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Abstract—The present paper offers a description of the survey research, conducted in a mixed group of university students of different social background and gender identity. The survey research was carried out on the basis of two top Russian universities and involved 310 respondents. The purpose of this study was to explore the sociological aspects of university education based on certain self-identification and value orientations. In view of the purpose, the objectives of the study were defined as follows: (1) to determine the students’ employment expectations; (2) to clarify success factors as motivation for education; (3) to assess the students’ satisfaction with life. The students were asked to evaluate their life keeping in mind their social conditions, education, income and personal fulfilment. Life satisfaction research was measured by means of a numeric ranking index of happiness ranging from 1 to 100 points. The main research findings cover the educational strategies of generation Z in Russia, their ambitions and factors of success, their work habits and expectations of the future job. The research findings are described against the background of general social situation in the Russian Federation.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Over twenty years of the reforms social and demographic situation in Russia has undergone a significant transformation, which led to considerable changes of quantitative and qualitative characteristics of human and institutional capacities of the country. It can be observed in the following trends: reduction in the share of generation Z (24 year olds and younger) among the total number of the population; deterioration of health conditions among children, teenagers and youth; academic and professional decline; decrease in the opportunities for young people to participate in public production and economic development. As a result of these changes the society meets with the desocialization of the young population, deterioration of youth human resources, increase of unemployment rate and shrinkage of labor market for the young.

As it has repeatedly occurred in Russia, the modern young generation, which forms a social, demographic and sociocultural group, appears to be in colliding relations with the society, demanding social innovations of norms and rules and at the same time being an actant of social reproduction of fundamental values and models of behaviour.

In matters of social innovations Russia has always followed the phases, described in the concept of social change as a conflict theory [1], more typical of Russia than functional or evolutionary development. In Russia new social elements always appear as a result of clashes between two opposite tendencies. One of them is a traditionally conservative set of social rules which place common public good and family ties at the top of individual priorities. The other centres on individualism and egoism with the priority of material values, to be more precise, of personal achievements, with money as a measure of success. In all periods of social trouble, the public good had unfailingly triumphed until 1991, when the society dramatically changed the course of historical development, embracing Western values and strategies, alien for the traditional Russian society.

The idea of open democratic society, adopted to substitute the communist theory, brought about deviant forms of behavior and deterioration in physical, moral and psychological health (drug addiction, prostitution, slothfulness, asocial and violent behavior). It turned out that the young generation was not immune to the social evils of the transition period to market economy, which substituted the socialist framework the country had been built on. The new social patterns brought about the “behavior produced by different modes of influence, level of physiological stress reactions, self-regulation of refractory behavior, resignation and despondency to failure experiences, self-debilitating effects of proxy control and illusory inefficaciousness, achievement strivings, growth of intrinsic interest, and career pursuits” [2].
Despite the period of discontent and dissatisfaction the Russian society is suffering from, it is the today’s youth, who very soon will replace their fathers to take leading positions in the country. Yet today they prove to be highly flexible in their economic activity, participation in the professional segment of the Russian society, grasping new innovative ideas and trends.

At the same time the older group of generation Z, 18-20-year-olds, are socially highly disorganized and quite ambiguous in their political preferences. They willingly get involved into groups of interests – sports fans clubs, dancing groups, music fans, street racers etc., but are relatively indifferent to political movements. The spontaneous marches, organized by political activists, are not numerous due to lack of support from the youth.

What makes things even more difficult is the absurd situation on the labour market - professional education has become one of the factors that cause its unbalance, perceived in the decay of vocational structure of jobs as a result of transformation of the manufacturing-based economy into the resource exporting economy; intermediary character of the economy (prevalence of professions in the service sector and simple work jobs); absence of demand for the “intellectual potential” which makes university graduates the main source of the unemployed; fast spreading of such social anomaly as taking a job, which requires lower qualification or qualification in a different professional sphere, as a result of no vacancies for a highly qualified specialist.

Under the circumstances professional education should not follow blindly the demand of the current labor market, it has to develop according to the formula of advanced needs. The advancing society needs a “pure” intellectual potential to guarantee steady progress, free from exorbitant claims from current employers, first of all in the sphere of science and technology.

