



**Corruption in russian
society as a specific form
of social interaction.**

CORRUPTION IN RUSSIAN SOCIETY AS A SPECIFIC FORM OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

LA CORRUPCIÓN EN LA SOCIEDAD RUSA COMO UNA FORMA ESPECÍFICA DE INTERACCIÓN SOCIAL

ABSTRACT

It is considered the phenomenon of corruption in modern Russian society, the causes and basis of its existence in this article. It was concluded that the key to the institutionalization of corruption in Russian society are the processes of legitimization and ritualization of corruption practices based on the results of our research. The corruption becomes one of the negative factors in regulating social relationships in contemporary Russian society due to this practice. The corruption experience and corruption culture of the population were showed in this article. There are the assessments and attitudes towards corruption, its manifestations in the mass consciousness of the population in this article. We identified the spheres where that phenomenon is more intensively. Also we determined the specific of the manifestation of corruption in the national subjects of the Russian state. The authors concluded that corruption is most clearly manifested in the situation of degradation of the value-normative space.

KEYWORDS: Corruption, Russian society, corruption practice, corruption experience, corruption culture.

Copyright © Revista San Gregorio 2018. eISSN: 2528-7907 ©

RESUMEN

Se considera el fenómeno de la corrupción en la sociedad rusa moderna, las causas y las bases de su existencia en este artículo. Se concluyó que la clave para la institucionalización de la corrupción en la sociedad rusa son los procesos de legitimación y ritualización de las prácticas de corrupción basadas en los resultados de nuestra investigación. La corrupción se convierte en uno de los factores negativos en la regulación de las relaciones sociales en la sociedad rusa contemporánea debido a esta práctica. La experiencia de corrupción y la cultura de corrupción de la población se mostraron en este artículo. Existen las evaluaciones y actitudes hacia la corrupción, sus manifestaciones en la conciencia de la población de la población en este artículo. Identificamos las esferas donde ese fenómeno es más intensivo. También determinamos lo específico de la manifestación de corrupción en los asuntos nacionales del estado ruso. Los autores concluyeron que la corrupción se manifiesta más claramente en la situación de degradación del espacio normativo de valor.

PALABRAS CLAVE: corrupción, sociedad rusa, práctica de la corrupción, experiencia con la corrupción, cultura de la corrupción.

Copyright © Revista San Gregorio 2018. eISSN: 2528-7907 ©

 VALERY V. KASYANOV  Russia Kuban State University, Russian Federation  culture@kubsu.ru	 SVETLANA A. LYAUSHEVA  Adyghe State University, Russian Federation  lyausheva@rambler.ru	 ANDREY P. MIKHAYLOV  Adyghe State University, Russian Federation  alexandr01.87@mail.ru
 SERGEY I. SAMYGIN  Rostov State Economic University, Russian Federation  samygin78_@yandex.ru	 ILYA V. PECHKUROV  Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russian Federation  i.pechkurov@gmail.com	 ANDREY A. KURNOSENKO  Department of Economic Security and Anti-corruption of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, Russian Federation  2277321@gmail.com
	 ROMAN V. SKOBLIKOV  Krasnodar University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation, Russian Federation  mr-skrim@yandex.ru	

ARTÍCULO RECIBIDO: 20 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2018

ARTÍCULO ACEPTADO PARA PUBLICACIÓN: 12 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2018

ARTÍCULO PUBLICADO: 28 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2018

INTRODUCTION

The problem of combating corruption, corruption processes and schemes has acquired special importance in the modern Russian society. It has been proclaimed the thesis at the state level that corruption threatens Russia's national security. The existence of this approach to this phenomenon is due to the fact that, firstly, the corruption is designated as one of the most dangerous phenomenon for public life, however, as for public administration, and secondly, there is a danger to the national interests of the Russian society in it. Therefore, it threatens the security of our state (Vereshchagina, 2017). In other words, the corruption disfigures the existing order of life and the system of public administration.

Definition of "corruption" means as "corruption", "deception", "bribery", "painful condition" in translation from Latin. The corruption means the extraction by public persons of personal tangible and intangible benefits from their official and official position in the most general case. In the opinion of K.V. Kabanov, a corruption was officially recognized as a "lubrication of the transition period" during the period of profound social, economic and political transformations in our country at the end of the 20th century. The reformers considered it a boon for economic transformation and did not take measures for its subsequent restriction. The reform of public administration in the interests of the citizen, society and the state could become such. The corruption has replaced the system of state administration, the ideology of public service and has grown to the scale of a national catastrophe under the conditions of "most favored nation" over the past 20 years (Kabanov, 2011).

The problem of corruption is at present one of the first places in the state policy of Russia due to its topicality. Therefore, the state bodies of the country are focused on carrying

out a decisive and effective fight against corruption. Moreover, a kind of "anti-corruption program" is being formed. The problem is not completely solved by declaration of war of corruption the proclamation of a policy of its eradication in modern Russian society. So the base, factors and conditions for the emergence of this phenomenon in modern society can not be discounted. The efforts should be directed at eliminating the causes and factors of criminality leading to the commission of corruption for liquidation such a negative phenomenon as corruption but we should not limited solely to measures of general prevention.

