votes could not change or even affect anything; on the contrary, every second student believed that the general situation in the country had a significant impact on the realization of his/her life plans. At the same time 51% of Moscow students considered themselves patriots, although every third experienced some difficulties with the self-identification in terms of patriotism, primarily because of the impossibility to define one’s attitude to the country with the word ‘patriotism’ (at that period it had obvious negative connotations in the Russian public discourse) or because of preferring the concept of a globalizing world, in which the notion ‘patriotism’ completely loses its meaning and relevance.

As citizens of the country, the students are proud of the historical past, natural resources, cultural heritage and sports achievements. The most often mentioned reasons for the student discontent happened to be the development of the economic and social spheres, respect for human rights and freedoms, activities of the public authorities, and general standards of living. Thus, the low level of social trust among the younger generation was predictable: only every third Moscow student trusted the government, public and international non-governmental organizations, judicial power and the media; every fourth trusted the Federation Council and the Public Chamber; every fifth — the State Duma. The absolute leader of the Moscow students rating of social trust was the President of the country (58%) followed by the church (50%), banks and large business (47% and 40%), while at the end of this rating we found political parties (the level of social trust did not exceed 14%), police and law enforcement agencies (15%) and the army (20%), i.e. the general level of confidence in the basic social institutions among the Russian student youth seemed to be low.

The figures mentioned above did not change significantly enough to worth attention or interpretation until 2013, and one possible explanation of the low level of social trust of the younger generation became obvious, when we asked the students to agree or to disagree with a number of statements describing the situation and the state of the Russian society. Two-thirds of the respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘rather agreed’ that “Russia is a country with a huge potential for the development”, but “All the troubles of Russia come from the inability of the rulers to manage the state and from their self-interests”, for the rulers strive to mindlessly copy the Western experience instead of taking into account the specific features of their own country, and do not respect the laws. Moreover, in 2014 our respondents expressed confidence that the Russian state (i.e. civil servants) represented and defended the interests of the rich (43%) and civil servants themselves (34%).

In 2015, the situation did not change significantly: still the majority of students (69%) claim to be interested in the political issues in one way or another (either “always try to be aware of political events in the country and in the world” — 26%, or “cannot say he/she is indifferent, however not particularly eager to be aware of everything” — 43%). Almost every tenth student (9%) refuses to include political topics in the scope of his/her interests mainly due to the lack of free time (about every fourth in this group) and evaluation of political interests as completely senseless (32%) or for considering politics a dirty business (26%). Still a quarter of the respondents does not participate in the elections for being quite confident that their vote cannot change anything; on the contrary, 37% believe that the general situation in the country has a significant impact on the realization of his/her life plans, while other 37% evaluate such an impact as rather insignificant.

The low level of social trust among the younger generation was again confirmed by the survey data, however, some indicators changed greatly proving the growth of social trust to some social institutions: 57% (not every third as in 2007) of Moscow student trust the government, 63% — the President of the country (58%), every second — the church, judicial power, the Federation Council, about 45% — the Public Chamber, and the State Duma, the police and law enforcement agencies (about 45% instead of 15%) and the army (45% instead 20%); about 40% (instead of every third) — public and international non-governmental organizations; a little more — the banks and large business (44% and 40% — the numbers did not change); every third — the media, and the political parties (the level of trust previously did not exceed 14%), i.e. the general level of confidence in the basic social institutions among the Russian student youth has increased over last eight years, however, is still low. The situation with the social trust improved greatly even over last two years for in 2016 the respondents expressed confidence that the Russian state (i.e. civil servants) represented and defended the interests of the rich (26% instead of 43% in 2014) and civil servants themselves (30% instead of 34%, i.e. the figure did not change).