However, what has happened to the university education in recent years obviously contradicts the formula of advanced needs. Now the higher education is viewed as an imperative requirement of the employer, a necessary, but insufficient condition to receive a workplace in an effective segment of labor market. University education, even in the spheres where it was not required before, now has to be supported with some additional training focused on deeper specialization or upgrading knowledge, skills, and abilities. Complexity and dynamism inherent to the labor sphere often generate erroneous perception of its structure and cause inadequate expectations in young specialists [3].

On the other hand, in many cases employers recruit the professionals of lower skills they really need and are therefore forced to invest additional financial resources into proper training or retraining new university graduates. In other cases, they cannot engage and keep interested, talented and dedicated employees, if they are not yet fully adapted to the realities of the labour market.

Sometimes employers, without having a large number of vacancies with really high degree of complexity of work, nevertheless, announce overestimated professional requirements for potential applicants. As a result, the population of the country and institutions of professional education receive false signals of a high demand on the labor market for specialists with a fashionable higher education who have the highly skilled status only formally. Most often these employers do not need professional qualification as it is, they require the university diploma irrespective of the vacancy’s key features. Such factors as the sharp rise in the number of paid education programs, university orientated school leavers, stereotypes of highly prestigious professions of a lawyer, economist, manager, etc. result in an excess of graduates with this kind of education on the labor market.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The obvious disbalance in educational programmes with numerical superiority of Humanities over Engineering inspired the authors to study the reasons for it together with the students’ motives who choose them.

The results of the academic research, described in the present paper, are based on the standard method of “social survey research”, focused on the Russian youth as a socio-cultural group with certain outlooks in the field of education. The purpose of the study was to examine the sociological aspects of university education based on certain identification and value orientations.

The empirical base of the research is composed of:

1. Materials of independent “social survey research” conducted by the authors, who have been working at three Russia’s leading universities: Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Law Institute of Russian University of Transport (RUT-MIIT).
2. Sociological studies conducted by the Russian Public Opinion Research Center (VCIOM) in 2018-2019 [4].

The “social survey research” was conducted in person among a group of 310 students from two top Russian Universities who are studying law and economics for the qualification of a ‘Customs Specialist’. It was carried out within the first April week, 2019 on different days, due to the Spring Semester schedules of classes and covered students aged 18 and over, being in different years of study.

The survey research combines both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection through a questionnaire composed of 20 closed-ended and open-ended questions. The former group was represented by multiple choice questions offered for the participants to tick the answer they chose. The other group of questions suggested screening the respondents’ thoughts and feelings, though the questionnaire was anonymous and was designed for particular research purposes. The questions of the survey reflected the purposes of the study, which were:

1) to examine the sociological aspects of university education, which lie behind the students’ motivation of study;
2) to determine their future job expectations on graduation from the university;
3) to assess and explicate the amount of satisfaction with life (rank of happiness index).

The method of evaluating the state of happiness, used in the present research, was developed by a group of independent experts "in support of a UN High level meeting on “Wellbeing and Happiness: Defining a New Economic Paradigm" [5]. The first report was released in April 2012 and was based on a set of available global data interpreted in relation to the reported quality of life and its individual measurement as “happiness”. Every year the report highlights the dominant aspect of social life which changes together with society, determines the line of human development and thus influences communities. Consequently, the indicators to measure the state of wellbeing and happiness change a little year by year, reflecting the changing world and human sensations. The central theme of World Happiness Report 2019 was defined as “happiness and community” with the special attention to “information technology, governance and social norms” [5]. The central theme aggregated six indicators - GDP per capita, social support, healthy life expectancy at birth, freedom to make life choices, generosity and perceptions of corruption which cause positive affect and negative affect on humans, discussed in the final part of the report.

Though the report itself together with the results, presented in it, are beyond any dispute and look quite convincing, we still feel that it should be modified a little in relation to our research and supplemented/topped up with some more factors which influence the feeling of life satisfaction, bringing about the feeling of happiness among university students. These are:

To collect the necessary information, the students were asked questions about their hometown, family status, sources of financing their education, success factors for personal growth and job expectations.

The survey was conducted in 3 steps:

Step 1. Design the students’ survey for evaluation.
Step 2. Conduct the survey.
Step 3. Analyze the collected data.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Russian Market of Youth Labour

The destruction of the infrastructure of public education, its excessive commercialization, erosion of quality and imbalance with the demand for labor have significantly worsened the conditions of socio-economic adaptation of young professionals in the labor sphere. It takes 4 to 5 years for students to get ready for professional labour, but nowadays the labour market changes so quickly, that it can undergo significant quantitative and qualitative changes in the professional and sectoral structure of employment. Fluctuations in the demand for certain professions in the context of rapid changes of the market conditions and the natural backlog of the education system exacerbates the gap between the knowledge and skills acquired by young people and their practical implementation. The quality of the workforce does not always guarantee its competitiveness.