Russian researchers understand a corruption as a phenomenon. The phenomenon is as "manifestation, expression of essence", "this or that discovery (expression) of an object, external, immediate forms of its existence". There is a "transition from the variety of available forms of an object to its internal content and unity to the concept" in thinking and science where the "phenomenon of essence", "the visible image of things", increasing content of their internal content and the ever closer rapprochement with them objective understanding. A corruption is a social, real and systemic evil, a negative social phenomenon. It is necessary to deal with it. The social nature of corruption is manifested in the fact that it has become a mass character. It has become a way of existence of a huge number of people. It has become as a subsystem and as an integral part of our society. It has become a daily norm of life (Balaev, 2010). The bureaucracy has emerged as a class, with its own interests, spheres of influence and protection system, with a volume of \$ 300 billion in circulating corrupt funds over the past period. Such information is the basis for the conclusion that corruption has become as one of the most profitable, therefore, the most attractive business in the country. And it has its own specific services and well-established tariffs.

According to Russian researchers, the distribution of budgetary funds, management of natural resources and state property, state purchases, illegal seizure of property of legal entities and citizens, gambling business are the dominant corruption spheres. Russian corruption has its own specific features unlike corruption in other countries. If it is initiated by citizens or business in Western countries, but the officials are as initiator in Russia. Spe-

cificity is that we have corruption as a power, because the bureaucracy is crushing. There are a lot of forms of pressure from the power structures to the permissive and similar procedures. It happens when the judicial system is not as good and also with the complete indifference of the society considering bribery as part of a social contract with the authorities for mutual coexistence. The highest level of corruption is not available for prosecution due to the high level of organization, the availability of various legal immunities. The indicative fight against corruption is conducted at the grassroots level. So, the main corrupt officials were doctors, teachers and policemen (Kabanov, 2011).

T.M. Bezubiak marks on value as an essential element of corruption. In his opinion, "the results of a theoretical analysis of the problem of corruption show that it acts as a specific form of social interaction that arises on the basis of changing social values and adopting antisocial attitudes in the mass consciousness. Such a social phenomenon involves the replacement of functional interactions that ensure the implementation of social needs, including business practices, dysfunctional practices, narrow group selfish ambitions, substituting for public interests" (Bezubyak, 2010). These processes naturally are as a historical tradition of the emergence of corruption as a social and legal phenomenon in modern Russian society. "Corruption as a way of selfish use of any power place exists always as long as there is power, no matter what society (primitive, slave-owning, feudal). Corruption methods change under the conditions of commodity-money relations. They acquire a monetary form" (Yakutin, 2010). In addition, the existence of an unchanged historical tradition of corruption in Russia, its scale of influence on social processes intensify globalization processes (Serapina, 2010), as well as a unified socio-cultural and economic environment. Three models of the most general understanding of corruption were outlined by M.Yu. Popov. At first, a corruption is as a socio-legal phenomenon that is as a type of crime. Secondly, a corruption is as a consequence of the personal world outlook, conditioned by subjective-environmental factors. Thirdly, a corruption is as historically conditioned non-legal normative (Popov, 2010).

The third model of corruption was designated by M.Yu. Popov, calls for addressing its

historical aspect. What is a corruption? This phenomenon is understood as the abuse of power by an official for personal gain in modern scientific literature. Any official person can be subjected to a corruption in whose hands the power is concentrated. According to researchers, a corruption is likely to go back to the custom of making gifts to achieve an arrangement (Ponomarev, 2012)

L.F. Pisarkova has been detailed historical aspect of corruption, the relationship between bribery and the traditional foundations of society and the "specifics" of its appearance in the Russian state on the basis of archival documents and historical works (Pisarkova, 2002). So in her opinion, the basis of bribery goes back to the sources of statehood, and they are linked to another phenomenon of Russian life as the "feeding" of the administration at the expense of the *posad* and the county population at an early stage of development. "Despite the fact that official persons received government salaries, "feeding from work" was at that time and quite legal source of their income, which exceeded several times the monetary salaries". And further she writes: "there was a clear division of gain from "deeds" into legal and illegal in the representation of people of the XVII century. Although the differences between "honors", "funerals" and "promises" were barely discernible from the standpoint of the legal norms of the later period. "Honor" ("honors") as a form of voluntary offering was already known in the times of Kievan Rus. The government recognized the money and in-kind contributions to officials before the commencement of the case ("honors") and the offer after the end of the case ("funeral") among these three types of "self-serving incomes". But they pursued "promises" (actually bribe) that were always connected with violation of the law, therefore regarded as extortion and "bad money". Prince Alexei Kropotkin and the deacon of the discharge order Ivan Semenov was beaten by a whip for "promises". The prince took 150 rubles. And the deacon took a barrel of wine and asked from Gorokhovets residents 30 rubles for a trade. Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich accused these bribe-takers of violating the "merciful order to all to live in truth and in chastity unselfishly and non-sententially", and, punishing them with a whip, ordered to write down in a discharge book that Prince Kropotkin is a "thief and a promise" (Pisarkova, 2002).