Thus, in the light of the above data and the tendencies they seem to reveal we decided to conduct an exploratory online opinion poll to reconstruct the social image of the civil servant in the Russian public opinion and to explain the low level of social trust in the Russian society and the stable share of young respondents claiming that the Russian state represents and defends the interests of civil servants (about every third Moscow student). The number of public opinion polls that reveal different aspects of the evaluation of the civil servants work in the Russian society has increased greatly since the mid-2000 [4—6] (if we take into account regional projects that form the empirical basis of numerous PhD theses in sociology and political science). Quite often, such studies use the tools, which apparently provide predictable responses. For example, the survey can begin with the question “Are you interested in the issues of public administration?” (even if not, the social desirability would make one answer “yes”) and “How would you evaluate your awareness of the activities of bodies of state power and administration?” (to some extent the majority is aware) [9]. There are often questions that produce predictable answers (the result of the ‘social approval’ effect), such as “Do you consider the expansion of the state bodies information openness necessary?”; questions, provoking ‘average’ answers, such as “To what extent, in your opinion, civil servants possess the following qualities?” (with a list of characteristics including kind-

ness, obedience to the law, fairness, honesty, etc.); questions beyond the common man competence, such as a request “to assess the degree of public confidence in the public authorities”, etc.

Undoubtedly, most of the questions in such questionnaires are based on the developed conceptual and operational definitions of the key parameters for evaluating the public administration bodies as a social institution and civil servants as a special social-professional group, which, however, does not alter the fact that the questions mentioned above can seriously disorient respondents. That is why we decided to develop a questionnaire that partly copies or echoes the typical questions of the studies of civil servants self-assessment. To identify the perception of the Russian civil service, in October 2015 we conducted an online survey on the sample (N = 1003) representing Russian urban population by all social-demographic parameters (the survey was conducted and the sample was designed by ‘Tiburon’), and, according to the survey results, having mainly negative experience of interaction with the power — if the interests of the people and local authorities differ, usually the authorities win (85%) rather than the residents (10%) or a kind of compromise (11%); the interests of the residents and the local authorities coincide just for 2% of respondents.

The results of the survey revealed two basic groups of ethical principles which, in the Russian public, should be guiding for all state/municipal employees: the first, more frequently mentioned group consists of professional characteristics, each of which was chosen by more than 70% of respondents — professional competence, honesty and impartiality, decency, responsibility for one’s work and law abidance; the second group with fewer choices (by about every second respondent) comprises of features of public/social mission — civil consciousness, selfless, benevolent, active and interested participation in solving social problems; guarantees of the confidentiality of information (42%) and in every way irreproachable behavior (35%) are less important for the Russians.

The grounds for considering and ‘labeling’ the behavior of civil servants as unethical can be divided into the following groups: 1) fraud, extortion, bribery (economic and criminal offenses) along with a disdainful attitude to the people that seem to induce unlawful acts (80%); 2) disregard for the law and the use of official position for personal gain (74%), i.e. not criminal acts, along with the bureaucratic red tape (67%); 3) poor training, disclosure of confidential information and its use, illegal behavior in the corporate interests (over 50%); 4) much less often mentioned types of unethical behavior (about every third respondent chose relevant answers) — conflicts of interests and accepting gifts, which are apparently much less often qualified by the average Russian as ‘unethical’ (there is nothing bad in giving and receiving gifts in everyday life, but extorting gifts is a completely different matter). Only bribery (corruption), extortion and fraud, as well as the disclosure of confidential information about the organization and conflicts of interests demonstrate similar figures in all age groups, whereas the frequency of choices of other grounds to qualify the behavior of civil servants as unethical increases with age, which can be explained by acquiring some life experience of communication with representatives of the state apparatus and sustainable social stereotypes about behavior patterns and value orientations of civil servants (the bureaucratic red tape is the most telling example here) (table 1).