Complete refusal from the system of guaranteed job placement for University graduates that existed in the Soviet era, has led to the fact that young people face an extremely difficult task of self-governing job hunting. Well-established relations between employers and educational institutions have been destroyed and have not been restored yet. Life experience proves that even in periods of stable economic development and predictable labor market, a significant proportion of University graduates are not ready for effective adaptation in the labor sphere. Their employment opportunities shrink further on in times of crisis.

On April 15, 2019 the Russian Public Opinion Research Center (VCIOM) released the result of the survey focused on the Russian labour market [4]. It shows that 28% of all employed persons in Russia have never worked in the job they have been trained for, and among those with secondary education this proportion is 36%. Today only 51% of all the respondents are working in the specialty field, and among the people with university education this share is 58 %, while 47% of all the respondents are doing other kinds of job with the portion of the people with secondary special education of 55%. Out of the group working in the specialty, only 48% of the employed persons showed a long-time employment (more than 5 years), another group of 16% have worked from one to five years, and 6% of the employed declared less than one year.

Those respondents who are not working in the specialty, explain it by their failure to find a suitable vacancy or lack of vacancies in the specialty (30%) on the labour market, higher wages in another professional field (24%), as well as the fact that they feel self-actualized in another field of activity (20%).

To get a job in a new field of activity, 37% of those who are not working in the specialty, have taken retraining courses. Among the persons with higher education, this proportion is higher, it amounts to 45%, while among jobholders with secondary education it makes just 24%. A little more than a third of all the respondents (33%) have not taken any special courses at all, but upgraded their skills and knowledge on their own, the share of the people with secondary education here is higher, it reaches 41%. However, only 29% of the respondents have not received any special knowledge or skills to work in the present field of activity.

These data show that though the situation on the labour market is quite unstable and diverse, persons with university education are more flexible and have more chances to find a job they are looking for. The trouble is that a great number of paid educational programmes paved the way to the university degree not only for the talented youth, but for everyone, with enough money to pay. As a result, social lifts for the talented youth of modest means have disappeared as contrasted with the Soviet period, when gifted students were encouraged to go to university and were granted scholarships, equated with/compared to the minimal wages, depending on their academic achievements. The new social practice to follow in the father’s footsteps prevent young people from choosing other life alternatives or participating in different social practices, thus closing horizontal shifts among social groups.

Here the emphasis lies on social stratification, when rejection of education is explained by financial insolvency.
The process of social differentiation in education, access to educational resources for school leavers from different social strata, employment prospects for graduates on the labor market are relevant to the extent that young people feel the need to obtain professional knowledge and skills. And if the driving force of social development is not the educational level itself, but the prerequisite for education, then there arises a necessity to study educational strategies of young people, their attitudes to education.

Educational strategies of young people as a choice are based on their understanding of the labour market situation, career growth opportunities, salary and fringe benefits, as well as on certain educational settings, which, if taken together, make significant adjustments to the structural changes in education.

Now that the global trend is to reduce the mobilization potential of education and prolong the social transit of young people, educational strategies characterize the group practices of young people aimed at social reproduction. Russian youth have to act in a situation where the social experience of older generations is ineffective, i.e. the tradition largely does not work, and the new norms are marginal, limited to "shadow" social practices and informal social dependencies. The majority of young respondents recognize the value of education (64.3%), but in general the positive attitude is differentiated, ranging from pragmatic to normative and therefore requires independent research [6].

Thus, an active role of young people in the education system depends on how much education corresponds with their group needs, the implementation of their life plans and social prospects. Such interpretation presumes independent steps of young people as a social group in the field of education. It is assumed that education as an institution of a modernized society is correlated with the social outsiders’ psychology of young people, their readiness for social change. In other words, youth through education activates social energy, becomes the subject of social action.