Before Peter's reforms the most state officials and official persons lived on "gratitude" that is, on the funds received from "interested" in their activities of citizens. The official crimes became less tolerant in the XVIII century. Despite the introduction the practice of assigning fixed wages to employees in 1715, a number of abuses of one's position and power not only did not diminish, sometimes increased. Thus, historical documents show that pervasive bribery and peculation have acquired unprecedented scope in the first quarter of the XVIII century. These phenomena have penetrated into structures called to their position and positions to deal with them. The denunciations of the fiscal, the whips, and the execution of the Siberian governor called M.P. Gagarin's Prince could not help the situation. It is known from historical documents that Peter the first was going to issue a decree, on the basis of which "he who steals from the treasury only so much to buy a rope, will be hanged on it". He was stopped by the frank confession of Prosecutor General called P.I. Yaguzhinsky that they are all stealing, "only one is more and more distinct than the other", and therefore "the new decree can leave the emperor without lieges" (Pisarkova, 2002).

The Code of Laws of the Russian Empire was approved by Nicholas the first in 1830. There was formulated the concept of "bribery" in it. About 2500 official persons were under investigation for bribes for the first time in history in 1853.

The bribery was considered one of the most serious crimes in the Criminal Code of the RSFSR in 1922. It was recognized as counter-revolutionary activity. A shooting was as a punishment for it. A problem of bribery was not openly raised in the Soviet state in the 80's of 20th century. People were forced to adhere to the ideology that corruption is unacceptable for the socialist system. It is characteristic only for bourgeois society (Klimov, 2010).

Thus, L.F. Pisarkova have been studied a large number of historical literature, especially the secret materials of the Golitsyn's archives. However, she did not see the basis for bribery and the system of abuse of power only in small salaries of officials and human greed. She concluded that this state of affairs in Russia is the result of many components of Russian life often originating in the depths of history, in particular: 1. the composition of civil ser-

vants, formed mainly from low-income and poorly educated sections of the population, who often tried to "get out into people" at any cost; 2. State's lack of adequate level of remuneration for officials and consequent connivance with respect to violators of the law; 3. permissiveness and legal nihilism of rich and noble people, characteristic of a strictly regulated class society; 4. Use to create a system of collective abuse of the power vertical created by the ministerial form of government; 5. The tradition of "feeding" officials, in a modified form, preserved throughout history and corrupting the administration; 6. Tolerance of society in relation to bribe takers, resulting from this tradition (Pisarkova, 2002).

How is it with corruption in modern Russian society? The researchers have the most diverse and sometimes conflicting positions in explaining the reasons for the existence of this phenomenon at present time. Some researchers hold the position that the Russian Federation is one of the most corrupt countries. Bribery has become below the world average level in many respects in Russia in 2011 according to one British audit company (Gufeld & Pastukhova, 2016). This situation develops in Russia today after it became a party to the UN Convention against Corruption in 2006. To implement the Convention's provisions, a number of anti-corruption legislative and regulatory legal acts were adopted, such as federal laws called "On combating corruption", "On providing access to information on the activities of courts in the Russian Federation", "On anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts", "On providing access to information on the activities of state bodies and local self-government bodies". It should be noted "Regulations on the representation by citizens who are applying for the replacement of public positions of the Russian Federation and persons who replace state posts of the Russian Federation with information on incomes, property and liabilities of a property nature", "Regulations on Representation by Citizens Claiming to Substitute Federal State Service, and federal public servants of information on incomes, property and liabilities of property character" and "Rules and methods of carrying out of anticorruption examination". In addition, "National Plan for Combating Corruption", its second edition "National Counteraction Plan Corruption for 2010-2011" as well as "National Anti-Corruption Strategy" were approved

in Russia. Despite their imperfection, these and some other previously adopted laws and acts, create certain regulatory law and information conditions that allow doing the control of separate directions of activity of the Russian authorities by responsible socially active citizens (Nisnevich, 2012).

Thus, we can conclude that the deal with corruption is actively continuing in the modern Russian society. The arrests of senior official persons (the Minister of Economic Development, governors, federal officials, etc.) years indicate about that. The extent of corruption does not decrease in Russian society despite the adoption of legislative acts and investigations.

S. Sampson notes in his book called "The fighters for honesty: world morality and anti-corruption movement in the Balkans" that one of the aspects of the global movement for responsibility and transparency is the fight against corruption. It has international nature for several reasons: firstly, corruption covers the whole world, and secondly, the fight against corruption and against it is an object of international coordination. At the same time, ethical coordination and ethical management become one of the central elements of corporate activity. Anti-corruption activity is part of the general trend towards global ethics and morality (Sampson, 2007).