Table 1

**What aspects of the civil servant/municipal employee behavior you would consider unethical?
(%, only answers varying by age groups)**

Age	18— 24	25— 29	30— 34	35— 39	40— 44	45— 49	50— 54	55— 59	60— 65
Neglect	70	79	84	86	80	85	87	86	90
Bureaucratic red tape	33	50	60	66	71	85	81	78	83
Illegal behavior in the name of the service	43	49	52	59	55	52	54	54	63
Use of official position for personal gain	60	74	65	74	69	79	83	78	83
Use of confidential information	41	56	50	57	64	62	64	59	64
Poor professional training	39	57	52	64	59	61	64	61	62
Disregard for the law	59	72	71	78	77	79	79	75	78
Accepting gifts	14	20	24	28	28	40	42	34	45

The respondents believe that when hiring people for the state/municipal service the employers pay attention primarily to the applicants work experience (72%) and a degree/diploma (64%); the second group of the most frequently mentioned requirements consist of responsibility, fast learning ability and willingness to work with maximum efficiency (almost every second respondent chose relevant response options), punctuality, high level of self-organization and self-discipline and leadership skills (about every third) (table 2). It is noteworthy that ethical principles — honesty and adherence to the working and ethical principles — happened to be at the end of the list together with the willingness and desire to help people (such a combination of the civil servant attributes was chosen by every fourth respondent). In the table below, we present some gender differences in the perception of the requirements to civil servants not because they are significant, but for they are telling about women's fears and worries in the labor market rather than about the image of public or municipal service employees. Russian women more often than men mention the need for experience, responsibility, willingness to work with maximum efficiency, fast learning, leadership skills and a high level of self-organization and self-discipline, perhaps trying on the application for the state and municipal service positions.

Table 2

**In your opinion, what are employers' requirements to the applicants
for the state/municipal service? (%)**

Requirements	Total	Men	Women
Work experience	71,8	66,4	76,4
Specific degree/diploma	64,1	62,3	65,7
Responsibility	52,6	47,8	56,8
Willingness to work with maximum efficiency	51,5	46,6	55,8
Fast learning	46,8	39,9	52,7
Punctuality	37,4	34,7	39,7
High level of self-organization and self-discipline	36,8	31,7	41,2
Leadership skills	32,8	27,8	37,1
Honesty and adherence to the working and ethical principles	27,8	27,2	28,4
Good grades in the basic subjects	26,2	28,7	24,1
Willingness and readiness to help people and serve the society	25,1	25	25,2
Creativity	20,7	19,6	21,7
High ethical standards	16,6	17	16,1
Lack of careerism	7,5	7,8	7,2

The respondents believe that to deal with cases of unethical behavior in the public administration bodies there should be ethics commissions (63%): 32% attribute their necessity to the specific character of civil servants' work, while 31% — to the importance of such supervisory authority in any organization; every tenth strongly opposes such an organizational means, and one in five admits it only for the situational analysis of complex intricate situations. According to the respondents, the composition of these ethical commissions should be as follows: independent experts not working in the public administration (59%) and representatives of all the parties involved (48%), perhaps the heads of the organization departments (18%) and ordinary employees (16%), representatives of all levels of administration (23%) and experts in the field of ethics as a science (20%). The respondents generally see neither representatives of other organizations as members of ethics commissions (10%), apparently following the Russian proverb "not to wash dirty linen in public", nor top managers (7%).

Unlike the sample as a whole and other age groups (every third respondent), 42% of the younger generation are convinced of the need in the supervisory authority in every organization; 18—24-year-olds (20%) twice more often than 25—29-year-olds, and three to four times more often than other age groups believe that ethical commissions should include only senior managers, and are less likely (32%) to entrust ethical control to the representatives of all parties involved (including the public). There can hardly be any unambiguous interpretations, however, probably due to the lack of life experience the, the younger people tend to adhere to the myth that only the most decent, honest and objective people, capable to impartially assess the ethical 'purity' of their colleagues can get to the top of the administrative pyramid (this collective representation is consistent with the classical Weberian model of rational bureaucracy, although with age the managerial representation become stronger).