B. Moscow City Statistics

Moscow, being the capital of the Russian Federation, like most metropolises in the world, is an extended city with noticeable social differentiation clearly seen in the types of high-rise apartment houses located in prestigious central city districts and much cheaper multi storey apartment blocks in urban renovation areas, lying in the outskirts of the city. The difference is even more visible, if we compare Moscow and its suburban areas and townships, which make an administrative division “Moscow region”. The observed difference in housing conditions cannot but influence the patterns of social behaviour revealed in the paper further on.

Nowadays “big Moscow” (Moscow together with the suburbs) has close economic, social and cultural relations with Moscow region and can be rightly called the biggest urban agglomeration in the Russian Federation with the population of over 12 630 289 people (January 2019), which makes 11.622% of the whole population of the country.

Fast growing urban infrastructure, various job opportunities and numerous cultural achievements attract both external and internal migrants, willing to make their home in Moscow. The migration trend in 2018 showed the total migrants’ population in Moscow of 353692 people, with net migration gain of 98763 people, or 78.7 people per every 10 thousand Moscow residents [7].

These data show only the people, registered by Moscow authorities, and do not include seasonal labor migration of self-employed people, who come to Moscow in summer season looking for temporary job placement of doing flat renovation, nursing sick or elderly people, or doing garden work for private owners/individual employers. Though such labour relations are risky for both parties, they do not go through job centres or formal agreements and are not taken into account by governmental or non-governmental statistics. There is no definite information about how big is this off the record sector of people, active on the labour market. Though according to some estimates is reaches 40 % of the total labour market in Moscow [8].

In 2018 Moscow residents constituted around 35 % of the labor force and about 20 percent was accounted for Moscow region residents [9].

Moreover, authorized statistics does not take into account Moscow region residents, employed in Moscow, or university students, who have to commute to their colleges and back 5 days a week. An average time span for them to get to the destination place is two hours one way or four hours of travel every work day. Since there is no approved information concerning social stratification of all migrants or student migration, we can assess how many of them come to Moscow to study from Russian regions or abroad very roughly. That is why we analyzed the result of our survey research separately for the three groups of students: Moscow residents, Moscow region residents and international students.

C. University Education Statistics in Moscow

Moscow is often called a University city as there are 161 institutes of higher education, which makes about 28.96% of all higher educational institutions in Russia (556 in total for 2018) [10]. About 90% of all them are state universities or institutes, which does not mean, that education they offer is free, most of the wide range of courses for 179 specialties are far from being free. Nevertheless, higher education is popular among Russian school leavers. Olga Vasilyeva, Minister of Education and Science of Russian Federation says that in 2017 only 30 % of 183441 Moscow students are Moscow residents, the other 70% come from other Russian regions and abroad. The Minister emphasizes the fact that now the situation looks quite the opposite in comparison to the years before 2009, when the Unified State Examinations, were introduced as mandatory for all secondary schools and higher education institution. Before 2009 the percentage ratio was as follows: 70% Moscow residents and 30% nonresident students [11].

One in every 5 graduates of Humanitarian specialties studied in the field of Economics and Management or Law, the priority of which is the Law. The growth in the number of graduates is observed in the service sector, in the field of computer science and technology, in construction and architecture [11].

These data prove the increased competition on the labour market and in the education sphere which undoubtedly affect
the motivation for education as well as the feeling of satisfaction/happiness of life [12], [13].

The findings of our research make it possible to state that over 80 % of the respondents made the choice of the university under the influence of the family or friends, about 10 % relied on social media in their search and another 10 % of them made efforts to study into the case visiting places and comparing strong and weak points of different universities.

Icek Ajzen, a famous American social psychologist, believes, that “intentions to perform behaviors of different kinds can be predicted with high accuracy from attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control…” [14]. Following this concept, one might believe that the school leaver’s intentions to go to the University are pragmatic: work hard to pass the exams, learn the profession and get a nice job on graduation. In fact, reality turns to be different. Here is a typical list of forced motivation students report: “I wanted to take up Computer Science, but I had low scores in Mathematics in the Unified State Examinations”, “my parents advised me to take up Law”, “I had no other options”, “when I realized what I was really interested in, it was too late to change anything”.

This leads to a number of negative consequences: low quality of initial training, lack of desire to improve their professional competence, lack of clear professional orientation in employment and etc. [15] Another equally important problem is the low social mobility of Moscow school leavers, their reluctance to migrate to another region for education.

Hence one of the significant problems of the modern labor market is the mismatch of the orientation for professional training young professionals have and the demand for professionals on the labour market. As a result, there is a glut of specialists in the field of Economics, Law, Humanities and Social Sciences on the labor market. Graduates who are qualified in these professions face significant difficulties in finding employment.