According to A.S. Kozhushko, being opposed to principle, immorality and speculation, a fighting against corruption seems an attempt to restore lost standards of morality and responsibility that we call "society". In other words, the fight against corruption turns into a crusade under the banner of morality (Kozhushko, 2012).

Almost all the public-administrative relations regulated by law and their subjects - politics, business, state and municipal service, law enforcement agencies, appeal to the Armed Forces, healthcare and education system, housing and communal sphere, show business, personnel appointments became the object of corruption (Okhotsky, 2008).

A package of laws were introduced within the framework of the anti-corruption campaign in the State Duma of Russia by Medvedev D.A. in 2008. They were aimed at eradicating corruption in modern Russian society.

Russia has to continue the fight against corruption at all levels and spheres of its manifestation, and so it is capable of destroying and greatly undermining the social foundations. In addition, there are social and economic problems on the base of its existence, in particular, price increases, social inequality, irrational use of budgetary funds, a decline in the prestige of the country, ultimately threatening the national security of the Russian state.

Based on the above, we can conclude that the problem of bribery can be solved by introducing new anti-corruption laws in Russia. This process can be reduced despite the complexity of the fight against corruption. The most important is thing that not only the authorities, but also ordinary citizens have the desire to eradicate this phenomenon (Gafiatulina et al, 2018).

There is opposite situation in the Russian society. So, Russia researchers distinguish three important properties of the attitude to corruption to be directly related to the mass psychology of Russians in Russia. Firstly, tolerance is the attitude to corruption as ubiquitous ("all take," "steal" and etc.), an ineradicable and inevitable of "minimal level of evil", not deserving serious condemnation. Secondly, not acts of corruption, and the size of bribes is caused a censure in the mass consciousness of Russians especially if they are "disproportionate" to the position of corrupt officials. Thirdly, they are inconsistency and inconsistency. There is a system of double standards as in many other situations. There is: "I and my environment are different". Thus, "the socio-psychological peculiarity of our culture is evidently manifested to create a favorable environment for corruption. It is in the priority of informal social relations over formal relations" (Zhuravlev & Yurevich, 2012).

CHARACTERISTIC OF OBJECT AND RESEARCH METHODS

The relevance of this problem for modern Russian society is studying of public opinion on this issue to identify the existing in the mass consciousness assessments and attitudes towards corruption, as well as corruption experience and behavior.

The purpose of sociological research is to study the content, intensity and sustainabi-

lity of the phenomenon called “corruption” in modern Russian society. The problem of research is to study the manifestation of corruption and the scope of its dissemination in modern Russian society to identify ratings, the reasons for its appearance and the mechanism for eliminating it in the public mind.

1. Sociological research for studying of corruption in modern Russian society, spheres and scales of its spread was held in the South of Russia (in Dagestan Republic): in Derbent, Kazbek, Kizlyar, Kizilyurt, Novolak, Khasavyurt districts, Makhachkala, Derbent, Kaspiysk, Kizilyurt, Kizlyar, Khasavyurt cities in 2015. N-903.

2. Sociological research for studying of interethnic relations of Dagestan peoples and factors to stimulate interethnic tension was held in Derbent, Kazbek, Kizlyar, Kizilyurt, Novolak, Khasavyurt districts, Makhachkala, Derbent, Kaspiysk, Kizilyurt, Kizlyar, Khasavyurt cities in 2016. N-945.

The main method of collecting information was a questionnaire. The survey was conducted by random selection. All three geographic zones of the republic (flat, foothill, mountainous) differing in socio-economic development and polyethnicity were covered by the survey. FAR program was for questionnaire processing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It has already been noted a corruption is one of the most negative manifestations in Russian society today. The statement of its existence is the first step on the way to deal with it and eliminate it. The problem of corruption and anti-corruption laws is in the spotlight on various levels of government because of its relevance. This problem is one of the most important for the mass media.

The federal law called “On Combating Corruption” was adopted on December 25, 2008. The basic concepts were clearly defined in it. 1. Corruption is considered as: a) to abuse of office, to give a bribery, to take a bribery, to abuse of authority, a commercial bribery or other unlawful use of physical person of his official position, contrary to the legitimate interests of society and the state in order to obtain benefits in the form of money, valuables, other property or services of a property

nature, other property rights for itself or for third persons or unlawfully providing such profit to person by other physical persons; b) to do the acts on behalf of or in the interests of the legal entity specified in subparagraph called “a” of this paragraph. 2. Anti-corruption is defined as the activities of federal bodies of state power, state authorities of the subjects of the Russian Federation, local governments, civil society institutions, organizations and individuals within their powers: a) to prevent corruption, including detection and subsequent elimination causes of corruption (prevention of corruption); b) to identify, prevent, suppress, uncover and investigate corrupt practices (dealing with corruption); c) to reduce and (or) to eliminate the consequences of corruption offenses (<http://ivo.garant.ru/#/document/12164203/paragraph/2769:2>).