The majority is convinced of the need to apply disciplinary measures (86%), the question is what measures to apply, and the respondents demonstrate quite consolidated confidence in the necessity of strict measures (73%) — only 13% exclude dismissal from the disciplinary sanctions list (in the youngest group every fourth emphasizes that dismissal as a sanction cannot be accepted). The respondents consider all types of sanctions applicable for civil servants — criminal (47%) and administrative (50%) responsibility, more often dismissal (58%), a decision on the professional incompetence (55%) and fines (57%), and the half is likely to accept open moral condemnation (20%) and a formal appeal to the senior managers (28%). The youngest group of 18—24-year-olds again stands out: they less often accept as a sanction a decision on the professional incompetence (37% vs. 55%), dismissal (48% vs. 58%) and criminal responsibility (29% vs. 47%), which also can be attributed to the lack of experience and too catastrophic perception of the listed alternatives. The majority of respondents approve the idea of special training of the public administration/municipal service staff in the field of ethical conduct (74%). With age, the confidence in the importance of ethical principles teaching decreases due to the belief that a man of such profession by definition must be ethical.

The respondents believe that there is a stable negative image of the civil servant/municipal employee in the Russian society (58%), while one in three found it difficult to assess it. Only 9% believe that the civil servant image today is positive, mainly the younger people aged 18—24 (23% vs. 9% in the sample). The respondents explain the

negative image of the state and municipal employees by qualifying them as corrupt bureaucrats (over 70%), indifferent to the needs and interests of citizens (84%); every second respondent mentioned their unethical behavior and poor professional training. The respondents mostly do not associate high level of corruption with low wages: although there are three modal figures — 40—50, 70—100, and 20—30 thousand rubles, the median value of the real wage and the wage considered enough to eliminate the idea of bribery match at 45 thousand rubles per month.

The respondents consider officials of regional and local authorities to be most corrupt; they are followed by officials of federal ministries and departments, and one in three qualifies the officials of the Russian President’s Administration as least corrupt, although here the biggest share of respondents could not assess the level of corruption at all (table 3).

Table 3

To what extent do you think are corrupted today...?

Types of officials	Most corrupt	Moderately corrupt	Least corrupt	Hard to say
Officials of regional and local authorities	59,6%	18%	9,7%	12,7%
Officials of federal level	41,6%	39,7%	5,4%	13,4%
Officials of the Russian President’s Administration	29,8%	12,8%	30,5%	26,9%

As the most common forms of corruption in Russia today the respondents mention bribery, misuse/grabbing of public funds and nepotism (over 70%); the second group of corruption practices named by every second respondent consists of fraud (with the state property and funds, registration services, ‘*blat*’ in general and violations of the existing order); only every third respondent believes civil servants to be a part of the organized crime (although this is a very high figure and, thus, depressing feature of the social image of the state and municipal employee). However, the youngest group (18—24) again proved to be most optimistic according to the estimates of the most common forms of corruption typical for civil servants — they less often (by 10—20%) mention as such different types of fraud and nepotism, extortion, and links with the organized crime (table 4).

Table 4

In your opinion, what are the most common forms of corruption in Russia today? (% , only differing figures)

Forms of corruption /age	18—24	25—29	30—34	35—39	40—44	45—49	50—54	55—59	60—65
Nepotism	59	68	67	75	76	66	74	75	81
Frauds with the state property	47	56	57	66	63	62	80	63	71
Misuse/grabbing of public funds	51	72	71	74	77	66	84	71	79
Frauds with the state contracts	31	50	57	65	66	67	76	64	73
Extortion	38	42	43	44	48	44	65	43	55
Links with the organized crime	26	33	29	24	32	35	49	40	46
Frauds with the unaccounted state funds	40	58	58	63	63	56	72	59	63
Providing undue benefits and privileges	32	42	39	41	48	48	61	48	53
Violations of the existing order for personal gain	35	50	50	49	50	54	63	47	55