At the initial entry onto the labor market, young people often have idealistic views of the future profession, labor in general and their professional career, which from the first steps onto the labor market pass away and lead to complex social and psychological conditions (anxiety, depression, affecting the communicative sphere and accompanied by a sense of hopelessness, guilt complex, and so on). A clash with labor reality causes the reorientation and even degradation of work values. Some sociologists say that unemployment should be considered as a kind of socialization of young people. But still, the most convincing is the point of view that unemployment has a negative impact on the socio-psychological development of young people and often leads to the loss of plans to seek a job, as a way of personal self-realization, and process of normal socialization [16].

Thus, the modern youth labor market of Russia as a part of the world is characterized by an increasing gap between the labor claims of young people and the opportunities to meet them. The findings of our research work show, that over 70 % of the respondents are convinced they will find a job in their particular specialty immediately after they graduate from the University. Their expectations of earnings are above the average. Since young people, as a rule, have no practical work experience (or lack of it), their high requirements for payments make a search for a suitable job quite problematic, though up to 35 % of all the respondents in our survey research confirmed having part-time or sometimes full-time jobs in the service sector of economy (as waiters/waitresses, merchandisers, pizza delivery men and so on), while the other majority (65 %) reported having financial support from their parents and 5 girls mentioned the financial support from their husbands.

Lack of relevant work experience often becomes an obstacle in filling vacancies, as heads of enterprises and organizations prefer to hire professionals with sufficient experience. Incomplete use of the labour potential of the youth is a bad thing, since slowing down the upgrade process of the workforce and turnover of staff (especially in those spheres of activity, which for young people is not attractive). And the waste of their labor potential at the present time is the loss of labor quality in the near future.

The problem of the market-labor relations for young people is closely connected with the problem of youth labor orientation, with their ability to structure priorities and needs, desires and opportunities. There is a common judgement that the acute situation with youth employment is primarily related to the lack of any vacancies at all. Then, if by means of some methods (preferential pensions for working employees, job quotas for young people, etc.) it will be possible to open new vacancies, they will be filled by young people, and the severity of the problem will be smoothed over.

D. Success Factors as Motivation for Education

The educational process acts as a component and a factor in the evolution of motivation of students, the formation of the student as a professional and as a person [17], [18]. The study of the educational process has shown that not every learning process forms a positive motivation, contributes to the development of personality. Interest in learning, academic achievements, respect for the student’s personality, molding such important qualities of a specialist as independence and initiative, decency and tolerance, adaptive abilities and the ability to self-actualization are the most successful and effective in terms of innovative learning.

Educational strategies of Russian youth are aimed at achieving success through education and come into conflict with the existing mobile potential of education. Education lags behind the training of specialists and is more focused on self-reproduction, which causes the effect of “situational choice” and neutralizes the search for the optimal model of educational strategy. The respondents were asked: “What do you think is most necessary for a young person to succeed in life?” (table 1 below). Let us compare this question with the answers given by the three student groups.

Among the group of 310 respondents, 42 % of the students are Moscow residents, 5 % are international students (mostly from former Soviet Republics), the rest 53 % are Russian region residents, including those, who live in Moscow region. The percentage ratio of the present research differs a little from the data, given by Olga Vasilyeva, Minister of Education and Science of Russian Federation. It can be explained by the comparatively small representative sampling of our research as compared with the total statistics of students, studying at
Russian higher educational institutions, irrespective of their permanent residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Moscow residents ranking indicator</th>
<th>Russian region residents ranking indicator</th>
<th>International students ranking indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inborn talents</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network of contacts</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiative</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard work</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good education</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good luck</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to arrange affairs</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family support</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-potential career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students could choose no more than 3 options.

The finding of the “social survey research” disclosed the factors, which lie behind educational strategies of an individual student. Though they tend to be variable with every single student, still there stand out some features typical of groups of students, united by common background.

In context of Julian B. Rotter’s theory “Locus of Control” the Success Factors presented in Table I fall into two groups, that of “internal locus of control” and “external locus of control” [19].

‘Inborn talents’, ‘initiative’, ‘ability to arrange affairs’ are clear-cut cases of “internal locus of control” and “external locus of control” [19].