First of all it is important to study “corruption experience” and “corruption culture” in our sociological research. Before proceeding to an analysis of the sociological material received, we should be noted that the characteristics of corruption culture integrate the features of all types of corruption, both socially and in terms of determination in Russia. In this case it is important to consider that corrupt practices as a specific kind of social interaction act as an object with a certain value-normative content. Consequently, corruption culture can be considered as a result of the process of informal institutionalization of this type of criminal practices (Kamensky, 2014).

Given the above the respondents were asked a question to allow and to determine their behavior in a situation when they deal with the manifestation of a corruption scheme (see sheet No. 1).

Sheet 1. The distribution of answers for question: “Haven’t you ever had to deal with corruption (bribery, illegal rebuffs and other unlawful self-interest actions) on the part of officials personally?” (The answers are given by groups of nationalities in percentages from total number of respondents)(See Annexes)

The results of the research show that, the “corruption experience” is significantly larger in women according to gender in comparison with the men subgroup who noted the position called “I have to deal with always”. The men and women respondents have underli-

ned the position called "No, I've never had to" with a small difference. We can see there is a higher share with "corruption experience" among the men respondents than among the women respondents. Seldom every third respondent among men had to deal with corruption. Every sixth respondent marked a position called "quite often" and "very often". The share of those among women is almost 1.5 times less. When we was formulating this question we had a hypothesis that a subgroup of businessmen would show a more active "corruption experience and behavior" by their activities. It was confirmed by the results of our research. Every third respondent among them underlined the answer called "I've had to deal very often". Every sixth respondent has experience of corruption relations. We can see differences in age. The older respondent, the more often he had to deal with a corruption. Now it is stand out age subgroups called "from 30 to 49" and "from 50 and up". Thus, we can be concluded that the "corruptive experience" of the respondents is directly dependent on socio-demographic indicators. Research results showed that male respondents have more experience than women. A subgroup of "businessmen" had to deal with corruption with age.

The respondents were asked a "control question" in our research called "What is the importance of the problem, in your opinion, of dealing with the shadow economy, corruption and other types of economic crimes?" That question allowed identifying us not only the respondents' assessment of this phenomenon, but also our attitude to it. The results of our research showed that every second respondent shared two opinions with a small difference called "corruption is the most important problem" (49.9%) and "corruption is one of the most important problems" (50.0%). While less than 1% of respondents hold positions called "this is a minor problem", "I do not see a problem at all" and "I difficult to answer". Thus, according to the results of our research, we can conclude that the vast majority of respondents have an idea of corruption not by hearsay, but from the process of personal experience. In this connection the issue about the confirmation of axiomatic statement called "The more a person meets with a negative phenomenon, the lesser evil it seems to him" is a great scientific interest. In our opinion, this statement has a limited character. It does not always rightly reflect

the attitude to the phenomenon. Quantitative changes can lead to qualitative changes, to the recognition, for example, that a corruption is a big evil and we must to deal with it under certain conditions (from the excessive pressure of corrupt officials and the insolvency of bribe-takers and etc.). The respondents were asked the question called "Have you ever had to give a bribe?" in our research. More half of the respondents answered affirmatively (78,1 %) and marked the position called "no" (21,9%).

What is situation about corruption now? We turned to the results of the all-Russian mass interview to get a reliable answer to this question. So an absolute majority of Russians (89%) considered corruption to be unacceptable in government bodies. As follows from Levada-center' interview 20% of respondent admitted to solving everyday issues with the bribes. Most often the respondents had to pay bribes when they violated the rules of the road, got a driver's license or were in the hospital. From 25% to 32% a year the number of those who believe that corruption "completely struck Russia's authorities from up to down" has grown. Another 47% of respondent say that the government is "largely" affected by corruption. But the number of respondents has been considering Vladimir Putin to be fully or largely responsible for the scale of corruption in the country has declined from 73% to 67% since 2013. We asked a question called "Have V.V. Putin responsible for the scale of corruption in the highest echelons of power its opponents are speaking about it?" in interview of 2013. So, 39% of respondents consider responsible him "fully", 34% of them as "to a large degree", 15% blamed "only partially" on him. 6% of respondents consider that "he can not be responsible for all this" and 6% of them "find it difficult to answer". We can see changes in the positions of the Russians respondent in research of 2017. 20% of them share the opinion called "only partially". The proportion of those who approve a position called "to a large degree" (42%) increased with a decrease in the number of people who are closer to opinion called "fully" (25%). 6% of respondents consider that "he can not be responsible for all this" and 4% of them found it difficult to answer (<http://www.levada.ru/2017/03/28/institutsionalnaya-korrupsiya-i-lichnyj-opyt/>).