The respondents assess the level of corruption in the public administration bodies as rather high (67%), 22% — as average and only 3% — as rather low, and men seem to be more pessimistic — 72% vs. 63% of women consider the bodies of state/municipal service highly corrupted. As with many other issues, the youngest group is the most optimistic here preferring moderate estimates of corruption to negative ones. 41% of the sample believe that the situation with corruption in the public administration remains the same, 18% — that the level of corruption is declining, 31% — on the contrary, that it is growing, i.e. the image of the Russian civil servant in public opinion is negative. The only exception here is again the youngest group of 18—24-year-olds with a more positive assessment of the situation — 31% believe that the level of corruption in the public administration and municipal service is declining, and 24% — on the contrary, that it is increasing.

As the least important factors determining the negative image of officials in the Russian society, the respondents consider the branding of the profession, careerism and the low credibility of power authorities in general. The youngest group again seems more optimistic, although also explains the negative image of civil servants by their incompetence (37% vs. 51% average figure), bureaucratic red tape (42% vs. 72%) and careerism (10% vs. 27%); however, beginning with the age of 50 respondents more often (by 10—15%) mention as factors determining the negative image of officials the bureaucratic red tape, indifference to the needs and interests of citizens, careerism, ‘opacity’ of work and the low credibility of power authorities. The respondents believe that the key concerns of the Russian officials of state and municipal levels are the desire to hold the posts (74%) and personal gain and interests (79%), though not the protection of large corporations (28%).

Thereafter, to obtain a positive image the respondents ‘advise’ state and municipal employees to achieve real professional results (78%), to effectively solve problems of citizens and society as a whole (80%), to be honest (72%) and competent (69%), to demonstrate a complete openness of one’s work (58%), and to promote mechanisms of public control over one’s work (41%). The youngest age group again shows specific preferences considering the real professional results less significant (68% vs. 78% average figure) together with the ability to effectively solve problems of citizens and society as a whole (60% vs. 80%) and improve mechanisms for public control (28% vs. 41%), which seems to be the result of the lack of personal experience of communication with civil servants.

To contextualize the image evaluation of the Russian civil and municipal service and to assess more accurately the image-status positions of this social-professional group in the public opinion, we asked two questions to identify social stereotypes about basic professional groups of the Russian society. The results showed that the most intelligent and talented people in the country are believed to work primarily in science (46%), less often in arts/literature/culture or business/trade/finances (according to the opinion of every third), while only one in five claims that such people work in the public administration and municipal service. Table 5 presents the spheres with an obvious decrease of positive estimates with age and at the same time proves the higher optimism of the youngest group (18—24) compared with the sample as a whole and with the elderly groups in particular (in most cases starting from the 30-year-olds).

Table 5

**In your opinion, in what fields the most intelligent and talented people
of the country work? (% , only differing figures)**

Fields	Total	18— 24	25— 29	30— 34	35— 39	40— 44	45— 49	50— 54	55— 59	60— 65
Business, trade, finances	31	42	36	31	33	28,	32	32	22	18
Medicine, education	26	36	26	32	22	29	22	26	24	12
Arts, literature, culture	33	44	38	34	39	38	25	30	23	23
Mass media	25	42	31	26	19	21	21	29	16	18
Politics	19	31	26	19	16	21	13	20	14	12
Show biz	24	36	29	26	24	20	20	27	20	9
Government, public administration	19	28	25	17	20	22	14	19	16	10
Municipal service	18	26	2	20	17	15	11	21	16	9
Service	18	30	20	17,8	19	17	13	18	16	10
NGO	16	26	16	18,6	16	13	11	14	16	8
State Duma, Federation Council, legislative authorities	21	34	25	20,9	18	18	15	24	17	13
Army, police, law enfor- cement agencies	17	30	19	16,3	14	15	11	21	13	10