The final step of assessment planned to be done as a result of the survey research was the degree of happiness, the respondents feel keeping in mind their social status, academic achievements, satisfaction with their contacts with friends and the relations with the family. The respondents were asked to measure virtually happiness with a numeric index ranging from 1 to 100 points. Surprisingly, except for 3 students, who specified 100 points and one student, who labelled his happiness with 0 points, other respondents of all the three groups showed approximately identical results, measuring it from 45 to 60 points.

**IV. Conclusions**

The overview of the main research findings and most common views on sociological aspects of education, the nature of educational motivation among students which, if taken together, inevitably influence their self-perception, emotional state, satisfaction with life and feeling of happiness. All these, especially the emotional components, preoccupy scholars worldwide and have become the object of scientific research for at least the past decade.

Summing up the results of the “social survey research” described in the present paper, the authors bring the following points to the foreground:

1. Young people have unequal access to education due to social, financial and territorial factors. Educational segments are disproportionate and do not meet the structure of the market economy forcing graduates to go into “shadow” social practices.

2. Most of the respondents (over 80 %) while choosing the university, did not have a clear view of their future professional career and took up the specialty and the course of studies under the influence of their parents, who pay for their education.

3. The students’ families and particularly parents made their choice of the children’s future taking into consideration the social status of their future job, high payments and career prospects. Though they seem to have over evaluated these factors, as the labour market is overflooded with young graduates of similar education.

4. Success factors in life designated by the respondents undoubtedly base on the socio-cultural aspects of their everyday life: economic status of their families, economic situation in the country, complexities of urban life in a megalopolis, attitudes towards the social environment and work, readiness for hard work as a necessary prerequisite for success. Most of the respondents belong to the group of people with a strong internal locus, who believe that their personal efforts do not matter much in their life, whatever happens in it, is the result of someone’s activity which comes only fifth in their answers. ‘Network of contacts’ together with ‘hard work’ and ‘family support’ are highly valued by international students for clear reasons, while ‘good luck’ is least valued by them.

Moscow residents do not value ‘inborn talents’ in the least, ranking them at the bottom. Russian region residents do not value ‘initiative’ least of all, which might reproduce their compliance with their parents’ decisions (82 % of them said the parents influenced their choice of the University).

The analysis of the findings demonstrates different approaches to education and different expectations of its effect on their life. While 100 % of the respondents recognize its value and necessity, only two groups of students (Russian region residents and international students) place ‘good education’ as the top factor of success in life. Moscow residents name the ‘money’ factor as the most important one of all. The difference in approaches reflects the existence and volume of social capital, resource capabilities of the parents, and most importantly – the ranking (brand) of the University that might influence the entire subsequent career of the student, his access to benefits and competitiveness as a young specialist.

Thus, Russian regions and international students in contrast with Moscow students occur in different social settings that contribute to the specific character of living standards in the metropolis in contrast to Russian provinces and former Soviet Republics. Nevertheless, it is still possible to see the vector and socio-cultural meaning determined by the students’ value orientations and behavioral patterns. And their assessments reflect the surrounding reality and orientation in it, reveal the degree of awareness of social values and the impact on their behavior in everyday life.

Moscow residents rely mostly on a ‘network of contacts’ and ‘good luck’, ranking them higher than ‘good education’,
or some outward circumstances. This is how they explain their passive attitudes and indifference even to their own life.

5. Educational strategies among the respondents are quite unclear. They all expect highest scores at the examination, but do not take pains even to go to the library. Less than 2% of the respondents (6 students) visit the library two times a semester: at the beginning to borrow course books and at the end to bring them back to the library. The rest respondents claimed that they find all the necessary information on the Internet.

6. Medium personal happiness index (45%-60%) can be interpreted by the inevitable feeling of dependence on the parents who pay for the education and on social and financial parents: part time jobs are not paid well enough to rent a flat, pay for their own education and feel independent. Besides, life in a metropolis or agglomeration, which Moscow undoubtedly is, appears to be stressful, due to crowds of people moving everywhere - in public places and shops, on public transport or using transportation facilities. And not everyone shows respect to each other’s personal space.

7. In view of the above, it is possible to identify a number of the strengths of the respondents:
   - high mobility potential, flexibility, activity, ability to adapt quickly, energy;
   - high degree of socialization;
   - knowledge of modern technologies and gadgets;
   - readiness to start working from low starting positions in a company.
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