Interview was conducted by the Levada Center in 2017. The respondents were asked a question called "Whom had to give bribes provide any services during the last three years when you contacted at this institution / in this situation?" The results showed that 42% of the respondents marked that in case of "violation of traffic rules and be detained by a traffic police officer", 31% of them marked that in case of "getting a driver's license / car registration / carrying out a vehicle inspection", 31% of them marked that in case of "being in hospital", 15% of them marked that in case of "placing a child in school", 9% of them marked that in case of "getting important documents, certificates in local authorities", 6% of them marked that in case of "applying for a job". The question called "How do you feel about solving everyday problems with bribe?" was answered by us. We received the following answers called "I think that sometimes it is necessary for the good of the case" (10%); "I think that we can put up with it" (10%); "I think that we can not put up with it" (28%); "I think that this is absolutely unacceptable" (46%) and a small percentage of respondents "found it difficult to answer" (6%).

We included the question called "What events do you have a feeling of shame in Dagestan?" in the questionnaire in our research (2015). That the question was supposed to show the emotions in relation to one or another events and facts from the Dagestan peoples. According to the results of our research, "religious extremism, terrorist acts committed outside the republic" (46,4%), "corruption" (38,4%), "crime growth" (32,2%), "loss of spiritual values our ancestors adhered to" (24,1%), "unwillingness of local politicians to revive their republic" (21,6%), "non-observance of national traditions and morals" (17,6%), "pursuit of profit" (13,2%) are caused the greatest degree of shame among the Dagestan people.

By remark of the country's top leadership the problem of corruption is one of the most painful for the Russian society. Therefore, more than half of the Tabasarans respondent, every second respondent among the Laks, Kumyks, every third respondent among the Avars, Azerbaijanis, Dargins, Lezgins, Russians and Chechens have a shame for its existence and scale of distribution. With the growth of the educational status, the proportion indicating corruption is increasing: 9,1% with a basic secondary education, 32,2% with

a secondary, 39,9% with a secondary special and 44,5% with a higher education. With age every second respondent in the subgroup "from 20 to 30", "from 30 to 40", "from 40 to 50", "from 50 to 60", and every second respondent "up to 20" and "from 60 and up" underlined indicator of corruption as a shame.

The authors share E.G. Kamensky's position that "corruption is a generic form of a certain kind of social relations and has a wide range of typical invariants of its representation, for example, in accordance with the specifics of the institutional locus for the implementation of corruption relations in the socio-cultural space. In these cases, the value-normative components of corrupt practices are also based on the specificity of the value-normative matrix of the institution of their localization" (Kamensky, 2014). The authorities is dealing with corruption for decades. The authorities adopted a number of legislative acts toughen penalties for this kind of crime. However, there are not positive developments in this direction. A person has a "corruption experience" at all levels of social interaction. Moreover, he "supplies" it to solve his problems. However, we should not lose sight of the fact to get quality education, medical assistance and like any other person's application to different instances it can not be done if he "thanks the needed people in the right form". There is a corruption in health and education spheres particularly alarming for us when people are put in such conditions that they are forced to pay for services that they are guaranteed by the Constitution. To the great regret, despite the assurances of state officials, a corruption is still flourishing in the entire post-Soviet space. The corruption cases are as evidence for that senior official are implicated in it.

According to the results of the sociological survey the factors contributing to the aggravation of ethno-political conflicts in the North Caucasus region were highlighted by V.A. Avksentiev and G.D. Gritsenko including the national policy in the region, the activities of national elites, the socio-economic situation of people, the rise of national identity, the radicalization of religion, the media and communications, corruption, migration, unemployment, action / inactivity of law enforcement agencies, ethno-clanality (Avksentiev & Gritzenko, 2016)

Taking into account the above criteria, we have to show the factors to contributing to degrade of relations between the Dagestan peoples when we are studying the state of interethnic relations in Dagestan in the interview of 2016. The respondents were asked the question called "What do you think, what are the reasons for the possible emergence of inter-ethnic confrontation between the Dagestan peoples?" According to the results of our research, "territorial disputes, living on the historical territory of one people of other peoples" (37,4%) is the factor of the possible emergence of interethnic confrontation between the Dagestan peoples. By ethnicity this position is shared by more than half of the Kumyks, the Laks and the Chechens respondent, and every third among the Avars, and every fifth respondents among the Russians and the Lezgins, every seventh among the Dargins. The position called "low level of social and economic development of the republic" (32,5%) is occupied the second ranking place and it is closer to every second among the Dargins, the Lezgins and the Russians, and to every third among the Avars, to every fourth among the Chechens and the Laks, every fifth among the Kumyks. The issue called "the features of the land reform conducted by the leadership of Dagestan without taking into account the opinion of the peoples living in these territories" (26,4%) are caused a commotion among the Dagestan people respondents. Every second respondent among the Kumyks, and every third respondent among the Chechens, and every fourth among the Avars and the Laks, and every seventh respondent among the Dargins and the Lezgins and a statistically small proportion of Russians marked on that position. "A corrupt scheme of transferring land to private hands" (23,7%) is occupied the fourth ranking rank. That position was marked by every third respondent among the Laks, every fourth among the Avars, the Dargins, the Lezgins, the Russians and the Chechens. According to Russian researchers a corruption perform some role to worse interethnic relations. Then every fifth person marked a position called "the mistakes of the republican state authorities in the national policy". By ethnicity it is closer to every fourth among the Dargins, Kumyks, Chechens, Lezgins, and to every seventh among the Avars and to every tenth among Russians. Interethnic conflict can be provoked by "competition for jobs" (16,7%). Every fourth respondent among