When asked to choose the main fields, in which the most honest, conscientious and decent people work, the respondents expressed opinions that let us make the following conclusions: first, these qualities are clearly separated from intellectual and other skills; second, it is much harder for respondents to evaluate professions by these qualities. Here the group of leaders consists of science, arts/literature/culture, industry, religious and non-profit organizations, medicine and education (they were chosen by every fifth respondent). One in ten mentioned services and law enforcement agencies (perhaps, the image of the latter is negative due to the media coverage of their activities), while public administration bodies were mentioned only by 7%, municipal service — by 6%, federal authorities — by 5%. The youngest group again proved to be more optimistic — the 18—24-year-olds by about 10% more likely to consider almost every field of professional activity as represented by honest and conscientious people. For most of the fields, there is an obvious decline of the share of those who believe they are represented by decent people with age.

The respect to various professions does not differ significantly by age groups, perhaps, pointing to the stable social stereotypes about the ‘status’ of different professions, which hardly change with age. Civil servants are not the leaders of the social respect and prestige rating. The most respected groups are peasants/farmers and scientists (the respect level is 69% and 65% respectively, with the lowest rates of disrespect); they are followed by school teachers, workers and the military, the maximum respect to which was expressed by the half of the sample; then come doctors and creative intellectuals with the same level of maximum respect as for the previous group, though their level of minimum respect is much higher (17% and 14% respectively), i.e. these

professions are perceived more contradictory, like theater and cinema actors and university professors. Such contradictions are not typical for the image of civil servants — maximum respect to them was expressed by 6%, minimum — by 57% (the situation is the same for politicians, civil servants win only over the police, judges and prosecutors).

Thus, it is obvious that the negative image of state officials in the public opinion is the key reason for the low level of social trust to the public administration in the Russian society in general and among the student youth in particular. This negative image is determined, on the one hand, by the clear requirements to civil servants, which they do not meet in both personal conduct and professional and ethical standards; on the other hand, by the stereotypical perception of this social-professional group in general — as not consisting of the most intelligent, talented and competent people in the country, not to mention the most honest, conscientious and descent ones.

REFERENCES

- [1] *Akimova E.Ju.* Problema imidzha gosudarstvennyh sluzhashhih v sovremennom obsche-stve [The image of state civil servants as a problem for the nowadays social sciences]. *Yaroslavskij pedagogicheskij vestnik*. 2011. No. 1.
- [2] *Astanin V.V., Storozhenko I.V., Sanatin V.P.* Vzaimodejstvie organov gosudarstvennoj vlasti s institutami grazhdanskogo obshhestv v sfere protivodejstvija korrupcii (rezultaty konkretno-sociologicheskogo issledovanija) [Public authorities and civil society institutions interaction in combating corruption (results of the sociological study)]. *Monitoring pravoprimenenija*. 2012. No. 4.
- [3] *Batajkina S.V.* Imidzh gosudarstvennoj sluzhby kak social'nyj konstrukt [Image of Public Service as a Social Construct]: Avtoref. dis. k.s.n. Kazan, 2009.
- [4] Gosudarstvennaja sluzhba i grazhdanskoe obshhestvo v uslovijah provedenija administrativnoj i sudebno-pravovoj reform: rezultaty vyborochnogo sociologicheskogo oprosa naselenija Rossijskoj Federacii [Public service and civil society under the administrative and judicial-legal reforms: The results of the all-Russian representative survey]. *Sociologija vlasti*. 2005. No. 5.
- [5] *Gorshkov M.K.* Vlast' i bjurokratija v zerkale obshhestvennogo mneniya [Power and bureaucracy in the mirror of public opinion]. *Gumanitarnyj ezhegodnik-7*. Ed. by Ju.G. Volkov. Rostov n/D., 2008.
- [6] *Klimova S.* Obydennye smysly bazovyh ponjatij socialno-politicheskogo leksikona: «Chinovniki» [Ordinary interpretations of the key notions of the social-political vocabulary: “Officials”]. *Socialnaja realnost*. 2007. No. 1.
- [7] *Kudrjavceva E.I., Makalatiya I.N.* Kompetencii gosudarstvennogo grazhdanskogo sluzhashhego kak issledovatel'skaja problema [Competencies of the state civil servant as a research problem]. *Nastojashhee i budushhee socialnyh tehnologij*. SPb., 2011.
- [8] *Samsonova Ju.S.* Imidzh gosudarstvennoj sluzhby v uslovijah administrativnogo reformirovanija v rossijskom obshhestve [Image of Public Service under the Administrative Reform in the Russian Society]: Avtoref. diss. k.s.n. Rostov-na-Donu, 2011.
- [9] *Turchinov A.I., Magomedov K.O.* Kadrovyy potencial gosudarstvennoj grazhdanskoj sluzhby: duhovno-nravstvennye problem [Personnel Potential of State Civil Service: Spiritual and Moral Problems]. M., 2010.