the Dargins, every fifth among the Laks and Lezgins, every sixth among the Avars marked that position. Statistically small proportion of respondents among the Kumyks, Russians and Chechens has been seeing a conflict potential in it. The migration process is a factor for conflict. It was marked by every sixth respondents. The share of those is much higher among the Kumyk respondents (one in three respondents), Russians and Chechens (one in four respondents), Dargins (one in six respondents) and there is significantly less in the Avars, Laks and Lezgins subgroup. The position called "costs of upbringing and the loss of the principles of international education" (16,0%) are located with a small difference from the previous. Among Russian respondents (one in two respondents), one in four respondents among the Lezgins, one in five among the Laks marked on this factor. There is much less the proportion in the other subgroups especially among the Chechens. The "low culture of interethnic communication" (14,2%) is closely connected with the costs of upbringing. Every fifth among Russians respondents, every fifth among the Lezghin, every eighth among the Avars, Dargins, Kumyks and less than 10 % among the Laks respondents marked on it. Every fifth among Laks, every seventh among Avars and Dargins, every eighth among Chechens and Kumyks underlined a position called "competition for land" (13,8%) to provoke ethnic conflict by it. Informal ethnic leaders (12,0%) can play a certain role as in the deterioration, as in the improvement of the character of interethnic communication. According to every sixth respondent among the Dargins, Russians and Lezgins, every ninth among the Avars and Laks their activities can provoke an ethnic conflict. The question of human resources can play no less important role in aggravation of interethnic relations. It is located in the last place. Every fourth respondent among the Chechens and every tenth among the Russians indicated on it.

Thus, based on the results of our survey, many factors can contribute to the interethnic conflict. The unresolved of these factors may help to maintain in latent form interethnic tension in the poly-ethnic territorial formations of the South of Russia.

The results of our research show the presence of corruption in the modern Russian society. We can even say that a kind of "co-

ruption culture” has been formed based on the “corruption experience” of the population makes it expedient to activate the authorities for dealing with it.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, one of the most important measures to counteract the manifestation of corruption in any sphere of social interaction is the struggle against conflicts of interest that may arise among public officials at all levels of government. A corruption becomes a specific form of social contact in the conditions of violation or loss of elements of the value-normative system. It has a wide spectrum of its manifestation. In other words, a corruption is a negative social phenomenon in today’s Russian society. This fact is understood a negative perception of this phenomenon by a large part of the population and mass consciousness. At the same time, a person has to resort to corrupt practices for solving his social problems with the aim of the best and optimal solution of issues. It should not be discounted that there is an alternative to corruption in the form of official law to identify a different institutions for the resolution of formal relations, acting independently.

Of course, the powerful anti-corruption war that the Russian state is leading is reduced exclusively to certain demonstrative political precedents. We can call among them, for example, “YUKOS’s case”, “Luzhkov’s case”, “Vasilyeva-Serdyukova’s case” and very often leads to the change of heads of Russian subjects. Many of them are brought to trial formally. For example, E. Vasilieva did not receive the punishment despite many billions of theft. “Invincibility” of the corruption component of Russian society is explained by many factors. For example, its existence at the North Caucasian level is conditioned by the consideration of ethno-confessional, a familial conformity in the selection, rotation and placement of personnel, personal loyalty, acquaintance, nepotism, family, typos, diaspora perceived by the population as specific, unchanging properties of the local community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avksentiev V.A., Gritsenko G.D. (2016). Ethno-political situation in the North Caucasus: an expert assessment // *Sociological research*. № 1. P. 95.
- Balaev A.Sh. (2010). Corruption in the light of the adopted federal law No. 273 FZ called "On Counteracting Corruption" // *Bulletin of the Academy of Economic Security of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia*. № 7. P. 116 - 120.
- Bezubiak T.M. (2010). Formation of readiness of pupils of the professional lyceum to anticorruption behavior // *Person and education*. № 3 (24). p. 66 - 69.
- Gafiatulina Nk., Vorobyev Ga., Imgrunt Si., Samygin Si., Latysheva At., Ermakova Li., Kobysheva Li. (2018). Social Health of Student Youth in South Russia: Analysis Of The Perception Of Socio-Cultural Risks. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*. Vol. 8, Issue 6, June 2018. P. 32-41.
- Gufeld V.V., Pastukhova E.A. (2016). Corruption is a scourge of modern Russia. Public commission to deal with a corruption / / Actual problems of legal regulation of public associations: Russian and foreign experience. Collection of abstracts of papers and articles of the IV International Scientific and Practical Conference of Russian and Foreign Universities and the Russian Academy of Sciences. G.V. Plekhanov with the participation of representatives of state and municipal authorities. M., P. 71 - 74.
- Kabanov K.V. (2011). Corruption: the general situation and current realities / / *Social sciences and modernity*. № 5. P. 34 - 36.
- Kamenskiy E.G. (2014). Corruption culture: theoretical and conceptual construct // *Journal of the Institute of Sociology*. No. 4 (11). Pp. 74 - 92.
- Kozhushko A.S. (2012). Corruption of society, corruption of the individual // *Humanitarian and social sciences*. № 6. P. 109 - 115.
- Klimov I.P. (2010). History and legal experience of counteraction of corruption and its value for modern Russia // *Bulletin of the Tyumen state university*. № 2. P. 150.
- Nisnevich Yu.A. (2012). Participation of citizens in proactive control of corruption // *Social Sciences and Modernity*. № 3. P. 69 - 78.
- Okhotskiy E.V. (2008). Public administration in modern Russia: educational and methodical complex. Moscow: MGIMO (U) Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia. 548 p.
- Pisarkova L.F. (2002). To the history of bribes in Russia (based on the materials of the "secret chancery" of the Golitsyns of the first half of the XIX century) // *Domestic history*. № 5. p.
- Ponomarev E.G. (2012). Corruption in Russia: the origins and conditions for overcoming / / *Society and Law*. № 4. p. 41.
- Popov M.Yu. (2010). Institutes of Civil Society against a corruption // *Historical and Socio-Educational Thought*. No. 2 (4). Pp. 24 - 31.
- Rasulov M.A. (2006). To the issue of the historical roots of corruption / / *Bulletin of the Institute of IAE*. № 4. P. 131 - 139.
- Serapina A.A. (2011). The world financial crisis and the need to strengthen the fight against corruption (the problem of globalization of anti-corruption policy) // *The Caspian region: politics, economy, culture*. № 1 (26). Pp. 84 - 90.
- Sampson S. (2007). The fighters for honesty: world morality and anti-corruption movement in the Balkans // *Fighting windmills? Socio-Anthropological Approach to the Study of Corruption / Comp. And otv. Ed. I.B. Olimpieva, O.V. Pachenkov. SPb. : Aleteya*, pp. 157 - 190.
- Vereshchagina A.V., Samygin S.I., Gafiatulina N.Kh., Rudenko A.M., Pechkurov I.V. (2017). *Sociology of Security: A Textbook*. Moscow: INFRA-M, 264 p.
- Yakutin Yu.V. (2010). "Evergreen" problems of corruption / / *Financial life*. № 1. P. 88 - 92.
- Zhuravlev A.L., Yurevich A.V. (2012). Psychological factors of corruption // *Applied legal psychology*. № 1. P. 8 - 21.
- URL: <http://ivo.garant.ru/#/document/12164203/paragraph/2769:26> (exact date of 04/20/2017).
- URL: <http://www.levada.ru/2017/03/28/institutsionalnaya-korruptsiya-i-lichnyj-opyt/> (exact date of 04/24/2017).



ANNEXES

Sheet 1. The distribution of answers for question: "*Haven't you ever had to deal with corruption (bribery, illegal rebuffs and other unlawful self-interest actions) on the part of officials personally?*"
(The answers are given by groups of nationalities in percentages from total number of respondents)

The variants of answers	BTot :	Including on the grounds of respondents:										
		Sexy		Age			Education		Social status			
		Male	Female	Up to 29	From 30 to 49	From 50 and above	Secondary and special secondary education	High education	Worker	Clerical worker	Businessmen	Students
No, I've never had to	26,0	21,8	28,1	42,1	19,0	10,9	24,9	24,8	29,3	25,4	4,9	67,3
I've had to deal once	7,8	6,1	10,1	7,8	6,2	10,9	6,4	10,4	13,8	13,2	5,1	7,9
I've had to deal seldom	24,7	33,1	16,5	7,9	38,0	32,5	25,6	29,9	29,3	24,6	17,3	17,4
I've had to deal often	14,1	17,3	11,1	16,9	5,9	22,0	13,4	10,1	13,9	13,5	17,1	17,1
I've had to deal very often	14,4	16,5	10,1	8,0	19,4	11,1	5,7	10,4	12,4	13,3	32,7	4,1
I have to deal always	9,3	3,6	17,2	17,4	6,4	3,8	7,2	10,1	15,2	6,3	15,7	1,1