НЕСКОЛЬКО СЛОВ О ПРИЧИНАХ ВЫСОКОГО УРОВНЯ СОЦИАЛЬНОГО НЕДОВЕРИЯ В МОЛОДЕЖНОЙ СРЕДЕ: ОБРАЗ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО СЛУЖАЩЕГО*

И.В. Троцук, Е.А. Ивлев

Кафедра социологии
Российский университет дружбы народов
ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 10/2, Москва, Россия, 117198

На основе эмпирических данных целого ряда повторных исследований, реализованных Социологической лабораторией Российского университета дружбы народов, авторы рассматривают типичные ответы студентов на вопросы об их политических взглядах и интересах, а также о социальном доверии в широком смысле этого слова. Уже с 2007 г., несмотря на навязываемые медиа клише, российских студентов нельзя назвать политически и электорально апатичными. Более того, московские студенты уверенно называют себя патриотами, гордящимися, в первую очередь, историческим прошлым, природными богатствами, культурным наследием и спортивными достижениями своей страны. К сожалению, иначе они оценивают нынешнюю социально-экономическую ситуацию, уважение к правам и свободам, деятельность государственных властей и общий уровень жизни. Авторы полагают, что подобные пессимистичные оценки в значительной степени объясняются низким уровнем социального доверия (или высоким уровнем социального недоверия), особенно к органам государственного управления и чиновникам в широком смысле. Авторы провели разведывательный общероссийский онлайн-опрос, чтобы реконструировать компоненты социального имиджа государственного служащего в общественном мнении как объясняющие низкий уровень социального доверия в обществе и стабильно высокую долю убежденных в том, что российское государство представляет и защищает интересы богатых и госслужащих. Анкета включала в себя вопросы об обязательных этических принципах в работе государственных и муниципальных служащих, о критериях отнесения их поведения к неэтичному, о требованиях к претендентам на посты в системе государственного управления, о возможных реакциях на неэтичное поведение в органах государственного управления, о структуре и детерминантах социального имиджа госслужащего и т.д. Хотя самая молодая возрастная группа (18—24-летних) оказалась наиболее оптимистично настроенной по всем перечисленным параметрам, тем не менее, и она легко воспроизводит негативный имидж госслужащего как не отвечающего профессиональным и этическим требованиям к данной социально-профессиональной группе, которая, по мнению россиян, не привлекает самых умных, образованных и компетентных людей в стране, не говоря уже о самых честных, совестливых и порядочных.

Ключевые слова: социальное доверие; социальное недоверие; российская студенческая молодежь; государственные служащие; государственное управление; опросы общественного мнения; социальный имидж государственного/муниципального служащего; этические принципы и профессиональные стандарты; государственный чиновник.

* Исследование выполнено при поддержке РГНФ. Грант № 15-03-00573.